

UNITED WISDOM

Another Person's Secret and the Need to Prevent Harm

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-15-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Another Person's Secret and the Need to Prevent Harm

Epigraph

> *A man of understanding holdeth his peace.*

Proverbs 11:12, concluding clause, King James Version. The saying stands beside a warning against disclosing confidences, but supplies no contemporary rule for every dangerous situation.

What this article is about

In a hypothetical scene, Lena learns from an acquaintance organising a small event that the venue has a defective emergency exit. He asks her to keep quiet: repairs have been promised, cancellation would be expensive, and an employee might be punished for the mistake. Lena has not inspected the building and does not know whether another suitable venue is available. Invitations have gone out, however, and the organiser proposes waiting until next week. Another person's secret has ceased to concern closeness alone. A decision may affect people who were absent from the conversation and never accepted its conditions.

Preserving trust matters. Anxiety does not automatically permit publishing private messages or gathering an accusing audience. Yet a promise of silence cannot be considered apart from its subject, the seriousness of possible danger and the possibility of preventing it. The ethical question is not a choice between permanent loyalty and immediate exposure. It asks what is known, who can act, what information is necessary and which less destructive options remain. This article explores moral reasoning, rather than emergency instructions, a building safety assessment or a legal disclosure procedure. The hypothetical scene holds trust, limited knowledge and responsibility towards absent people together.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. What Was Actually Entrusted

A secret may concern personal distress, someone's address, a regrettable action, a workplace document or a circumstance affecting other people's decisions. These cases all restrict circulation, but their moral weight differs. If someone confesses embarrassment after an unpleasant conversation, other people's interest does not make the story a matter of public concern. If the account contains information about an obstacle that could seriously harm event participants, another subject requires consideration. Name that subject precisely before evaluating the promise. Lena received a report about a particular exit, rather than permission to investigate the organiser's entire life, family relationships and earlier mistakes.

Distinguish the information from the conditions under which it arrived. The acquaintance may have requested confidentiality, while Lena answered vaguely without understanding the request's extent. Even explicit agreement does not make every subsequent circumstance identical. Nevertheless, she should not retrospectively declare that no promise existed simply because keeping it became inconvenient. She can acknowledge that she accepted a restriction and has since encountered a circumstance requiring reconsideration. That admission does not resolve the dilemma. It prevents responsibility from being replaced by a convenient reconstruction of her own memory.

There is also a difference between someone's own secret and information about a third party. The organiser mentions an employee who made a mistake. That employee did not choose Lena as a confidante. Their name may be unnecessary for removing the obstacle. If the issue concerns the exit's availability, explanations of personal motives and circulation of a name constitute additional interventions. A concealed circumstance does not confer the same entitlement to every detail mentioned alongside it. Information necessary for action and information interesting to an audience deserve separate consideration.

Finally, “secret” sometimes names something nobody agreed to keep: a person merely hopes to avoid an awkward question. The opposite mistake is possible too. No written agreement does not make a confidential conversation public material. Moral reasoning considers the other person's actual expectation, one's own response, the information's nature and the people affected. In this scene, silence deserves consideration without closing the question of the exit. In another scene involving personal correspondence without a threat to third parties, the restriction's weight could be considerably greater.

II. Danger Cannot Be Replaced by Inconvenience

“Preventing harm” can become too broad. Harm may refer to lost convenience, acquaintances' indignation, reduced sales, injured pride or the possibility of a grave consequence. When these distinctions disappear, almost any disclosure acquires a noble description. Ask a concrete question: what event are we trying to prevent, whom would it affect, and why does the available information give grounds for concern? Lena cannot simply say that the organiser behaves badly. She must retain the particular circumstance: an exit may be unusable, and people will attend the event. A moral assessment of his character cannot replace examination of that circumstance.

