

UNITED WISDOM

Truth Spoken to Cause Pain

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-15-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Truth Spoken to Cause Pain

Epigraph

> *There is that speaketh like the piercings of a sword: but the tongue of the wise is health.*

Proverbs 12:18, King James Version. The image of speech and injury is read as a moral contrast, not a promise that words have medical effects.

What this article is about

Nikita has cancelled his promised help with a friends' dinner at the last moment for the second time. Pavel is left doing everything and feels angry. At the table, he announces that Nikita once failed to finish his studies and lived on his parents' money for a long time. These facts are true and were disclosed privately. They have no bearing on today's cancellation, but Pavel knows precisely where they will hurt. When challenged, he replies that he only told the truth.

This hypothetical scene contains a genuine ground for complaint and a separate action turning complaint into humiliation. A statement's truth answers one question: does it correspond to a known fact? It does not explain the audience, extent, timing or purpose. We will preserve the possibility of a direct, sometimes painful conversation while noticing truth used as a weapon. We will neither diagnose Pavel's character nor require Nikita to endure any speech for moral growth. The question concerns a particular action and available correction, not a psychological diagnosis or a rule for relationships involving threats or violence.

I. A true fact and a permissible action require different checks

Pavel begins his defence with the strongest claim: it really happened. That needs checking if there is doubt. But once confirmed, the discussion does not end. We can accurately state a debt before people who have no need to know it. We can truthfully describe an error and add a detail designed solely to create shame. Truth protects a statement against one kind of wrongness, invention. It does not grant general permission for any use of reliable information, particularly information entrusted in another context.

Two actions need separate examination in the scene. Nikita cancelled an accepted task late, and Pavel can discuss the consequences. Pavel disclosed a personal history to provoke pain, and that needs its own ground. One person's mistake does not automatically permit another's actions. Combining them into a judgement about who is worse loses specific correction. Pavel defends every sentence through Nikita's unreliability; Nikita can defend every cancellation

through Pavel's cruelty. Both questions remain unresolved while the dispute sounds intensely moral and emotionally convincing.

A fact also differs from a conclusion. Not finishing a particular educational programme is a claim about a past event. Saying that Nikita can never be relied upon generalises about all future actions. The first does not prove the second. Two cancellations matter to the next agreement, without authorising a confident account of someone's entire personality and future. The word truth often conceals this transition: an assessment is placed beside a reliable detail and no longer checked. Restore the boundary between an event, its known consequence and the speaker's large conclusion.

Permissibility cannot be judged only by whether the audience already knew. Some friends may know the history, yet Pavel still uses it afresh as leverage. Conversely, a new unwelcome fact may be necessary to correct a shared mistake. Novelty alone does not decide. Grounds, recipients and connection to a forthcoming action matter. The past studies do not help distribute dinner preparation or establish whether confirmed help can be relied upon tomorrow. They give Pavel a more painful instrument, which is precisely what needs examination.

II. Pain does not always mean cruelty

A direct account of a broken agreement can hurt Nikita. Pavel says that he relied on the help, the cancellation arrived too late, and the whole evening had to change. Unpleasantness does not establish impermissibility. A person encounters consequences of their decision, and the discussion may require acknowledgement, a new procedure or a decision against further shared preparation. Care does not mean withdrawing every complaint once someone feels shame. Otherwise a person bearing a real cost has no opportunity to describe their position or determine what they will no longer undertake.

In Nicomachean Ethics Book IV, Aristotle distinguishes a constant wish to please from indifference to another's pain, and allows an unpleasant objection where agreement would be unbecoming or harmful. This ancient normative picture contains social distinctions of its time. We do not transfer its hierarchy into assessment of contemporary people. For the scene, the limited question is whether unpleasantness accompanies a necessary objection or is an independent purpose. A uniformly gentle tone does not guarantee care, and evident firmness does not prove an intention to humiliate.

Content and form work together. A sentence about late cancellation may be delivered loudly before everybody expressly to cause public shame. A calm voice may accompany a detailed list of another's failures. Simply advising quiet speech is therefore insufficient. Examine why this audience was selected and what the person can do afterwards. When a conversation addresses someone able to change an agreement and contains a specific requirement, its

unpleasantness has a subject. When it recruits spectators for another's pain and excludes a response, the problem remains regardless of voice or careful wording.

We cannot infallibly infer intention from another person's reaction. Nikita may experience a fair complaint as an attack; Pavel may deny a plainly selected humiliating purpose. Our own check is more available: which result do I want and which words are actually necessary? If we want the other person to feel as bad as we do, name that wish separately from a need to correct the cancellation. Such honesty requires neither immediate forgiveness nor continued cooperation. It helps choose an action expressing a boundary without presenting revenge as truthfulness's only form.

