

UNITED WISDOM

Persuasion, Pressure and Manipulation

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-19-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Persuasion, Pressure and Manipulation

Epigraph

> *the available means of persuasion*

Aristotle, Rhetoric, I.2, the short concluding fragment of the definition, in W. Rhys Roberts' English translation. It identifies the subject of an art of speech rather than permitting every means of obtaining agreement.

What this article is about

In a hypothetical editorial scene, Oleg organizes a reading-club meeting and asks Daria to lead Saturday's discussion. He explains the topic and says her experience would help newcomers. Daria hesitates: her day is occupied and the duration unclear. Oleg adds that “everyone else has agreed,” although only two have answered, and that a true member would not refuse for personal convenience. He demands an immediate decision although the venue needs confirmation only in three days. The proposal remains attractive, but the way of obtaining an answer changes the conversation.

This article considers influence in ordinary adult conversation. Persuasion offers reasons, pressure increases disagreement's cost, and manipulation here conceals a significant part of the choice's arrangement. These are working distinctions between actions, without personality diagnoses or a complete scientific classifier. Emotional speech is not automatically dishonest; real deadlines differ from invented urgency, and legitimate constraints retain force. Comparing Aristotle with Kant preserves different questions: persuasive speech and limits on treating people. The editorial exercise clarifies one's proposal without promising agreement, replacing specific duties or establishing a method for discovering hidden motives.

I. First Name the Decision Being Encouraged

Oleg asks Daria to lead a particular meeting at a particular time, rather than simply “support the club.” The descriptions differ in the scope of agreement. Supporting the club may mean attending, selecting a text or speaking with a newcomer. Leading a meeting entails another role and expenditure of time. While the subject remains broad, refusal of one action is easily portrayed as rejection of a shared value. Daria begins defending her attitude to reading and people instead of assessing Saturday's work. Initial clarity therefore concerns what the listener should actually do and which commitment follows a positive answer.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

An offer should contain known significant features. If discussion will last three hours, it cannot honestly be described as “sitting with people briefly,” intending to clarify the duration after agreement. Preparing materials is another part of participation. Oleg may not yet know exact attendance or duration. He then names uncertainty and explains what remains to be agreed. Incomplete knowledge differs from concealing a known inconvenience. Daria need not receive an exhaustive account of the club, but should understand the action actually proposed. A clear subject makes an answer more meaningful, even if it is negative.

Name why this person is being approached. Daria's experience may suit the topic, while agreement to another meeting creates no obligation to repeat participation. Oleg can respect her ability without making it a trap: “You are the best, so you cannot decline.” Praise becomes questionable when followed by a prohibition on personal decision. A favourable opinion is not necessarily manipulative. The question is whether the speaker leaves room to reject a specific conclusion drawn from that assessment. Daria can be a suitable discussion leader while being unavailable this Saturday.

An organizer should distinguish a request from authority. Tasks may be assigned where participants accepted that arrangement, or voluntary participation invited. These positions have different grounds for expecting a response. Something cannot first be presented as a free invitation and refusal subsequently treated as breach of an unaccepted commitment. If a role belongs to a prior agreement, show that agreement and discuss possible revision. If this is a new request, club membership does not replace new consent. A defined action helps both parties avoid claiming more freedom or authority than their actual relationship contains.

II. Persuasive Success Does Not Establish a Means' Acceptability

Daria may agree because the subject matters and she can genuinely help. She may agree because she fears being the only person to refuse. The outward result is identical: her name appears on the schedule. The routes to that result differ. One agreement involves assessing reasons presented; another may depend on a false account of others' views or threatened exclusion from a circle. A positive answer alone establishes no quality of influence. Examine what was said, what the speaker knew and which possibilities remained available to the listener at the moment of decision.

At the beginning of Rhetoric, Aristotle considers arguments, trust in the speaker and the listener's state as means of persuasion; in a judicial context he also criticizes influence that distorts judgment of the subject. Emotion is not excluded from his art. The ancient question about available means and their use remains distinct from a modern theory of manipulation. For our editorial argument, the ability to influence differs from grounds for doing so. Knowing a

phrase can produce agreement does not answer whether using it is fair in this relationship and these circumstances.

