

UNITED WISDOM

Public disclosure and proportionate consequences

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-19-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Public disclosure and proportionate consequences

Epigraph

> *Acts injurious to others require a totally different treatment.*

John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, chapter IV, fragment of the discussion distinguishing personal conduct from acts affecting others. English original.

What this article is about

Discovering wrongdoing can make silence feel like participation. If others are misled, shared spending is concealed or losses continue, an open conversation may indeed be necessary. Yet needing to tell the truth does not mean disclosing everything to everyone in the most destructive form. A public statement changes more than recipients' knowledge. It may change someone's participation in shared work, bystanders' relationships and the possibility of correcting a mistake in the accusation itself.

Proportion does not protect a wrongdoer's convenience at the cost of continuing harm. It connects disclosure's extent to a specific subject of protection and responsibility. What is established? Who is affected? What information do they need to decide? Which conclusion remains a supposition? A hypothetical reading club's expenses supply the setting. Mill distinguishes personal dislike from acts affecting others; Matthew shows an approach involving an individual, witnesses and a community within its religious context. These foundations remain different; historical texts supply no modern legal instructions. The practice is editorial, without established efficacy: it guarantees neither a fair audience response nor complete control over circulation of what has been said.

I. Disclosure begins with what is established

Consider an original hypothetical editorial story. An adult reading club collects money to print a shared anthology. Its organiser, Dmitry, reports that the entire sum was spent on printing. Elena receives two expense confirmations: one concerns the printer, the other dinner after a meeting. The agreement available to her does not separately mention dinner. She wants to announce publicly that Dmitry is deceiving participants and attach complete document images. They show the names of people who helped arrange the order. Elena has a genuine discrepancy between the report and confirmations. This establishes neither Dmitry's intention nor assistants' authority or every meaning an audience may give the publication.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The first statement must preserve the distinction between fact and conclusion. One can say that the report allocates everything to printing while one document concerns dinner; the expense's purpose and approval need explaining. This is a verifiable subject. Saying every assistant joined a deception is another claim needing other grounds. Even deception requires distinguishing an inaccurate report, conscious misrepresentation and a disputed agreement. Moral judgements are not prohibited. Their certainty must match the evidence. A public tone must not create knowledge where only a persuasive supposition exists.

Examine the material itself too. A document might concern another event, record an advance rather than final payment or belong to a corrected report. In our principal scene its connection to this collection is confirmed; other circumstances remain under examination. That boundary is no device for delaying discussion. It prevents a response being built on misunderstood evidence. Where time is limited, established facts can be communicated with an explanation still outstanding. This differs from publishing a complete accusation with a small qualification effectively cancelled by the rest. Uncertainty must affect wording, rather than being a decorative sign of caution.

Identify what disclosure should change. Participants need an accurate report, a decision about unapproved spending and conditions for the next collection. Those purposes do not automatically require declaring Dmitry unfit for every collaborative activity forever. Specific duties may need restrictions; perhaps clarification and repayment by agreement correct the error. That belongs to a later decision. If the desired result is destroying all trust in someone, acknowledge that publication is already doing punishment's work alongside informing. Its extent cannot then be evaluated solely through the assertion that the documents are authentic.

II. Dislike and an affected shared interest

In chapter IV of On Liberty, Mill distinguishes conduct chiefly concerning the adult themselves from actions affecting others' interests. He does not prohibit unfavourable opinion or choosing one's company, but does not make every dislike grounds for additional punishment. Breaching duties towards others has a separate subject of assessment. This is a philosophical foundation for liberty and social intervention, no ready digital disclosure protocol. For the club, ask whether a statement protects an affected shared interest or turns personal dissatisfaction into a public verdict. Examine the action, not how persuasively the speaker claims to represent everyone.