III. Recipients and extent change the moral meaning of speech

Not every truth is needed by everyone present. If two people prepared the dinner, their initial conversation about labour can happen between them. If cancellation disrupted an agreement involving the whole group, participants may need to know who now does what. This does not make the educational history or financial dependence necessary. Relevant extent is determined by the recipients' forthcoming decision, rather than how many reliable details the speaker possesses. Knowing more about someone close provides more material for pain; knowledge increases responsibility for selection rather than authority to use everything.

Public speech can sometimes be justified. If the group wrongly accuses Pavel of abandoning preparation himself, correcting its misunderstanding may require explaining the cancellation. A private conversation then fails to remove a public false picture. But extent remains connected to correction: the timing and content of the agreement, without expanding into biography. Necessary publicity and excessive detail can coexist in a statement. A person should not have to choose between total silence and unlimited disclosure when the specific shared misunderstanding can be corrected precisely.

Entrusted information matters particularly. Nikita described his past while receiving support, not to supply evidence of unreliability in every future quarrel. Entrustment does not make information permanently untouchable in every possible case. Disclosure still needs a new ground, and today's resentment alone does not establish it. We are not determining legal secrecy or professional disclosure. We are discussing an ordinary relationship in which remembering another's vulnerability should differ from bringing it out whenever winning a dispute becomes desirable.

Before speaking, mentally remove a detail and examine what disappears. If the late-cancellation complaint remains complete without the educational history, that history is not doing necessary explanatory work. If removing the date and accepted task would again wrongly assign the cost to Pavel, those facts matter. This exercise does not make speech

infallible or automatically determine rights. It restores a question about each fragment's function. Words that only increase painfulness should be examined in that role, even when each is reliable and listeners find the account entertaining.

IV. Truth can become a performance for witnesses

Pavel chooses the friends' table because his objection becomes a performance there. Listeners' laughter and surprise can sustain a sense of just retaliation. Audience approval does not examine grounds. People hear one side and often lack the context in which private details were shared. Their support shows a reaction to an account, without proving permissible disclosure. Their objection likewise does not settle how the cancellation should be resolved or which boundary the organiser needs. Reaction and examination are distinct parts of the situation.

In IV.8, Aristotle separately considers humour seeking laughter at any cost and distinguishes appropriate wit from speech that spares nobody. His criteria concern an ancient account of refinement, rather than a ready-made contemporary rule for humour. Our comparison is confined to function: is a person becoming a cost paid for spectators' pleasure? A smile or an announcement that it is only a joke does not change Pavel's selection of a known vulnerability and recruitment of others into it, without discussing the agreement that actually needs attention.

Publicity gives Nikita less room to respond. Explanation may be framed as excuse, silence as confirmation and anger as inability to accept truth. Every action then serves the accusation in advance. This does not prove a psychological type in Pavel; it describes the arrangement he has made. Formally allowing a response is insufficient to change it. Stop giving every reaction the same predetermined meaning and return to a specific event both can clarify without proving their entire human adequacy before the group.

Analects XV.27 calls for examining a person both when everyone hates them and when everyone loves them. We do not make the saying a method for establishing truth at dinner. The limited comparison resists an easy conclusion from unanimity: an approving chorus does not replace examination. Friends can interrupt mocking circulation and separately ask about preparation. Participation need not select one good and one bad person. It can avoid increasing a public cost while the real complaint still requires an accurate conversation of its own.

V. Care does not require a pleasant untruth

After objection, Pavel may jump to the opposite extreme: he must now say everything is fine and nothing affected him. Care requires no such claim. The late cancellation had consequences that can be stated directly. He may decline to prepare together again, require earlier confirmation or stop relying on Nikita's promise in the next plan. A boundary can be unpleasant while addressing a real action. The moral question concerns grounds and method, rather than whether everybody retains comfort and the evening's mood.

Precision differs from softening that destroys meaning. Calling the event a small misunderstanding is inaccurate if someone twice accepted a task and cancelled too late. Saying that he always abandons everyone exceeds what is established. Between these lies a sentence with a subject and consequence. It need not sound like somebody else's polished technique. Pavel can speak in his own voice, remain serious and acknowledge anger. Avoid unsupported generalisations and private details making pain the principal result while leaving the practical question outside the conversation.

Ephesians 4:15 connects truth with love within a Christian image of community; 4:25–32 brings together speech, anger and treatment of others. We preserve this religious context without turning it into universal communication training. The comparison asks about truthfulness's direction: does it serve relationship and correction, or destroy a person in other people's eyes? Love is not reduced to pleasantness. The text does not establish that Nikita must accept every complaint without replying, or that Pavel must continue a relationship after every breach.