Oleg can select an intelligible example, explain newcomers' difficulty without a leader or show which work he will undertake himself. These make the subject more accessible and may include emotion, personal concern and expressive speech. Calling every living appeal manipulation leaves artificial dispassion, which guarantees no honesty. Conversely, a calm tone can accompany a concealed lie about timing. Assess the proposal's arrangement: does its form reveal the action and reasons, or make a significant part of the choice less accessible? Outward calm and outward expressiveness are insufficient for a final judgment.

The speaker's purpose matters too. Oleg wants a useful meeting, but may also wish to avoid work or show the group he can assemble people quickly. Mixed motives do not identify acceptable means in advance. Even sincere interest in a shared good cannot make a false statement true. Even personal benefit does not remove the possibility of an honest invitation, provided no important condition is concealed. Examining actions is more precise than hunting one secret motive. An invented deadline or false claim about agreement can be checked without declaring the organizer's entire personality and every reason for behaving revealed.

III. A Reason Should Remain Open to Objection

Persuasion offers a conclusion and the connection through which it was reached. Oleg says Daria knows the text, newcomers need a leader and the meeting suits first participation. Daria can answer that she has not reread the book recently, the topic is harder than it seems or Saturday is occupied. Such responses concern the request's substance. If Oleg can consider them, reasons become a shared subject. If every objection proves selfishness, reasons no longer play that role: they merely decorate a decision already prescribed to the listener. The possibility of answering matters to the method of influence.

An objection need not make the speaker immediately withdraw. Oleg can clarify a fact, offer another time or explain the topic's importance. Strong persuasion permits persistence when it remains directed at the subject and considers the response. Repeating a request after clear refusal can change the conversation, particularly where the listener depends on the organizer or must continually justify herself. Ask whether new relevant information appeared or an attempt to exhaust resistance continues. Not every second question is pressure; not every persistence remains fair because each individual question sounds polite and formally permits “no.”

Distinguish information from its assessment. “Two have answered” reports a quantity. “The others will probably want to participate” is a supposition. “Everyone has agreed” is another claim and may be false. Even later agreement by everyone does not make the earlier statement

retrospectively honest. Daria decided at an earlier moment using different information. Oleg should correct the inaccuracy and permit reconsideration if it mattered. A proper final result does not eliminate questions about the picture of circumstances used to obtain agreement or the other party's ability to assess it reasonably.

Explanations have limits of extent too. A small request need not become an interrogation with dozens of questions. A few words and a shared arrangement sometimes make the reason intelligible. Demanding disclosure of every thought can itself be excessive. An important condition nevertheless cannot hide behind convenient brevity. Additional preparation for leading a meeting concerns choice, even if complicating the invitation is unpleasant for the organizer. Appropriate clarity depends on action and relationship. It requires no perfect knowledge of every future consequence, but calls for honesty about what is already known and capable of changing the listener's answer.

IV. Pressure Raises the Cost of Disagreement

After hearing about a true club member, Daria considers two tasks: leading the meeting and maintaining her standing. Oleg has added a social cost to refusal. This may be explicit, through threatened exclusion, or unclear, through hints of changed treatment. The existence of a cost does not itself make every restriction unacceptable. Actual relationships contain duties, assigned tasks and consequences of non-performance. But a cost should correspond to an accepted commitment rather than be specially created to turn a voluntary request into a demand. Otherwise freedom remains in the wording while a significant part of choice shifts towards threatened loss of belonging.

A genuine deadline also limits options. If the venue requires confirmation that evening, Oleg can request an answer by a particular hour and then choose another leader. State this as an organizational circumstance. If confirmation is three days away, demanding an immediate decision can remove available time without actual grounds. Examine urgency through a fact: what will happen, when and to whom? Absence of an instant answer need not threaten the whole meeting. An organizer may have a convenient plan, but convenience should not be presented as impossibility of waiting. A real constraint thus differs from an obstacle created to prevent calm consideration.

