

UNITED WISDOM

A good purpose and humiliating means

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-19-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A good purpose and humiliating means

Epigraph

> *thou spoilest all that thou givest.*

Seneca, On Benefits, II.13, the concluding fragment of the address to pride. Aubrey Stewart's English translation.

What this article is about

A good purpose often makes questionable means less visible. We need to restore order, teach responsibility, end an injustice or protect shared work. It then seems acceptable to display someone's mistake to everyone, make someone express gratitude for assistance or explain their inadequacy so that they stop arguing. We see the desired result and overlook what happens to the person on the way to it. A demand to correct an action becomes a demand to accept a diminished position.

Yet dignity does not mean freedom from criticism, consequences and uncomfortable conversations. Sometimes a mistake must be named openly: others have suffered, information concerns shared work, or silence conceals an ongoing problem. The distinction concerns the demand's subject, the necessary audience and the possibility of correction. We can discuss an action firmly without turning someone into material for educating everyone else. We can feel moral shame without accepting imposed contempt for ourselves. A hypothetical shared workshop provides the article's setting. Seneca, the Dhammapada and the Analects raise different questions about treatment, speech and education. Their foundations remain distinct; the practice is an editorial exercise, without established efficacy or a promise of calm agreement.

I. Describe the purpose on its own

Consider an original hypothetical editorial scene. Adult participants in a shared workshop take turns using worktables. After a session, Pavel leaves tools and material scraps behind, and the next group spends time cleaning up. The coordinator, Lidia, wants to restore order. She photographs the table, adds Pavel's name and displays the picture with a caption inviting everyone to look at a person who considers the others his servants. At the next meeting the table is clean. This result does not yet answer whether the method was acceptable. Purpose, action, means and consequences need to be distinguished before being combined under the word education.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The purpose can be described without naming the person at fault: after each session the table must be usable by the next group, tools returned and rubbish removed. This description makes it possible to check what is required and who needs it. It does not remove the question of who broke the agreement, but it does not make someone's inferiority part of the desired result. If the purpose is expressed as putting Pavel in his place, we are discussing a different intention. A clean table may accompany its achievement without exhausting it. The difference matters even if the coordinator sincerely cares about the workshop and is tired of other people's carelessness.

Describing the means separately also requires precision. Lidia could have restated the rule, spoken to Pavel and asked him to remove what he had left and address the lost time. Instead, she joined the mistake to a public assertion about his attitude to everyone in the room. In our hypothetical scene we know about the abandoned table, but have insufficient grounds for that generalisation. The photograph establishes the state of the place, not the participant's entire moral character. When a factual image is joined to an excessive conclusion, the first part's credibility may silently lend authority to the second. Both parts of the message and how they are presented require examination.

Objecting to humiliating means does not require excusing the uncleared table. The next group lost time; its participants need not pretend nothing happened. Pavel may bear concrete responsibility: cleaning up, explaining repetition and accepting a reasonable restriction on access if rules are not followed. But restoring fairness gives the coordinator no unlimited authority over how he will be represented to others. A working criterion already emerges: each additional action needs a connection to correcting the violation or protecting shared work. That connection cannot be replaced by an appeal to good intentions or to the fact that the person at fault felt uncomfortable.

II. An uncomfortable demand and a diminished person

Humiliation here means more than any painful experience of criticism. It concerns treatment that uses a person's diminished standing, contempt or enforced self-abasement as an instrument for achieving a purpose. This is an editorial distinction, not a complete scientific classifier or a diagnosis of intentions. Someone may react painfully to a well-founded criticism. They may also smile in response to a humiliating procedure because they depend on the speaker or wish to avoid further conflict. Neither the intensity of feeling nor outward submission is sufficient grounds for evaluation. The words, actions, circumstances and demands themselves must be considered.

“Clear away the tools you left” concerns an action that can be changed. “People like that do not belong here” shifts the discussion to someone's membership of a community without identifying which action can be corrected and under what conditions. Sometimes exclusion

really is considered because rules have repeatedly been broken. It then needs intelligible grounds, a duration, a way to discuss it and a connection to protecting participants. A contemptuous formula supplies none of these. It may deliver a final judgement before circumstances have been established, leaving only self-abasement or expulsion. Even a real right to end cooperation does not make every way of exercising it morally equivalent.

The subject of an explanation matters too. Pavel may say that the session ended late and he rushed to collect an order; this does not remove his obligation to clear the place. But hearing it is useful for understanding the case and choosing a response. If every explanation is called an excuse in advance, a substantive answer becomes impossible. If an apology must be repeated before every visitor, it changes from acknowledgement of specific responsibility to demonstration of a permanent debt of submission. The distinction is between a procedure capable of ending through correction and treatment for which correction continually proves insufficient. It is not a choice between gentleness and firmness.