Careful precision can also include uncertainty. Pavel knows about the cancellation but may not know its cause. He can find an explanation insufficient to remedy his cost, without inventing motives of laziness, contempt or deliberate exploitation. A fact about action can justify a boundary without a complete account of another's inner world. This reduces the need for a moral trial of personality. We can decide a preparation arrangement no longer works while its causes remain incompletely known and both people describe their relationship to friendship and help differently.

VI. When we want the other person to feel the same pain

Retaliation can contain a need for our cost finally to be noticed. Pavel is tired of cancellation apparently not counting as an event. Naming that need makes other actions available: describe the work, state anger, require a changed procedure or decline the next joint task. This does not guarantee acknowledgement from Nikita. It gives the action a discussable subject. A painful biographical detail is no longer the only proof of a complaint's seriousness, and declining to use it does not require swallowing the consequences or calming down immediately.

A wish for revenge does not always disappear after a better formulation. More accurate speech can be chosen while anger remains. Moral action does not require achieving a faultless inward state first. What matters is not assigning anger the choice of every fact and recipient. If the subject is hard to retain now, the conversation can be moved to a definite time while a significant boundary is communicated. A pause should not become indefinite punitive silence or make refusal incomprehensible. It helps avoid extending harm in the next reply, without promising guaranteed emotional processing in minutes.

Another's painful reaction should not automatically prove our honesty. Saying that it hurts because it is true rules out an objection to method beforehand. Pain may arise from a reliable fact, excessive publicity, breached trust or an unfair conclusion. These differences need examination. Conversely, a calm reaction does not justify disclosure; Nikita may show no distress. Permissibility is not measured by visible emotional intensity. Assess grounds and the chosen action, rather than requiring enough pain to be displayed before recognising another person's boundary.

Pavel can acknowledge that cancellation hurt, that he wants the cost taken seriously, and that private information should not serve as his argument. This does not cancel Nikita's responsibility or require an immediate reciprocal apology. It separates two events and returns each person's part. Nikita answers for accepted participation and cancellation; Pavel for disclosure. If one declines to discuss their part, the other can still define a boundary. Consent to further cooperation remains separate from competition over who admits fault first and earns the right to demand something.

VII. Correct the speech while retaining the justified complaint

After dinner, Pavel recognises that he intentionally caused pain. Correction begins with a specific acknowledgement: he brought a private history before friends and used it to humiliate. A conditional apology for someone else's perception does not describe his choice. But claiming he had no right to be angry removes another significant question. He can acknowledge wrongful disclosure while retaining a need to discuss cancellation. Two separate conversations may be clearer than one large exchange of apologies where actual costs disappear behind a wish to restore a pleasant image of the relationship quickly.

Correction before the audience should consider the picture already created. If friends heard an unsupported conclusion about Nikita, Pavel should distinguish it from fact and withdraw the generalisation. If he retold entrusted information, he need not repeat every detail in a new public message. He can acknowledge its improper use and ask others not to circulate it. Compliance is not guaranteed. The request defines his participation and reduces support for the earlier account. Serious situations require different handling; this scene is no universal procedure for restoring privacy or reputation.

In private, Nikita can be invited to discuss consequences without being required to accept an apology immediately. He may be unready, clarify his position or decline shared preparation. Pavel may decline the previous arrangement too. Correcting speech does not create a duty to preserve friendship unchanged. It restores, where possible, honest grounds for a further choice. An opportunity to part without new disclosure or humiliation matters: a relationship is not valid only when both agree to resume the same arrangement and forget what happened.

A specific future boundary is then needed. For example, do not use information from supportive conversations in a quarrel; discuss cancellation through agreement and consequences; clarify who confirms a task beforehand. This may help without promising freedom from all conflict. Its value is checked in performance: do information and context remain aligned, do tasks have clear deadlines, and can a participant decline early? One well-written apology cannot establish that the problem is resolved. Work continues in the next action, which supplies evidence of what has changed.

VIII. Direct speech that allows an answer

A good direct conversation leaves room for clarification. If Pavel says cancellation came late, Nikita can show the message time or explain that he understood the task differently. Pavel need not agree with every version. But significant facts can be checked instead of demanding acceptance of a large accusation. Speech about a particular action is open to a fact capable of changing a conclusion. Speech about an irredeemable personality often excludes that beforehand. Preserving examinability makes truth responsible participation, particularly when the speaker regards personal pain as sufficient for final judgement.

Directness may end in a clear refusal: next time Pavel will not rely on this help; if the agreement fails, the meeting will be moved; he will no longer discuss private details with the group. Connect boundaries with one's own action and a real subject, rather than punishment for another's reaction. Restoration of trust need not be promised by a deadline. We can acknowledge uncertainty about continuing. Confident language is unnecessary where no decision has been made. Honest uncertainty can be more precise than rhetoric about permanently losing the right to be heard.