The connection between consequences and the role also matters. If Daria declines one meeting, organizers can find someone else for that task. This need not justify denying her a voice at every subsequent discussion or spreading accounts of unreliability. The response's scale needs separate assessment. Not every punishment can be inferred from one inconvenient decision. Even where a commitment was accepted and breached, name the breach, remaining harm and relevant action precisely. An unclear deterioration of the entire

relationship makes someone guess the cost of particular disagreement and renders the choice less intelligible.

Daria may accept under pressure and later lead the meeting well. Her ability does not justify the appointment's method. She may also accept voluntarily and lead poorly. Work assessment and obtaining agreement concern different subjects. After conflict, “But it went well” cannot close discussion of pressure. A result can be acknowledged while the invitation rule is corrected separately. A bad result similarly does not establish that the original request was dishonest. Judgment should concern facts of the particular influence rather than be inferred entirely from subsequent success or failure.

V. Describe a Concealed Arrangement of Choice Precisely

Here “manipulation” concerns examples where a speaker conceals a significant method of influencing a decision: misrepresenting circumstances, withholding a known condition or making an expectation unnoticed by the listener into grounds for choice. This is a working use, rather than a universal scientific list. Oleg's scene contains two checkable actions: falsely reporting universal agreement and artificially shortening the deadline. Assessing them requires no knowledge of whether he considers himself a manipulator. A precise subject helps discuss correction without replacing conversation with a label claiming complete knowledge of motives and habits.

In Section II of the Groundwork, Kant considers humanity as an end and explains the problem of a lying promise through the other person's inability to assent to the actual method of treatment. His foundation concerns practical reason and duty rather than speech's effectiveness. We compare the possibility of understanding participation, without attributing our pressure classification to him. Daria should be able to assess the actual proposal rather than a deliberately prepared false picture. This editorial conclusion concerns an ordinary request. It demands no complete access to the organizer's consciousness and does not make every influence on another person prohibited use.

Portraying something as the sole alternative can also become manipulative. Oleg says: “Either you lead, or nobody welcomes the newcomers,” although shortening the meeting or inviting someone else is possible. A proposal need not enumerate every imaginable option, but a known available alternative cannot be concealed to produce an impression of no way out. If no alternative actually exists, explain that and leave room for an answer. The absence of alternatives creates no authority to demand every participation. Distinguish difficult reality from a picture of difficulty manufactured for influence. To the listener they may look identical, so the speaker's responsibility includes honestly describing the situation accessible to them.

Not every omission is intentional concealment. Oleg may have overlooked another leader, miscounted replies or misremembered a date. On discovery, willingness to clarify, correct and permit reconsideration matters. Error differs from using an error after learning about it. Daria may also misunderstand a brief statement. Reconstruct the conversation rather than declaring every dispute proof of hidden control. Precise description leaves room for the unknown: what was said, what can be confirmed and which intentions remain conjectures. This does not weaken assessment of actual false information; it prevents unjustified expansion of that assessment.

VI. Emotion Can Reveal Significance or Close a Question

Oleg can describe a newcomer's joy in first understanding a difficult book, or an open club's importance to the town. Such accounts reveal the meeting's human meaning. Daria can feel interest, care or a wish to join. An emotional reason need not remove independence. People consider meaningful relationships beyond dispassionate figures. A problem arises when feeling prohibits examination of conditions: “If you really care about people, questions about time are inappropriate.” Emotion then ceases to reveal the subject and becomes grounds for disregarding a significant part of it.

Guilt may concern an actual forgotten or breached commitment, or arise from a new unaccepted demand. Daria's feeling guilty alone cannot assess the influence. Ask which commitment is named and how it corresponds to the relationship. Oleg can recall materials previously promised. This differs from claiming that refusing a new Saturday betrays the entire community. Precision respects conscience without making it an available lever for every request. Feeling gains a discussable subject rather than becoming final proof that agreement is obligatory.