Discomfort can accompany restored fairness. Pavel must acknowledge that others cleaned up after him, and this may produce shame. Lidia must acknowledge that her caption was excessive, even though a violation really occurred. Neither participant is promised a painless experience. But discomfort must not become independent evidence that a measure is right: someone being hurt does not establish that they have learned something. The reverse also fails: an uncomfortable conversation need not therefore stop. The demand's grounds and the manner of treatment must be assessed substantively, rather than through a single emotional result.

III. A benefit gives no right to contempt

In On Benefits II.12–13, Seneca considers assistance spoiled by arrogance. His severe example concerns a ruler's power and a degrading gesture demanded after someone's life has been spared. The subject is the quality of a benefit and the giver's treatment of its recipient. This is no modern theory of workshop management. Its limited question for us is what happens to a good when its delivery requires one person to be elevated through another's abasement. The historical distance between the Roman example and ordinary adult participation remains: their circumstances and scale are not equated.

Lidia may organise the workshop without payment, buy supplies and provide a rare opportunity for people to work together. These contributions are real. They explain her substantial effort without turning every subsequent remark into a continuation of goodness. An opportunity to use the table does not purchase a right to insult a participant. Otherwise every new action's discussion would end by counting previous achievements: the coordinator has done most, so the others must accept everything. That arrangement deprives the community

of a way to evaluate present treatment. Gratitude for assistance and objection to particular means can coexist; the latter does not necessarily erase the former.

Objection is especially difficult when access to something valuable depends on one person. Pavel might fear losing his workshop place after disagreeing. Others might remain silent out of respect for Lidia's efforts or a wish to settle the practical problem quickly. We do not present these possible motives as established facts in the hypothetical scene. They show only which questions outward agreement cannot settle. Can the form of a criticism be discussed without access being automatically lost? Is there a way to distinguish following the rules from personal gratitude to the coordinator? Dependence makes examining treatment significant, although it does not itself prove abuse.

It is useful here to limit the actions that irritation justifies, rather than demand that a benefactor never feel irritated. Lidia may be tired, ask for support, establish a cleaning rota and reduce her own workload. She can say that the workshop cannot operate unless its rules are followed. Such words communicate the conditions of shared work. A different form demands acknowledgement that the participants are worth nothing without her. Their dependence then becomes an object of display. Preserving assistance's quality includes refusing to make the recipient's devaluation its necessary price. This is a separate question about treatment, unanswered by the size of the contribution.

IV. Shame, conscience and another person's power

Analects II.3 distinguishes government through punishments from education through virtue and proper conduct. In James Legge's translation, a moral sense of shame has a positive place in the second path. This differs significantly from supposing that every form of shame must be removed. The ancient discussion of government and education supplies no ready procedure for a modern association. It helps us keep the capacity to recognise an action's failure to meet a moral requirement distinct from publicly diminishing a person. The article develops that distinction for our scene; it is not presented as Confucius's own terminology or a proven behavioural mechanism.

Moral shame may arise from recognising that I left my work to others although I had agreed to act differently. The acknowledgement retains an active person capable of seeing a violation, answering for it and changing an action. Public devaluation proposes a different subject: my action supposedly proves that I belong to an inferior category of people. A shared norm becomes an occasion for distributing dignity. Not every experience of shame is pure, and not all publicity is destructive; actual cases are more complicated than two formulas. Yet a path from action to correction allows a concrete question: after this conversation, what can the person legitimately do to fulfil their responsibility?

If the answer is that Pavel must prove his normality to everyone, the measure remains indeterminate. Every new action may be interpreted as insufficiently sincere, every objection as a continuation of the old fault. If the answer is to clean the table, restore the agreement and follow the rule in subsequent sessions, the demand has a subject. It can be checked without endlessly assessing an inner state. Correction does not always restore trust immediately. But slow restoration of trust differs from having no path back at all. Participants may be cautious while distinguishing reasonable caution from a permanent right to remind someone of their diminished position.

The leader's moral example also requires examination. Lidia may demand care, but her ways of making criticisms belong to the community's life too. If rules protect some people's dignity while a mistake makes others exceptions to those rules, the norm becomes a conditional privilege. This does not give the person at fault and those affected identical positions in the discussion. Different responsibilities remain. Yet responsible leadership needs to state a demand without constructing an additional ladder of contempt. Moral education includes the form of one's own action; it can be assessed without promising that a good example will inevitably change every participant.

