

UNITED WISDOM

Loyalty to an Employer and Responsibility towards Society

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-16-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Loyalty to an Employer and Responsibility towards Society

Epigraph

Do not impose on him, and, moreover, withstand him to his face.

Analects XIV.23 in James Legge's numbering. The passage concerns service to a ruler in a historical setting, rather than a contemporary employment contract or external reporting procedure. Here “impose on” means deceive, rather than impose a demand.

What this article is about

In a hypothetical scene, Sasha works for a company maintaining a city journey planner. She notices that some routes are marked wheelchair-accessible using outdated data. The team acknowledges the issue but proposes correction after an advertising launch. She is told that raising it now would hurt the company and colleagues. Sasha has not checked every route or every municipal-project condition. Yet users already rely on the published marks, while the internal correction plan includes no comprehensible limitation on the website.

Employer loyalty has grounds: work agreements, entrusted information, cooperation and responsibility for a shared outcome. Society includes people beyond the team, however. Product users are affected by its messages too. This article distinguishes organisational support, specific objection, personal contribution and responsibility towards outside participants. It determines no publication's legality, protected-report status, employment rights or mandatory complaint route. It proposes neither exporting internal documents nor investigating the whole system independently. Its narrower subject is what an employee can justify when organisational convenience conflicts with significant expectations beyond the company, while knowledge and authority remain limited.

I. The Employer Is Not Everyone Affected

Sasha receives company pay and performs its tasks. Public-good language cannot simply discard that particular relationship. Work involves agreed deadlines, access rules and coordination. Yet the product addresses users making decisions from its information. Absence from an internal meeting does not diminish those decisions' significance. The scene concerns route accessibility rather than general dislike of advertising. People may need a reliable limitation or verification to plan a journey. Company statements affect outside lives even where a mistake arose through an ordinary work process.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Identify who is affected. The broad word “society” can conceal the subject and make any speaker's action seem morally grand. Here particular route users, support staff, data owners and project partners are involved. They have differing opportunities and expectations. Sasha need not claim representation of every resident. A published mark has recipients who did not choose the team's internal risk. Responsibility concerns a particular communication rather than an employee's entitlement to speak for abstract public good.

A shortcoming differs from a significant error. A map may have an imperfect colour scheme or misdescribe a route's traversability. Both concern the product but affect choices differently. Sasha should clarify which information is outdated, where this is confirmed and what remains unknown. An unchecked rumour should not become established inaccessibility of every route. Nor should a confirmed circumstance disappear into “ordinary rough edges.” Moral reasoning starts with precise subjects rather than exaggeration or convenient understatement replacing examination.

Limited knowledge does not require complete silence. Sasha can report a checked discrepancy and request consideration of remaining data without appointing herself an expert on the city's entire infrastructure. Her role may concern wording or conveying questions to responsible people. She need not independently inspect streets or certify every technical requirement. Yet participation in a statement she knows to be unconfirmed raises a question about her contribution. The employer remains significant, while its convenience does not close consideration of the statement's actual recipients.

II. Loyalty Can Mean Fidelity to the Work

Supporting a company sometimes means avoiding unpleasant questions. An organisation exists for particular work, however, rather than merely preserving an image. A journey planner's purpose includes information fit for decisions. Sasha can object because she takes that purpose seriously. This motive guarantees no conclusion's accuracy and permits no declaration that quiet colleagues are dishonest. Loyalty and objection are not inherently exclusive roles. Ask which work is supported and whether advertising success alone has replaced its purpose.

Analects XIV.23 includes refusal to deceive and direct remonstrance in serving a ruler. Its historical ruler–servant relationship differs from modern employment and authorises no arbitrary resistance. The limited comparison concerns fidelity itself: disagreement does not necessarily stand outside service. Nearby XIV.8 connects loyalty to instruction of its object. No contemporary reporting procedure follows, and a company is not designated a moral ruler. The retained question is whether fidelity may include correction rather than approval alone.

Objection needs connection to the work. General dislike of advertising can erase the route issue; unsupported declarations of dishonour move discussion towards reputation. A narrower concern is that published marks lack confirmation in a particular part, users treat them as current, and the interim limitation needs deciding. This editorial example is no mandatory formula. It permits examining the subject without accepting a comprehensive company assessment or first declaring Sasha morally superior.