Money collected for a stated purpose relates to participants' decision and expectation of accountability. If some is spent differently without intelligible grounds, the question concerns more than Dmitry's personal taste. People may ask how the agreement was carried out. His habits, communication style and private relationships do not automatically become disclosure's subject because expenses were reported inaccurately. Some may connect

directly to a particular decision; that connection needs showing. Habitual irritation supplies no additional evidence. A portrait of an unpleasant person may make publication emotionally stronger while making its subject of responsibility less precise.

This distinction also concerns Elena's side. She may have long disagreed with Dmitry about meetings' format. That disagreement makes the discovered discrepancy neither false nor something she cannot report. It gives reason to separate documents from accumulated opinions more carefully. Perfectly pure motives need not be demanded as preliminary permission for a truthful statement. Make the statement verifiable without trusting its author's sympathies: what happened, what confirms it, what needs explaining and what measure is considered? Shared interest then does not depend wholly on who dislikes whom. It retains a subject others can examine.

Unpleasant consequences for Dmitry may be justified parts of responsibility. Participants might withhold a new collection from him until the report is clarified. Difficulty or shame alone makes this no unfair persecution. Each measure still needs a connection to an action and decision: who adopts it, on what grounds, for how long and what would further clarification change? Inviting an audience to make someone's life difficult in every available relationship loses responsibility's boundary. A right to know about spending and a right to allocate someone's entire subsequent losses are different claims. The first grants no automatic second, even when wrongdoing is real.

III. A private approach and a wider circle

In Matthew 18:15–17, addressing an offending brother begins privately, then includes witnesses and the community; the neighbouring 18:21–22 raises forgiveness. The sequence retains its religious subject of community relationships. It gives no universal order to negotiate privately before every warning about harm. For our club it raises a limited question about a widening circle: what is needed first, what changes if no answer is given and who should be informed next? The text includes a community, not only secrecy. It cannot be reduced to prohibiting open discussion by removing later stages and conditions.

In an ordinary expenses case, Elena can first ask Dmitry a specific question if this is safe and does not obstruct timely information for affected people. She could send both documents and request an explanation before the club's next decision. This may clarify an error without unnecessary circulation. Its purpose is not an indefinite right for the organiser to keep a shared question in private correspondence. The answer concerns shared money, so participants need the final information. Even if Dmitry admits an error privately, an accurate report must replace the earlier one where participants received it. Private agreement does not remove a publicly created inaccurate picture.

Sometimes warning affected people matters more than awaiting a personal reply. A new collection might begin on the same terms while the discrepancy remains undisclosed and a decision is needed now. Or a private approach could create substantial risk for the person speaking. These are editorial conditions for consideration, not established facts of the principal scene or a ready modern procedure derived from the Gospel. Describe them concretely: what harm continues, how much time exists and who needs protection? Urgency permits no unverified additions. It may change notification's order while keeping content within established facts and clearly identified questions.

Widening the circle needs grounds at every stage. If the question is resolved within the club and new information reaches everyone affected, publishing for a casual city audience needs further explanation. Perhaps Dmitry organises similar collections elsewhere and those participants need specific information. The circle is then wider but still follows a connection to the action. If the only reason is wanting everyone to learn what kind of person he is, publication changes function. It makes his standing an unrestricted object of punishment. No ideal audience can be specified for all cases. Each further circle can be asked why it needs information about this violation in this extent.

IV. Complete documents and unnecessary disclosure

An authentic document may contain truthful information unnecessary for deciding the disputed question. An expense confirmation may show an assistant's contact details, a recipient's name and order particulars unrelated to the reporting discrepancy. Publishing the whole image is not made necessary by its apparently stronger persuasiveness. Elena can preserve the original for appropriate examination while showing participants relevant portions with a clear explanation that other details are concealed. This is an editorial example of limited disclosure, no universal document-handling instruction for all professional situations. Rules requiring another process have their own subject.

Concealing irrelevant details differs from removing context that could change assessment. A line approving dinner cannot be omitted to present spending as certainly unapproved. A date cannot be cropped to make one collection resemble another. Sufficient context lets recipients check the claim substantively without supplying everything accidentally on the sheet. This requires care. Sometimes two forms are needed: complete examination by authorised participants and a limited statement to others. Their difference must be honestly described. A limited image cannot be presented as complete proof of the entire story, nor access to the original made a reward for agreeing with the accusation.