Proverbs 12:17–23 places truthfulness, destructive speech and restraint near each other. We do not read the sequence as a developed system of contemporary boundaries. It keeps moral assessment wider than reliability alone. Comparison with Greek discussion of social interaction and Confucian examination does not make three traditions one doctrine. Their historical grounds differ. For our scene, they reveal a subject concealed by the word truth: to whom, why and how a statement becomes an action, and what responsibility remains with the person choosing it in this conversation.

Nikita's cancellation remains an event needing discussion. Pavel's disclosure remains another event. Preserving both without merging them into a total sentence is already more accurate participation. We can seek correction while disagreeing, respect someone while ending a shared project, and speak truth while limiting extent. In the original scene, the available next step is acknowledging disclosure and separately discussing the task. This guarantees no reconciliation. It offers an opportunity to stop using reliability as an unrestricted weapon, while allowing people to answer for their actions and choose their further participation.

What this means in practice

Choose an ordinary complaint you want to express. Do not use the exercise as a procedure for relationships involving threats, violence or significant professional risk. Record the event, known consequence and your conclusion separately. Check whether one fact has become proof of a whole personality. Name the purpose: clarification, correction, a boundary, acknowledgement of cost or retaliatory pain. Mixed motives are possible; acknowledging them helps avoid presenting one as the complete explanation of your chosen action.

Identify a recipient able to participate in the decision. If misunderstanding is already public, determine the necessary public extent of correction. Remove details one by one and examine what is lost. If only painfulness disappears, consider leaving the detail out. If a significant explanation of responsibility vanishes, retain it without biographical expansion. Information entrusted elsewhere needs a separate ground for disclosure; current resentment alone does not establish that everything now belongs to the complaint.

Formulate a specific event, consequence and available request or boundary of your own. For example, help was cancelled after you relied upon it, preparation had to be done alone, and earlier confirmation is needed next time. This belongs to a hypothetical scene, not a universal script. Allow clarification of the fact and understanding of the agreement. Promise neither pleasantness nor immediate restoration of relations, and do not require a correct emotion before allowing a response.

If painful disclosure has already happened, acknowledge the chosen audience and unnecessary detail separately. Correct the conclusion without unnecessarily repeating private information. Return to the original agreement if both are ready, or define your own participation limit. Afterwards check one action: has your circulation stopped, a task been clarified or an obligation fulfilled? This author-designed practice is not a diagnostic test, has no claimed research-established efficacy and guarantees no reconciliation. It helps retain truthfulness, responsibility and the subject of a complaint in one particular conversation.

Key quotation

> *speaking the truth in love*

Ephesians 4:15, a King James Version clause. The context is the Christian community's growth in Christ, not an independent technique for managing another person's response.

Connections between traditions

Source	Context	Limited comparison	Difference preserved
Proverbs 12:17–23	Truthful, destructive and restrained speech	Reliability does not exhaust assessment of information use	The healing image is not a medical promise
Ephesians 4:15,25–32	Truth, love, anger and treatment within community	Speech directed towards relationship and correction	Christian context does not replace contemporary consultation
Aristotle IV.6–8	Pleasing, unpleasant objection, truthfulness and humour	Distinguish painfulness from pain as a purpose	Ancient hierarchy is not transferred to human dignity
Confucius XV.27	Examination under widespread love or hatred	Audience reaction is not sufficient examination	The saying is not a conflict-investigation method
United Wisdom	Hypothetical scene and editorial exercise	Separate cancellation, disclosure, correction and future boundary	The procedure is not attributed to sources

Sources

• Proverbs, King James Version, Wikisource. Selected Proverbs 12:10–28 context was read; the article uses 12:17–23, and the epigraph 12:18. Worldwide rights in the edition are not declared established.

• Epistle to the Ephesians, King James Version, Wikisource. Displayed Chapter 4 context, including 4:1–32, was read; the article uses 4:15 and 4:25–32. The key quotation is a short clause of 4:15, with its religious continuation preserved in the explanation.

• Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, Book IV, W. D. Ross translation, MIT Classics. Selected IV.6–8 and neighbouring context were read. Pleasing versus causing pain, the separate truthfulness

question and humour assessment are used. No contemporary validated communication model is claimed.

• Confucius. The Analects, James Legge translation, Project Gutenberg 3330. Selected XV.21–29 context was read; XV.27 is used for comparison. No literal quotation appears here; its own historical grounds remain distinct.

Tags

truth, speech, pain, cruelty, directness, care, fact, conclusion, intention, complaint, cancellation, responsibility, trust, privacy, audience, publicity, extent, anger, revenge, humour, correction, boundary, consent, dignity, Proverbs, Ephesians, Aristotle, Confucius

About the authors

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

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