Separate the report from your inference. The acquaintance described a defect; Lena inferred that repairs might not be completed. He mentioned a deadline; she supposed that the promise was unreliable. Both inferences may deserve attention, but cannot be communicated as established facts. A message to someone able to check the situation should preserve the difference. She could identify the information's origin and her limited knowledge without publishing the correspondence: someone reported this obstacle, I have not checked it myself, and its actual state matters before a decision about the event. This editorial example does not prescribe an official channel or wording for professional duties.

Probability and seriousness are not interchangeable either. An infrequent grave event cannot be dismissed merely because it usually does not happen. An alarming imagination does not establish that this particular outcome is imminent. Where competence is lacking, seek assessment from someone able to evaluate the subject. A philosophical article neither sets technical building requirements nor appoints the reader an inspector. Responsibility includes acknowledging a limit: I can raise a specific question, but cannot declare the premises safe or unsafe on the strength of a conversation alone.

In On Liberty, Mill's example involving speech about corn dealers shows that an utterance's content and the circumstances of its delivery cannot be assessed independently. His argument concerns liberty and interference, rather than contemporary confidentiality rules. It offers a limited comparison here: conveying the same information to different people in different settings may have different consequences. A narrow request for verification and incitement of a public crowd do not become the same action because both employ one fact. That application belongs to this article; it is not presented as Mill's ready-made solution to Lena's situation.

III. Trust Does Not Mean Promising Powerlessness

Keeping a confidence creates space in which someone can acknowledge a mistake before it becomes a wider disaster. If every account immediately becomes an accusation, the motive to speak honestly weakens. This is a moral reason for careful treatment of information, rather than a measured prediction of every person's behaviour. The organiser may have told Lena because he expected a calm conversation. Respecting that approach can involve discussing removal of the obstacle first. Yet the ability to hear an admission need not mean agreeing to wait indefinitely under every new circumstance.

A request for silence may seek preservation of dignity or demand that a danger be allowed to develop freely. Sometimes both meanings are present. A person fears unfair punishment while asking that a significant fact be concealed. Selecting the most charitable or most suspicious interpretation of their motive does not settle the issue. Even an honest fear does not cancel questions about other people. Even a questionable motive does not permit disclosing everything. The decision concerns what should happen to a particular circumstance, rather than who deserves a final verdict on their character.

In Proverbs 11:12–14, the understanding person's silence appears alongside warnings about revealing secrets and the value of counsel. Keeping confidences and seeking thoughtful advice are not depicted as one simple opposition. The passage does not establish present-day professional powers, reporting procedures or exceptions to professional secrecy. It supports caution concerning speech: knowledge is not always something to distribute. The article's subsequent distinction between audience and minimum necessary disclosure belongs to its own ethical reasoning, rather than a hidden modern regulation inside the ancient saying.

Preserving trust sometimes means stating its limits beforehand. Before a person gives the information, one need not promise unconditional silence in every possible case. If the information is already known, honest reconsideration is preferable to secretly changing the terms where it is safe and does not obstruct necessary action. Lena can say that personal details will remain private, while the exit needs checking. Such a conversation guarantees neither agreement nor comfort. Its value is precision: protecting a person is distinguished from agreeing to leave unresolved a circumstance affecting others.

IV. Not Every Listener Is an Appropriate Recipient

Once complete silence seems insufficient, a separate question arises: whom should one tell? Posting in a group chat often looks like the most direct way to obtain attention. A large audience does not necessarily have the ability to remove the obstacle. It may merely discuss blame, circulate inaccurate retellings and spread information further. In our scene, establish who is responsible for the premises and can check their condition. The ethical criterion for a recipient relates to the action's subject. Curiosity, friendship with Lena or shared dislike of the organiser does not sufficiently justify inclusion in the conversation.

Choosing a narrow audience does not mean obligatory trust in any manager. A responsible person may also have an interest in concealment or lack actual authority. The question then remains: seek a way to check the matter appropriate to real circumstances and applicable duties. This article establishes no universal escalation ladder and advises no independent investigation. It distinguishes someone able to prevent a particular consequence from someone who merely increases the number of people informed. Those roles can overlap, but their overlap needs a reason beyond volume or status.