Assessment concerns the listener too. Daria may reject an important argument because it touches her feeling of independence. The ability to object does not make every objection substantive. She can recognize an appropriate request, see available resources and still decline; she can also change an initial answer after a clear explanation. Freedom of judgment includes hearing inconvenient things. The article does not call only influences that leave a person completely unchanged honest. Persuasion exists because reasons can change decisions. What matters is how they enter consideration and what happens to the ability to assess their connection with the action.

If conversation is too tense, a short pause may leave room for clarification. It guarantees no calming effect and is not always available. Name the unclear question and agree to revisit it by the actual deadline. Oleg can explain how long he can wait. Daria can say she would decline an immediate decision because she cannot check her plans in time. This identifies an actual limit. It does not require declaring emotion an enemy or the other person dangerous. Participants

can preserve a living concern for the meeting while recognizing that part of the choice needs a clearer space.

VII. The Ability to Decline Relates to What Was Actually Promised

A voluntary request permits a negative answer. If Oleg respects refusal only until Daria uses it, the invitation contains concealed obligation. The ability to decline does not erase previous promises, however. Daria may have agreed to prepare Saturday's materials and now want to stop. The question then includes others' expectations, timing and available replacement. Name what she declines: new participation, an initially undefined part of a role or work already accepted. This prevents autonomy from becoming a general method of declaring every inconvenient commitment never to have existed.

If a commitment was accepted using false information, reconsideration deserves a separate conversation. Oleg said preparation was unnecessary and the opposite emerged later. Daria can explain that agreement concerned another scope. No single result is predetermined: preparation could be shared, timing changed or participation ended through intelligible notice. Initial agreement cannot be universal permission to add work. The listener's answer must remain connected with the proposal actually answered. A significantly changed subject calls for renewed agreement rather than only a reminder that “yes” was once spoken.

How refusal is expressed matters. Daria can say she is unavailable to lead on Saturday without inventing an accusation against the club. Oleg can be disappointed and recognize the limit. Both may discuss a narrower option: a brief introduction, advance preparation of one question or participation on another agreed date. An alternative should not become an obligatory concession required to gain permission to decline. It remains a proposal with its own scope and reasons. Refusal of the first action supplies no silent agreement to the second. Clarity preserves cooperation without pressuring the very act of concluding a conversation.

Without agreement, the organizer must act within the remaining situation. He can change the programme or cancel part of the meeting. These consequences may be inconvenient and deserve attention. They do not prove Daria's refusal improper: late invitation, an excessive plan or unshared preparation may account for them. The listener can also bear responsibility if she previously created another expectation. Reconstruct accepted roles instead of making general accusations. Not every difficulty after refusal is punishment, and not every description of difficulty is pressure. The question is whether actual circumstances are being explained for a shared decision or used to prohibit a negative answer itself.

VIII. Correcting Influence Begins by Restoring Conditions

If Oleg acknowledges misrepresenting the group's answers, correct that message. Tell Daria who actually agreed, which deadline exists and what work is expected. If the erroneous statement was public within the group, one private correction may be insufficient to restore the shared picture. The article supplies no universal notification order, but retains the connection between an error's setting and the possibility of correction. Clarification cannot be portrayed as Daria's whim when the organizer himself changes significant information. Correction should restore the ability to assess the offer reasonably, beyond protecting its maker's reputation.

Leave room for a new answer. Oleg may state the correct deadline and immediately add: “But you agreed already; nothing changes.” Corrected information then cannot affect the choice for which it matters. Where agreement relied on error, consider its connection with the actual offer and what has happened since. Work may have begun, others accepted commitments or expenses arisen. This requires specific agreement rather than automatically erasing everything. Events nevertheless cannot make the false initial picture acceptable. Correcting information and discussing reconsideration's consequences are related but separate actions, each with its own subject of responsibility.

An invitation rule can also change. The organizer states the role, significant conditions and actual deadline before requesting agreement, reports no group view without confirmation, and separates respect for a person from readiness for one task. These changes are no validated technology of successful cooperation. They address specific grounds of the earlier error. Less frequent agreement need not mean honest influence has failed: some earlier positive responses may have relied on ambiguity. Assess the rule through accuracy and acceptable relationships beyond an acceptance rate convenient to the organizer.