Fidelity also requires hearing clarification. The mark may already be labelled provisional elsewhere, or fewer routes may be affected than Sasha thought. Compare such information with what users actually see. An internal intention is not a published limitation; an accepted correction task is not an implemented change. Sasha can distinguish these states without rejecting explanations or treating every explanation as completion. Loyalty becomes precise where actual communication, rather than meeting participants' confidence alone, evaluates the shared outcome.

III. Inaction Can Involve Responsibility, within Limits

On Liberty I considers harm through inaction as well as action. Mill also emphasises greater caution in compelling responsibility for failure to prevent than for direct causation. His argument concerns social compulsion and utility rather than current product-error reporting law. The limited comparison is that doing nothing new does not always remove a moral question. It does not require every employee to prevent every social consequence. Consider knowledge, role, opportunity and particular relation to the statement.

Sasha may not control map publication. This limits her opportunity without erasing available actions: clarify a discrepancy, convey it to an actual responsible participant, propose a visible limitation or decline personally to certify an unproved mark. Every worker does not have every option. No single sequence is prescribed. Responsibility needs an honest account of actual possibilities rather than imagined total control. Limited authority also cannot excuse a claim one can change within one's own contribution.

Waiting can mean awaiting competent checking rather than indifference. With ambiguity, immediate broad publication can amplify inaccuracy. Waiting nevertheless has a subject: who checks what, and what message remains available meanwhile? Without distinctions, “checking” can name indefinite postponement. Sasha need not appoint an arbitrary deadline she lacks competence to set. She can establish the task's actual state and separate acceptance from completion. Waiting has stronger grounds where its limits and relation to current use are visible rather than known only to those eager to finish an advertising launch.

Where data already shape important decisions, an interim limitation becomes a question. Some information can be identified as requiring checking without declaring the entire product

useless. The option must correspond to actual knowledge and authority. It supplies no universal technical solution or route-safety guarantee. Its moral point is not presenting an unconfirmed claim as verified. Immediate danger involves applicable local services and professional duties this article does not establish. Calm reasoning should delay no necessary assistance or replace specialist assessment.

IV. Confidentiality Differs from Concealing the Subject

Companies entrust internal information to employees. Protecting it has independent weight: documents may contain personal data, plans, others' work and material unrelated to an error. Public responsibility does not automatically permit exporting everything. An inaccurate mark does not make customer lists or private colleague correspondence public material. Distinguish necessary subject from accompanying information. This article does not decide external disclosure's lawfulness. Its moral boundary is that a serious concern does not make all accessible information the employee's property.

An issue can sometimes be described without closed material: identify the published mark, one's own check and knowledge limits. Sometimes competent consideration requires an internal document. The recipient's actual role and applicable access conditions then matter. Sympathy does not make every transfer permissible, while “confidential” does not permanently resolve every question of content. Moral reasoning retains both sides and recognises where particular duties require applicable rules and professional advice. Philosophical comparison grants no legal permission.

Internal conversation may be an available first route without being established as sufficient in every case. Acceptance by a responsible person creates an opportunity for correction; ignoring the concern does not remove it. No universal escalation ladder or endless return to one recipient is prescribed. Examine actual ability to act and the issue's state. Sending a letter is not removing an error; broad outside communication is not removal either. Actions are assessed by subject, accuracy and consequences rather than internal or external location alone.

Minimum sufficient extent should not conceal what matters. Unconfirmed accessibility should not become a cosmetic suggestion if that changes the recipient's understanding. Nor should Sasha add intentional-harm accusations where she knows only that correction was postponed. Honest extent joins clarity and restraint. Data and deadlines can be described accurately while unknown motives remain unknown. Confidentiality then does not close the subject, and public responsibility does not justify excessive circulation.

V. Public Benefit Does Not Permit Every Means

Sasha may want attention through a sharp public accusation, seeing it as the only route beyond internal delay. Before treating it as necessary, examine its claims and who it enables to act. Unconfirmed technical conclusions can confuse users; others' data create separate harm; motive accusations may lack grounds. These are possible consequences rather than a prediction that every external report is wrong. Public responsibility demands precise means because it addresses people outside the team, rather than granting the speaker moral invulnerability.

Enchiridion XXIV considers benefit to friends and country without permitting loss of fidelity, honour and one's moral good. Stoic evaluation of external goods differs from present-day evaluation of wages and should not dismiss employees' actual needs. The limited comparison concerns means: declared usefulness does not justify every loss of one's action's grounds. The passage supplies no civic reporting regulation or employer protection. It asks what someone preserves in seeking usefulness and whether that quality disappeared through the selected method.