Bystanders are particularly vulnerable to a general caption. An assistant's name may suggest they knew of wrongdoing and supported it. Such knowledge is unestablished in our scene; they may only have placed a technical order. A caption must therefore distinguish

organisational participation from responsibility for disputed spending. Naming someone unnecessarily needs separate grounds. Protecting bystanders must equally not become a pretext for concealing the spending itself: amount, purpose and connection to the report remain available. Unnecessary loss can be reduced without reducing clarity about the question. Accuracy and limited disclosure can support one another.

Examine the set of documents, not just individual sheets. Two accurate images joined to a selected caption can suggest an entire scheme while showing one case. If repetition is unestablished, habitual practice must not be insinuated. Other confirmed cases are described separately with their own connection. The number of attachments supplies no such connection. Abundant material sometimes makes a claim's boundary harder to see. Build the statement around a limited question and its evidence, preserving further clarification. Disclosure must not become a collection of everything unpleasant discovered about a person and their associates.

V. Proportion considers a statement's later life

A publication differs from conversation in a room because it can become detached from initial context. Readers may forward an image without explanation, retain an old version or receive only a headline. We do not claim this always happens or give unsupported statistics. The possibility belongs to assessing the chosen method. Stronger personal conclusions and wider audiences make the boundary of established facts more significant. “We are only asking” helps little when the headline has already announced a final answer. A question can do an accusation's work if everything else closes the possibility of another explanation.

A proportionate statement permits uncomfortable clarity. Elena can state directly that the report incorrectly allocates everything to printing and that grounds for the other expense have not been presented. This gives participants reason to keep the matter open. Adding a call to destroy every relationship Dmitry has goes beyond examining the shared collection. Even if some readers are willing to act that way, the author answers for their own invitations and clarifications. They do not control every reaction, but can avoid encouraging additional harassment. Refusing that invitation does not weaken the facts. A statement can be strong through its precise connection between evidence and demand.

Some consequences cannot be completely reversed. A corrected headline guarantees no receipt of the new version; deleting a document removes no saved copies everywhere. This does not require perpetual silence for someone's convenience. Continuing harm may also be irreversible. Compare concrete conditions: what follows from delay, what can be disclosed now, what needs further checking and who must know promptly? A response may be open and firm while limiting its extent. Impossible risk-free publication cannot be demanded. Equally, incomplete control cannot justify abandoning available accuracy.

Proportion also concerns an ending. Once a report is clarified, disputed spending restored through participants' decision and a new process established, the statement should reflect that condition. An earlier text may remain as history but must not represent the person in their former position without explanation. Restrictions may remain on substantive grounds; repayment does not always restore trust immediately. Yet continued publications after change need a new subject. Endlessly repeating an old accusation to maintain punishment differs from keeping accurate history. The statement should show what changed, what remains disputed and which responsibility is still under consideration.

VI. A chance to answer and protection of those affected

A chance to answer gives Dmitry no right to halt every statement until he approves it. Participants may discuss shared collection facts without the organiser's consent. But significant explanations need a path to examination. He may produce an agreement about dinner, a corrected report or evidence of another purpose for a document. Such information cannot be excluded because the original publication has gained support. Public trust in an author makes their subsequent knowledge no final account. A chance to answer concerns the quality of shared discussion; it promises neither acceptance of every version nor unlimited time to avoid a concrete question.

All examination must not be shifted onto those affected. Participants contributed money and may lack energy for a lengthy dispute. Elena or an appointed group can formulate the question, gather relevant information and present findings. Speaking for affected people must nevertheless stay within actual agreement. Not everyone wants their name or personal circumstances included in publication. Shared interests can be protected without displaying each private story as emotional evidence. Permission to tell one fact does not authorise using everything known about someone. Public correctness creates no unlimited right to another person's experience.