V. Who needs to see the mistake

Sometimes a request to discuss everything privately sounds persuasive but neglects other participants' interests. If a group cleaned up after Pavel, its time was affected; its members can reasonably ask how order will be restored. If a violation recurs, a shared agreement may require shared discussion. Privacy is therefore no universal answer. Identify the necessary audience: who was involved, who needs to decide and who needs information for their own work. That audience differs from everyone who could be shown the photograph. The possibility of distribution establishes no need for distribution; a useful general warning does not automatically require a name and an assessment of personality.

In the hypothetical workshop, the next group can be told that the cleaning rule was broken and that the participant will put the table right before the next session. If identifying responsibility matters to a shared decision, the name may be stated. This does not make a contemptuous headline or access for casual visitors necessary. Substantive transparency answers questions about the event, responsibility and measures taken. Displaying disgrace uses the event to show who deserves ridicule. The distinction cannot be settled by the word public alone. It depends on information's extent, its recipients, its purpose and an opportunity to answer significant assertions.

Protecting those affected must also be distinguished from the organiser's convenience. Lidia may consider the shared picture the fastest way to end disorder. Speed matters without settling the question of unnecessary consequences. Sometimes a brief announcement of

changed rules will suffice; sometimes a specific discussion is required. We do not assume that an equally quick and pleasant alternative always exists. Examining means allows for genuine costs of more respectful treatment. It has limits, but those limits cannot be declared exhausted before at least the available options are considered. Before appealing to necessity, establish what could not be protected through a more limited action.

Mistakes and corrections often receive different audiences. Many people saw the photograph, while only the coordinator is told that the violation has been addressed. The original assessment then lives separately from the factual result. If a mistake was reasonably discussed with the group, the group generally also needs information about the completed measure. This requires neither a public celebration nor immediate restored trust. It requires avoiding a continuing appearance that the person remains in the earlier state. Communicating correction concerns the accuracy of shared knowledge. It helps close a specific discussion while leaving room to discuss subsequent violations separately if they actually occur.

VI. Speech must not do punishment's work

Dhammapada 133–134 connects harsh, angry speech with pain and continued contention; the neighbouring chapter X context concerns causing harm, while this passage's conclusion points to Nirvana. This is a moral and spiritual subject, not a statistical prediction that every sharp phrase produces the same response. For our theme it questions the speaker's own speech. Buddhist discipline is not converted into a way to guarantee obedience, nor is its foundation declared identical to Seneca's discussion of benefits. A shared scene allows questions to be compared while retaining the sources' different purposes and premises.

In an ordinary discussion, speech may quietly assume punishment's function. Lidia imposes no formal access restriction on Pavel, but makes enough contemptuous remarks to make his presence painful. Discussing rules is replaced by an undescribed sanction. The person knows neither its duration nor its subject or ending condition; nobody takes responsibility for its extent because the speaker is supposedly only expressing an opinion. This does not prohibit expressing dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction can be stated directly: I had to clean up after you, and I consider that unfair. Such a subject differs from repeatedly displaying someone's worthlessness as punishment for a violation.

Accurate speech preserves differences between an event, repetition and supposition. One uncleared table is not constant disregard. Several violations give more grounds to discuss repetition without dispensing with examining the circumstances of every significant assertion. Perhaps Pavel really refuses to follow the rule; the group must then decide about further participation. Perhaps the rule is unclear or sessions end with no cleaning time; part of the responsibility then concerns organisation. These possibilities do not exclude one another in

advance. Discussion may establish more than one cause. Generalised contempt tends to close them prematurely because assessment of the person has already replaced explanation.

Notice your own irritation without making it the principal argument for others. Lidia can postpone publication, formulate a brief factual demand and decide what needs discussing at the meeting. A pause promises no calm and is not always possible. If an action needs stopping immediately, it can be stopped briefly and firmly. But the urgency of stopping does not automatically extend to a later account of the person. Afterwards there is time to examine wording, audience and extent. Responsible speech requires no endless gentleness; it requires not adding arbitrary contempt to a necessary action.

VII. Agreement to strictness has limits

An objection arises: Pavel agreed to the workshop rules and knew mistakes would be discussed at meetings. This matters. An accepted agreement may include open assessment of results, criticism, loss of a privilege or a temporary suspension of participation. But agreeing to a specific procedure does not mean agreeing to any treatment later called educational. Examine the agreement itself: what is discussed, who attends, what information is published, which measures are used and how someone can answer. The less defined the conditions, the more carefully one should claim that everything was accepted in advance. A general phrase about strictness supplies no procedural content.