Public good can extend a personal conflict too. Sasha may dislike task allocation while genuinely identifying an error. Mixed motives do not prove a report false. Personal dispute should not hide inside technical accusation, however. Separate known facts about the map from team-relationship judgements. Recipients need what was checked rather than proof of an employee's resentment or selflessness. No purity of soul must be established before every objection. The subject should not be strengthened with unconfirmed information serving another purpose.

Means include obtaining knowledge. Moral concern authorises no access bypass, copying of others' databases or concealed investigation on one's own decision. Information available in a work role still requires consideration of actual duties and conditions of use. Unavailable information does not become accessible through a helpful goal. This does not close every route: the published product and one's contribution may sufficiently ground clarification. Distinguish a responsible question from appropriation of others' resources; otherwise public benefit can conveniently name an employee's new unauthorised power.

VI. The Cost of Objection Must Remain Visible

Sasha depends on pay and team relationships. Dissatisfaction, lost opportunities or other consequences are possible. Philosophy promises no protection, compensation or favourable development. Courage demanded without attention to actual living conditions comes too easily to an observer. Moral reasoning should allow assessment of real support, competent consultation and limits on participation. Financial dependence does not permit every assertion. It means a decision's cost deserves precise consideration rather than disappearing behind an employee supposedly always able to leave.

One individual should not receive the entire organisation's responsibility. A shared-process problem needs appropriate roles for correction. Sasha can contribute without pretending total control. Management answers for decisions, specialists for checks, and published messages for actual content. Allocation should not become reciprocal excuse; it helps direct concerns to people able to change the subject. Personal responsibility remains: one cannot claim verified data merely because another department presumably should have checked them.

Loyalty to colleagues includes care for private circumstances. Delayed updates may reflect overload or missing inputs. Such facts matter to resolving work without always belonging in public explanation. Sasha can object to delay without making colleagues responsible for everything. Particular actions needing review form a separate subject for appropriate roles. Supporting a person does not require supporting each decision. Correcting a product does not first require humiliating the worker whose mistake became visible. Precise treatment preserves cooperation where possible.

Cooperation may change after objection. Sasha may decline to confirm unverified marks or consider another role. A choice should affect actual contribution rather than declaration alone. Stating a boundary while continuing to write “all verified” leaves the question unresolved. Quietly achieving an honest limitation is no less significant for lacking a public proclamation. Cost and form differ. No correct life outcome is appointed; examine which action actually changed and what responsibility remains.

VII. Correction, Warning and Accusation Are Different Actions

A team may correct data while users who saved a route retain the earlier impression. The question then concerns the previous message as well as the current product. Establish available clarification appropriate to the project's actual conditions. This article prescribes no technical notifications or personal-data processing. It distinguishes changing a current mark from giving previous recipients understandable clarification. The latter may need other work. Removing an old line does not establish that every decision depending on it was corrected.

A data limitation warning does not replace correction either. It may make uncertainty temporarily visible without confirming accessibility. An open task should not become completed simply because a general notice appeared. Preserve what was clarified, checked and remains unresolved. This resists substituting a convenient report for actual state. It requires no publication of an internal task list or perfect-data promise. It requires truthful limits to information other people use.

Accusing motives is another action. Sasha may know a launch will proceed without knowing whether leaders consider the issue insignificant, trust another source or consciously preserve misunderstanding. These differ morally and need evidence. A checked discrepancy may suffice for correction without a final conclusion about intention. Later motive evidence can be considered separately. Successful correction does not prove every earlier accusation; proof of malicious intent should not be demanded before questioning actually inaccurate information either.

Sasha herself can be mistaken. If valid data confirm accessibility, her earlier conclusion needs clarification. This does not make all objections useless. Responsibility includes correction before recipients of an inaccurate impression. Separate factual error, excessive circulation and unnecessary accusation. Abandoning discussion generally will not resolve three different consequences. An employee remains a responsible participant rather than possessor of the single morally correct perspective requiring no subsequent evidence.

VIII. Both Responsibilities Remain after a Decision

Suppose marks were labelled as requiring checking, then checked and updated, while Sasha kept her job without publishing internal correspondence. This hypothetical conclusion predicts no typical outcome. It distinguishes subjects: a limitation became visible, data were checked, a new version was published through an actual role, and private information stayed private. Team relationships may remain strained. Product change does not establish restored relationships; an unpleasant managerial conversation does not establish an uncorrected error. Each state needs its own evidence.