People may differ about required consequences. Some want a corrected report, others a new organiser, others the club's closure. These cannot be presented as everyone's single voice if no unity exists. Disagreement makes no established fact unreliable. It shows that facts and measures belong to different stages. People can agree a report is inaccurate while still disputing future trust. Openly describing that difference is more honest than a general appeal in the group's name. It also avoids using the strictest participant as everyone's standard of conscience, or the most forgiving as evidence that no genuine problem exists.

Protecting participants sometimes requires restricting authority before complete clarification. A new collection could be postponed or several participants asked to examine reporting. This may reduce continuing risk without declaring every dispute already settled. These are organisational options in our scene, no universal mandatory steps. Their grounds must

concern potential new loss and an accepted procedure, not putting a suspect in their place. Temporary status also needs content: a review date, required information and decision-making circle. Calling a measure temporary does not limit it if reconsideration is never provided.

VII. The person disclosing answers for their own error

Perhaps Elena later discovers that she misunderstood part of a document. Dinner might have been paid from a separately approved remainder, with the original report inaccurate only in labelling categories. This changes the conclusion about unapproved spending while keeping reporting accuracy in question. New knowledge cannot stay hidden in private correspondence with Dmitry. The audience received a stronger claim and needs a corresponding, accessible clarification. Correction need not declare the original question meaningless. It must directly state which conclusion changed, why and what remains established. Otherwise earlier certainty continues without its grounds.

Saying publication served a good purpose is insufficient. Protecting participants explains the action without replacing responsibility for a mistaken conclusion. Elena can respect her original concern while acknowledging a specific error. Deletion without explanation is also insufficient if the statement has already become substantially visible within that circle. No artificial recirculation of the accusation is required; earlier recipients need a chance to see correction. If a bystander's name acquired a mistaken accusatory meaning, their position matters too. The author's reputation for truthfulness gives no grounds to leave someone else carrying its inaccuracy's consequences.

Correction may require more than text. Contact people who used the original information for a particular decision, restore a denied opportunity to answer and remove unnecessary names from available versions. This may be only partly possible. Promise no correction of every copy or restoration of every relationship. Limited possibilities do not cancel available steps. Describe and check actual results: where was clarification published, who was notified and which decisions reconsidered? The article supplies no legal process for this. It concerns an author's moral responsibility for their contribution to a circulating account, especially when they demanded accuracy from another.

A mistaken conclusion makes no future statement by the author impossible. It changes certainty's grounds and the need to show information's boundaries carefully. They can keep asking questions about shared work without first demanding recognition that earlier publication was faultless. Dmitry can accept correction while retaining distrust; participants can reconsider a measure while maintaining accurate reporting's requirement. Nobody must immediately restore former relationships. Responsibility ends through available duties being fulfilled and remaining consequences honestly identified, not mandatory forgiveness.

Continuing consequences need their own subject, rather than a general declaration that an apology has closed everything.

VIII. Openness should lead to a responsible decision

Disclosure becomes morally clearer when a definite decision can follow. Who clarifies the report? Which spending is disputed? Who examines the explanation? What changes in the next collection? These questions return information to shared work. If publication leaves only repetition and a growing audience, the statement loses a path to completion. This does not make every violation easily correctable or promise cooperation from the person at fault. Cooperation may end. Even that decision has a describable subject, grounds and consequences. Openness must not become an endless procedure for maintaining another's disgrace without a next responsible action.

Distinguish a historical record from a current warning. History retains what happened alongside corrections and later decisions. A warning concerns a risk in present or specific future action. One may need long-term retention, the other reconsideration as conditions change. They cannot be mixed without explanation. If Dmitry no longer collects shared money, an earlier statement about a current collection needs clarification. If he begins a new collection while the question remains unresolved, a warning has a present subject. Keeping memory does not require continually displaying the same person to every new audience.