The hypothetical scene could end with Daria agreeing to lead for two hours with shared preparation, while Oleg clarifies the programme and corrects the report of universal agreement. Alternatively, Daria declines and he seeks another format. Both permit confirmation of a subject and answer; agreement cannot prove all pressure removed, nor refusal prove complete freedom in the relationship. Assessment requires attention to how conditions were presented and what followed objection. Persuasion remains valuable as the ability to offer a meaningful reason. Its boundary is crossed where obtaining a convenient answer deprives someone of the ability to see and consider the actual action being encouraged.

What this means in practice

For ordinary conversation, examine a proposal of your own. This editorial exercise has no established efficacy; it discovers no hidden motives with scientific certainty and replaces no relationship rules involving special duties. Start with one request you actually intend to make.

Record the listener's action, duration, important conditions and unknowns. Separately state why the offer deserves consideration and why this person is approached. If a reason concerns a shared value, show its connection with the action. “The club matters” does not automatically explain why Daria specifically should lead this particular meeting.

List each factual message: who agreed, the established deadline and available alternatives. Separate confirmation from assumption. Check whether your convenient date became the sole possibility in the account or a known alternative disappeared. Correct false statements before requesting an answer; if answered already, explain the correction and consider its significance for agreement.

Ask what follows “no.” If a consequence concerns an accepted prior commitment, name it and the agreement. For a new voluntary request, do not make respect and belonging payment for assent. Explain real organizational difficulty without making an accusation against the listener's whole personality.

Compose a message allowing a relevant answer: “The discussion needs a two-hour leader; we share preparation. The venue needs confirmation on Friday. Does Saturday suit you? If not, we will look for another option.” Use this wording only where the conditions actually hold. Calm language cannot automatically correct a concealed lie.

Afterward, distinguish proposal, understanding, agreement and performance. Record confirmed facts without adding unknown pleasure or a complete absence of pressure. If someone objected, note whether a new reason appeared or attempts to obtain the desired answer merely repeated. Finally ask: does my reason remain intelligible if another person can reasonably consider it and still decline? The answer guarantees no error-free judgment; it identifies where a request needs a more honest arrangement.

Key quotation

> *in every case as an end withal, never as means only.*

Immanuel Kant, Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, Section II, the concluding fragment of the humanity formulation, in Thomas Kingsmill Abbott's English translation. The formula concerns humanity in one's own person and another's. “Means only” matters: every shared use of abilities is not equated with unacceptable treatment.

Connections between traditions

Source	Its own question	Limited comparison	Boundary
Aristotle, I.1	Subject of judgment	Influence can distort consideration	Judicial context is no universal protocol
Aristotle, I.2 opening	Means of persuasion	Arguments, trust and emotion are distinguishable	No modern manipulation classifier
Kant, Section II	Humanity as an end	Actual participation should be conceivable	Duty is not reduced to effectiveness
Kant, lying promise	Treatment of another	A concealed picture obstructs agreement	Editorial application is identified separately

Sources

• Aristotle. Rhetoric, W. Rhys Roberts, Internet Classics Archive, MIT. Continuous I.1 at displayed web lines 27–54 and opening I.2 paragraphs at lines 56–65 were read. The epigraph is the short concluding fragment of the I.2 definition. Complete reading of the remaining Rhetoric is not claimed; the modern working manipulation distinction belongs to the editorial argument. Worldwide rights in the translation are not established.

• Immanuel Kant. Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, Project Gutenberg 5682. Continuous Section II context at displayed web lines 418–448 was read: humanity as an end, its formula, lying promises and distinctions between duties. The key quotation is the formula's concluding fragment at line 424. Influence and ordinary agreement are considered editorially; full source texts are neither imported nor indexed.

Tags

persuasion, influence, pressure, manipulation, request, choice, consent, refusal, reason, emotion, trust, fact, assumption, deadline, alternative, condition, autonomy, dignity, humanity, end, means, promise, commitment, correction, responsibility, conversation, Aristotle, Kant, ethics, community

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

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.