Seeking advice also calls for restraint. Sometimes the dilemma can be described without names or recognisable details. Yet changing a name does not necessarily anonymise an account: in a small community, the event itself may identify the participants. Ask how much actual information this particular adviser needs for a reasoned answer. If specialist knowledge is required, the person's real role and the conditions of consultation matter. A friends' group chat does not become a professional consultation simply because someone participating has relevant qualifications.

The recipient has responsibilities of their own, while Lena retains hers. Passing on the question does not always conclude involvement: she can ask whether the message was received and whether the subject will be checked. Such clarification grants no entitlement to every document or authority over people whose duties she does not know. Conversely, sending a message does not establish that the risk has been removed. Preserve distinct states: I reported it; the message was received; the circumstance was checked; a decision was made. This prevents disclosure itself from being mistaken for harm prevention or success from being claimed before evidence exists.

V. Minimum Disclosure Is Not Evasiveness

Disclosing the necessary minimum does not mean softening the information until the recipient cannot understand it. If the obstacle concerns an exit, communicate that circumstance and the limit of your knowledge. Unnecessary details about the organiser's character can remain private. Do not call the issue a “minor organisational delay” if that expression conceals what needs checking. Minimality concerns the extent of another person's information, rather than the message's clarity. It requires sufficiency: the recipient should understand what needs verification, why it relates to the approaching event and what uncertainty the speaker has not resolved.

Evidence and spectacle also differ. A document or message may sometimes be necessary for checking. That does not mean the entire conversation belongs in public. A fragment has context without which its meaning could change, but context is not the whole relationship's history. Consider extent by subject: which lines confirm the circumstance, which clarify the date, and which contain personal details unrelated to action? No particular selection is guaranteed to suffice or be permissible in a real procedure. The article distinguishes substantiating a necessary fact from exhibiting a person before outsiders.

Minimality can conceal the speaker's own uncertainty. If Lena has not seen the premises, she cannot omit that limitation to make her message more persuasive. If she only knows of promised repairs, she should not present their absence as established fact. Honesty concerning limited knowledge reduces categorical certainty while preserving the possibility of clarification. The recipient can check the subject instead of sorting out two confident conflicting accounts. When consequences are grave, responsibility requires both willingness to speak and refusal to strengthen a report with invented certainty.

A narrow report may leave much unknown. How did the defect arise, who first noticed it, and why was discussion delayed? Not everything must be established before raising a question about an upcoming event. Attempting to assemble a complete moral history can divert attention from a subject requiring a decision. Once the obstacle is removed, responsibility may still deserve examination by appropriately authorised people. Those tasks need not share one message and one audience. Prevention does not cancel subsequent review; subsequent review should not become a precondition for noticing a concrete need now.

VI. Closeness and Impartiality Do Not Coincide

In Analects XIII.18, Confucius evaluates familial concealment differently from an interlocutor praising a son for testifying against his father. This difficult passage should not become contemporary advice to conceal threats or crimes. It explicitly makes the father–son relationship significant to understanding uprightness. Its relevance here is that it prevents all traditions from being declared supporters of one formula of transparency. Within the passage, moral order includes particular closeness. The present editorial dilemma remains open: what weight should absent people receive, and which action is permissible under a particular danger?

Proverbs 24:10–12 addresses failure to help people approaching destruction and questions a profession of ignorance before God. Its religious context and subject differ from the Confucian conversation about familial testimony. These texts cannot become two ways to prove a rule selected in advance. Comparison exposes a tension: preserving relationships and responsibility towards someone in danger can require different questions. This article does not dissolve that tension by claiming that all sources secretly say the same thing. It retains the difference so that a real choice cannot hide behind a convenient appeal to unified ancient wisdom.

Lena knows the organiser but hardly knows the guests. His fear is therefore concrete: she sees his face, hears his explanation and imagines cancellation's consequences. Possible consequences for guests remain anonymous. This difference in visibility neither establishes that she must be biased nor supplies a psychological diagnosis. It grounds a simple question: would my judgement change if someone close to me were among the guests? Conversely, which personal details would I protect if the organiser were an unpleasant stranger? Such questions do not settle the answer; they make the decision's basis more visible.