Suppose the group really decided to display pictures of workspaces after sessions to notice organisational problems. This may be reasonable. Adding a name, a moral generalisation and a mocking caption changes the subject, however. General monitoring of tables becomes personal display of guilt. Even if these details were expressly agreed, their acceptability would remain a separate question; advance agreement does not complete every moral assessment. But our hypothetical scene contains no such agreement. The discussion distinguishes conformity with an accepted arrangement from the quality of that arrangement. The first need not be established by condemning every possible shared check, while the second requires its own examination.

Other participants' interests must not dissolve into Lidia's relationship with Pavel. Those who spent time cleaning may object to excessive leniency. Their objection deserves substantive consideration: what restores fairness, who does the work and what can the available organisation do about repetition? Yet a claim to restoration grants no unlimited right to entertainment at the guilty person's expense. If the group demands that Pavel endure ridicule, that demand also needs assessment. The number supporting it does not change the action's subject. Responsibility to the group can be real while the group's chosen form of treatment is excessive.

Rejecting humiliation must not become another way to force magnanimity on those affected. They need not immediately forgive, smile or restore former relationships. A sanction can be limited while preserving a right to distance and discussion of concrete consequences. Participants might accept cleaning and a changed rota without yet trusting Pavel to finish sessions independently. Such a decision needs substantive grounds and later reconsideration. It differs from requiring a declaration that nobody was affected. The dignity of the person at fault and acknowledgement of others' losses must not be purchased from one another; each question needs its own answer within the shared procedure.

VIII. Correct the means while keeping the purpose

Lidia can remove the caption and acknowledge attributing more to Pavel than she knew. This does not declare his behaviour acceptable. The coordinator can clarify two facts at once: the uncleared table broke the agreement, and the public generalisation was unfounded and humiliating. This separation becomes especially difficult once a disagreement turns into a struggle for complete vindication. Conceding a point about form seems to cancel the substantive demand. Yet the demand becomes clearer when excess is removed. Pavel answers for cleaning and accepted obligations; Lidia answers for her own message. Another person's mistake does not remove responsibility for one's response to it.

Correcting public treatment must take account of who received it. Quietly removing a picture is insufficient if the group remembers its caption as established fact. Lidia can briefly explain that the conclusion about Pavel's character was excessive, while the specific cleaning issue is being discussed separately. This need not repeat the insult to a new audience or require Pavel to attend another examination of himself. The purpose is to correct her own contribution to the shared picture. Existing consequences should also be identified: perhaps someone withdrew from the next session or others began using the earlier formula towards him. We do not assume these consequences; we check whether they exist.

Then return to the workshop's arrangements. How much time is allowed for cleaning? Does everyone understand what they must do? Is someone responsible for checking completion, and what happens if a violation recurs? These questions do not excuse carelessness, but help avoid making shame do unclear rules' work. If the system depends on the coordinator becoming publicly angry every time, its arrangements need substantive reconsideration. Conditions of participation and their consequences can be defined beforehand, workload distributed and a way to discuss disputed cases retained. These are organisational proposals for a hypothetical scene, not a universal recipe for efficiency or a guarantee against new conflicts.

A good purpose retains its strength when its means withstand examination. The workshop still needs order; the next group's time still matters; Pavel's responsibility remains open to

discussion. Alongside those tasks comes responsibility for how they are pursued. A more limited method may require an additional conversation and supply no immediate satisfaction. It cannot be promised always to be faster, cheaper or more persuasive. Its foundation lies elsewhere: participants remain people whose actions can be assessed and whose obligations can be required without making contempt the necessary currency of shared work. Correction has a subject, a limit and a possible ending; dignity is no prize reserved for the faultless.

What this means in practice

Choose an ordinary adult situation where a good purpose is to be pursued through a painful criticism or public discussion. This exercise diagnoses no personality and replaces no specific professional obligations. Write the purpose without characterising the person at fault: what needs restoring, protecting or changing? Separately record the observable action and what you do not know. In the workshop scene, the table's state and lost time are known; Pavel's attitude to everyone cannot simply be treated as established. If the purpose already requires someone to feel worthless, that element needs its own moral assessment.

Describe the proposed means literally: which words will be spoken, to whom, where, how often, and which pictures or names will be displayed. Set aside general labels such as feedback and educational measure for now. Check the demand's subject: an action, restoring a loss, conditions of further participation or enforced acknowledgement of inferior standing. Discomfort is no proof of humiliation; outward agreement is no proof of acceptability. Assessment of treatment needs factual grounds. Separately note what opportunity the recipient retains to explain significant circumstances and whether the content of their answer can affect the decision.