Future agreement can clarify who confirms marks, how outdated information appears, who considers objections and how final messages are checked. This belongs to the team within actual powers, rather than authorising Sasha to impose a universal process. An adopted rule is not established implementation. The next case needs checking of specific new information rather than renewed investigation of the entire company. Proportion preserves the subject and makes responsibility feasible: source, confirmation, limit and actual communication matter more than continual demonstration of suspicion towards every colleague's action.

Confucian service with remonstrance, Stoic preservation of fidelity and Mill's attention to others have different grounds. Mill's historical colonial limitations on liberty are not accepted as contemporary norms; the Analects' social hierarchy does not determine an employee's dignity. Comparison proves no unified reporting theory. It poses limited questions about fidelity, means and responsibility. Current decisions need their own facts and applicable duties. A quotation exempts nobody from them and grants no absent powers.

Employer loyalty and public responsibility can support one another where work fulfils its purpose. Where they diverge, identify a particular action rather than choose permanent allegiance to a camp. An employee can value colleagues, protect unrelated confidences and object to an unconfirmed statement. They can acknowledge knowledge limits and a choice's cost. Moral clarity guarantees no convenient outcome. It enables action answerable to the team and outside people who do not disappear merely because they do not pay one's wages.

What this means in practice

For an ordinary case without immediate danger, describe one discrepancy between an internal decision and outside expectations. This editorial exercise has no established efficacy. Identify a published or planned message rather than the organisation's general image. What have you checked, heard or inferred? Who beyond the team is affected? Claim no right to speak for everyone. Record no secret documents or private details unnecessary to the subject.

Identify your role and actual control. Who can check and change the remainder? Separate options: clarify a fact, convey a concern, show a limitation, correct your part or consider a participation boundary. This is no universal complaint sequence. Particular legal or professional duties need applicable rules and competent advice. Examine means: sufficient clarity, excessive extent, unknown motive presented as fact, or assumed access bypass for a good goal. Separately name real life consequences and available support.

After action, check states. Sent, received, considered, data checked and product changed are different outcomes. Uncertainty warnings are not confirmation; a changed current page does not establish corrected earlier expectations. If your fact proved wrong, identify particular clarification and recipients. End with a limited future rule the team can adopt within its role. Examination should delay no necessary assistance under immediate danger and replace no specialist technical assessment.

Key quotation

> *With the preservation of your fidelity and honor.*

Epictetus, Enchiridion XXIV, short fragment concerning one's place in the state, Thomas Wentworth Higginson translation. Its Stoic grounds promise no contemporary employee protection and supply no external reporting procedure.

Connections between traditions

Source	Its own question	Limited comparison	Boundary
Confucius, XIV.8,23	Loyalty, instruction and ruler service	Fidelity may include objection	No contemporary employment contract
Mill, On Liberty, I	Others, action and caution about compelling prevention	Silence does not always remove a question	No current law or universal duty to prevent everything
Epictetus, XXIV	Benefit to friends and country while preserving moral good	A good aim does not permit every means	No dismissal of income or protection promise
United Wisdom	Hypothetical journey planner	Separate correction, warning and accusation	No complaint, investigation or certification procedure

Sources

• Confucius. The Analects, James Legge, Project Gutenberg 3330. XIV.8–14 and XIV.20–29 were read in displayed continuous contexts; XIV.8 and 23 are used. The epigraph is XIV.23's short reply in Legge's numbering, rather than every modern edition's numbering.

• John Stuart Mill. On Liberty, Project Gutenberg 34901. Continuous Chapter I context, web 200–215, was read, including the author's limitations and 210–214 on action, inaction and responsibility. The 211 distinction is used; historical colonial exceptions are not accepted as modern norms.

• Epictetus. The Enchiridion, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Project Gutenberg 45109. XXIV was read in full, web 237–242. The key quotation is eight English words about fidelity and honour. The later edition and Albert Salomon introduction are distinguished. Full sources are not imported; worldwide edition rights are not declared established.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Tags

loyalty, employer, society, responsibility, work, team, product, data, accessibility, communication, verification, objection, confidentiality, limit, role, authority, action, inaction, means, honour, fidelity, correction, warning, motive, users, Confucius, Mill, Epictetus

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.