Particular care for an acquaintance can appear in the manner of communication rather than concealment of the subject. One can avoid humiliation, allow the person an opportunity to correct the circumstance and refrain from circulating unnecessary names. This need not make their convenience outweigh every consequence for others. Impartiality need not mean insensitive publication of everything known either. In this scene, it means that guests do not lose significance because Lena lacks a personal connection with them. Different traditions help formulate the question of closeness; the particular choice remains the participants' responsibility rather than an automatic product of a comparison table.

VII. Agreement Is Desirable but Does Not Always End the Question

If the organiser is willing to act, part of the dilemma may be resolved without disclosure of the private conversation. He can approach responsible people, change the venue or postpone the event until inspection. Lena can propose that route without making the conversation an ultimatum about his moral character. A promise to act and actual removal of the obstacle remain different outcomes. Where other people's decisions depend on the premises' condition, friendly reassurance alone may be insufficient. Retain the question of confirmation proportionate to each person's role. Readers are not asked to provide professional certification; they are asked not to pronounce a problem gone merely because a conversation became more pleasant.

Consent to communicate information makes the moral situation easier, but does not replace examination of extent. Fear may lead someone to permit circulation of everything, including information concerning others. They do not always control that information alone. Even with consent, ask who else is affected and what actually needs communicating. The organiser's agreement to have an exit checked does not mean the employee consents to publication of family circumstances accidentally mentioned in the conversation. Absence of that consent need not prevent a report about the exit itself. The subjects differ; conflating them creates a false impression of one comprehensive permission or prohibition.

Without agreement, self-justification becomes a greater danger. Lena may treat her anxiety as sufficient grounds for any form of action. An appeal to prevention calls for stricter attention to means: a clear subject, honest uncertainty, a recipient able to act and consideration of available less revealing routes. This is neither a formal permission procedure nor a promise that all four considerations can always be satisfied beforehand. Immediate danger involves appropriate local services and professional duties that this article does not define. The ethical exercise supports calm consideration, rather than delaying necessary assistance.

Sometimes the relationship cannot be wholly preserved. An acquaintance may experience disclosure as betrayal even after an explanation. That reaction matters, but does not alone establish that the action was wrong. Nor does every hurt response prove that a courageous exposer acted rightly. Questions remain afterwards: was disclosure necessary, was the fact communicated accurately, could the audience have been smaller, and did unnecessary publicity arise? Answering honestly matters more than a heroic identity. Responsibility includes willingness to correct excessive communication even where the original reason for raising concern was serious.

VIII. Disclosure Requires Work on Its Consequences

Suppose the premises were checked, the event moved and personal details kept private. This is a limited conclusion to our hypothetical scene, not a prediction of how such cases unfold. It does not establish that disclosure always improves matters or that the organiser must feel grateful. Several outcomes can be distinguished: someone able to inspect received the question; information about an obstacle was checked; participants no longer depended on an unverified promise. Lena's relationship with her acquaintance may still require a separate conversation. A technical solution does not replace that work.

If a report proves inaccurate, correct it before the same people who received the mistaken impression. Telling yourself your intention was good is insufficient. Correction can include acknowledging the initial limits of knowledge, clarifying the fact and requesting that the earlier version not be circulated. It guarantees no complete restoration of reputation, but expresses responsibility for one's contribution. Confirmation of the circumstance does not justify added speculation about motives either. One true detail does not establish the entire account's truth. After the outcome, assess the report's subject separately from unnecessary inferences attached to it.

A confidential conversation afterwards may be difficult. Lena can explain what she communicated and why without demanding immediate agreement. She can recognise an experienced loss of trust without accepting a demand never to raise such concerns. Discuss new boundaries concretely: which personal information remains closed, which circumstances cannot be promised concealment in advance, and how future conversations will work. A formula permitting everything for the sake of good destroys meaningful limits. A formula making secrecy outweigh every absent person leaves another side without moral consideration.