Identify the necessary audience and the extent of information. Who was affected, who decides and who needs to know about a completed measure? Sometimes this justifies openly discussing a particular violation. The next question remains: why are this caption, character judgement or publication to a wider audience necessary? Consider an available, more limited method and its genuine costs. Do not promise identical results beforehand. If complete privacy conceals a continuing problem from affected people, do not use it as an automatic answer. Match openness to the subject of responsibility, retaining accurate information and an opportunity to report correction.

State what counts as fulfilling the demand and when discussion can end: clearing the table before the next shift, agreeing how sessions finish or reasonably restoring lost work, for example. If the measure is an undefined demand to earn everyone's respect, its limits remain unclear. Clarify the consequences of repetition and how restrictions can be reconsidered. Trust may return more slowly than factual correction, but this gives no right endlessly to present an old mistake as evidence of human inferiority. Those affected retain a right to

caution and distance; it can be expressed without demands for demonstrative forgiveness or permanent contempt.

If humiliating means have already been used, correct your own part while keeping the specific demand concerning the violation. Clarify unfounded conclusions to the audience that received them without widening circulation of the original insult. State separately which responsibility remains under discussion. Demand no gratitude for correction and turn no apology into a fresh display of superiority. Check whether consequences already exist for participation, relationships or the shared view of someone. A spoken acknowledgement cannot be assumed to remove them. Possible further steps are discussed around their specific subject, without promising complete restoration of former trust.

Afterwards assess factual change: was the work done, were rules clarified, were false or excessive assertions corrected, and does an open demand remain without a subject or duration? Claim no established efficacy for the exercise. It may help describe your own action and limits without guaranteeing the other side's agreement. Continued rule-breaking leaves the question of restricting participation alive. Those affected not being ready for reconciliation also deserves respect. The practice ends with a more precise distinction between purpose, responsibility and acceptable treatment around which the next step can be discussed substantively, rather than a requirement that everyone feel good.

Key quotation

> *Do not speak harshly to anybody*

Dhammapada, 133, opening fragment, F. Max Müller's translation. The moral instruction about speech was read in the context of 129–134; it is not used as an empirical guarantee of the listener's response.

Connections between traditions

Question	Source	Distinction retained
Can treatment spoil a benefit provided?	Seneca, On Benefits, II.12–13	A benefit's quality and the giver's arrogance; the Roman example is not equated with an ordinary scene.
How should one's own angry speech be assessed?	Dhammapada, 129–134, especially 133–134	Spiritual discipline and ending contention, with reference to Nirvana; no prediction of obedience.
Is every sense of shame necessarily destructive?	Analects, II.1–4, especially II.3	Virtue and proper conduct in education; moral shame is not equated with public abasement.
Where does a demand to correct an action end?	Editorial comparison of these three sources	The article's working question about a measure's subject and ending; no ready unified doctrine of three traditions.

Sources

1. Seneca. On Benefits. Aubrey Stewart's English translation; Project Gutenberg 3794, London edition with a preface dated 1887. Continuous II.12–13 was read at displayed lines 310–316, with neighbouring II.11 conclusion at lines 308–309. The epigraph is six English words from the conclusion of II.13; the Russian translation is our own. A historical discussion of benefits supplies no modern management procedure. Rights outside Gutenberg's applicable jurisdiction are unestablished; this link authorises no raw import or indexing.

2. The Dhammapada. F. Max Müller's translation, Sacred Books of the East, volume X, part I; Project Gutenberg 2017, published without introduction, notes and index, as its header states. Continuous chapter X, 129–134, was read at displayed lines 272–281. The key quotation is six English words from the opening of 133; the Russian translation is our own. The spiritual context of Nirvana in 134 is retained; assertions become no statistical promises. Worldwide rights are unestablished; the complete original publication was not imported.

3. Confucius. The Analects of Confucius. James Legge's translation from the Chinese Classics; Project Gutenberg 3330. Continuous II.1–4 was read at displayed lines 50–54, especially both parts of II.3 at line 52. No literal fragments are quoted. The ancient discussion of government, virtue and education supports a limited comparison without being assigned a modern definition of humiliation. Worldwide rights and permission for raw import are unestablished.

Tags

good purpose, means, dignity, humiliation, responsibility, shame, conscience, criticism, correction, moral education, respect, publicity, privacy, audience, repair, beneficence, gratitude, power, dependence, speech, anger, order, shared work, fairness, consequences, trust, Seneca, Dhammapada, Confucius, United Wisdom

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.