The hardest part is relinquishing a wholly comfortable role. A keeper of secrets may participate in inaction; a determined speaker may cause unnecessary harm. These possibilities do not require endless hesitation, but a precise basis for action. Another person's confidence still matters when a particular circumstance must be reported. Prevention still matters when silence is requested. Between them lies work on facts, recipients, extent and consequences. It offers no moral invulnerability. It helps one choose an action for which one can answer without concealing one's limitations or appropriating another person's entire story.

What this means in practice

For a calm case requiring no immediate assistance, try examining one confidence in writing. This is an editorial exercise without established empirical efficacy. Do not record names and details where storage would create a new unnecessary disclosure. Replace the broad word “secret” with a subject: personal confession, unverified report, document or circumstance affecting others. Separately note what you promised and what expectation actually arose. If the promise was vague, preserve that ambiguity instead of retrospectively selecting a convenient answer.

Describe the possible harm as a specific event. What supports its possibility? What did you observe, hear or merely infer? Who is affected but absent from the conversation? Do not assign a numerical risk without grounds. If specialist knowledge is needed, identify the need for appropriate checking. Distinguish possible routes: speaking with the person who told you, asking without recognisable details, approaching someone with an actual relevant role, or communicating more widely. This list is no universal sequence and replaces no applicable professional duty.

For the selected route, write the minimum sufficient information. What does the recipient need to understand the subject and the limits of your knowledge? Which personal details do not help action? Where would shortening make the message misleading? Imagine changed closeness: the person who told you is unpleasant, or someone close to you is among those possibly affected. Does the basis of your decision change, beyond your feeling? End by asking how you would correct a false fact and reduce excessive circulation if mistaken. The exercise should clarify limited action, rather than delay necessary help under immediate danger.

Key quotation

> *Those that are ready to be slain.*

Proverbs 24:11, short concluding fragment, King James Version. The whole verse addresses failure to deliver people from destruction; the following verse relates responsibility to God's knowledge. The fragment establishes no contemporary legal disclosure procedure.

Connections between traditions

Source	Its own question	Limited comparison	Boundary
Proverbs 11:12–14	Thoughtful silence, confidences and counsel	Circulating knowledge requires grounds	No contemporary confidentiality regulation
Proverbs 24:10–12	Helping people facing destruction and responsibility before God	Ignorance cannot serve as a convenient excuse	No determination of competence or emergency action
Mill, On Liberty, III	Free expression and circumstances causing harm	Recipient and setting change a communication's significance	No disclosure instruction
Confucius, XIII.18	Uprightness and particular father–son relationships	Closeness carries its own moral weight	Concealment becomes no general contemporary permission
United Wisdom	Hypothetical scene and limited disclosure	Distinguish fact, recipient, extent and later correction	Editorial exercise without empirical promise

Sources

• Proverbs, King James Version, Wikisource. Selected continuous contexts 11:10–18 and 24:10–19 were read. The epigraph is the concluding clause of 11:12; the key quotation is the concluding fragment of 24:11. Worldwide rights in this historical edition are not declared established.

• John Stuart Mill. On Liberty, Project Gutenberg 34901. Selected opening Chapter III paragraphs on freedom of opinion, corn dealers and the circumstances of speech were read. The article uses a limited distinction concerning setting, without attributing a contemporary reporting procedure to Mill.

• Confucius. The Analects, James Legge, Project Gutenberg 3330. XIII.17–20 context was read, especially XIII.18. Its difficult distinction concerning familial uprightness is retained rather than adapted to one modern formula. Full source texts are neither imported nor indexed.

Tags

secrecy, trust, silence, disclosure, harm, responsibility, fact, uncertainty, verification, promise, consent, recipient, audience, extent, dignity, closeness, impartiality, care, safety, correction, reputation, personal information, third parties, ethics, Proverbs, Mill, Confucius, society

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.