Keep a person's responsibility distinct from shared work's value too. The club may continue with new reporting arrangements; some participants may leave; Dmitry may give up his role. These results are neither necessarily truth's defeat nor complete reconciliation. They reflect people's decisions after receiving significant information. The person who first discovered the problem gains no right to determine each result. Their contribution matters, but shared responsibility becomes no personal possession. A proposed measure is discussed substantively alongside alternatives. Truth helps decisions; it transfers no automatic authority to its messenger.

Proportion keeps several subjects present: established accuracy, protection of affected people, necessary audience, bystanders, a chance to answer and changed conditions. None should automatically terminate the others. Concern for consequences excuses no concealment of continuing harm. A truthful document excuses no unnecessary disclosure. A chance to answer excuses no indefinite evasion. Author error erases no entire original problem. This promises no easy agreement but connects publication with responsible decisions. Publicity then helps people see the actual question and act while retaining the extent of their own and others' responsibility.

What this means in practice

Take an ordinary adult case where you are considering reporting a violation. This exercise replaces no applicable legal or professional rules. Record the established fact, its evidence and conclusions still only supposed. Separately identify what should change: a specific action should stop, a report be clarified, a loss restored or grounds supplied for shared decision. Begin with publication's subject, not making it maximally powerful. If the desired result is unlimited damage to someone's standing, that separate intention cannot be concealed beneath telling the truth.

Identify affected people and information needed by each circle. Who relied on an inaccurate statement, who can stop continuing harm and who needs the final report? Could a private question clarify matters without dangerous delay, and what answer deadline is reasonable here? Make no private approach a universal first requirement. But consider no wide reach useful by itself. Each wider audience needs a connection to protection or responsible decision. Where immediate notification is necessary, content still remains within established facts and clearly identified open questions.

Check documents, captions and headline together. Is context capable of changing assessment retained? Has one case become an assertion of a permanent scheme? Which unnecessary names and details could affect bystanders? When limiting an image, explain its boundaries honestly and retain necessary examination. Access to evidence must not reward agreement. Consider the conclusion received by someone seeing only a headline or image. Further reading cannot be completely controlled, but a knowingly stronger impression than information supports need not be created.

Define a route to answer and decision beforehand. Who examines significant explanation, what could change the initial conclusion, what provisional measures are available and when are they reconsidered? Attribute no single position to everyone affected without actual agreement. Measures can remain disputed after facts are agreed. Where protection is needed, connect restrictions to risk and specific authority. Replace them with no invitation to make someone's life as difficult as possible. Those affected need not forgive immediately; the author gains no unlimited right to choose every consequence for them.

After publication, attend to new relevant information and available correction. A changed conclusion needs clarification visible to earlier recipients at corresponding scope. Say directly which assertion is wrong or excessive and what remains established. Examine bystanders' positions and decisions made using earlier claims. Promise no repair of every copy and relationship, but fulfil available steps. Deletion without explanation does not always supply necessary knowledge. The author's good purpose replaces no responsibility for error, just as someone else's error removes no need for accurate correction.

After deciding, update the current picture: what is corrected, what restored, which restriction remains and which question is disputed? Distinguish history from present warning. The practice is editorial, without established efficacy; it guarantees no circulation control, accepted explanation or reconciliation. Its task is a more precise subject for action and limits on arbitrary additional loss. Cooperation may end or shared arrangements change. Check actual decisions and completed steps, honestly stating what remains, rather than declaring every inconvenience either deserved punishment or proof that publicity is unacceptable.

Key quotation

> *between thee and him alone*

Matthew 18:15, fragment of the approach to a brother, King James Version. The context 18:15–22 was read, including witnesses, community and forgiveness; the fragment becomes no universal prohibition of public notification.

Connections between traditions

Question	Source	Distinction retained
When does a question concern affected others?	Mill, On Liberty, IV, selected continuous passage	Personal conduct differs from duties to others; not every dislike grants a right to punish.
How does an approach's circle widen?	Matthew 18:15–17	Brother, witnesses and community within a religious subject; no universal modern procedure.
Does community remove forgiveness's question?	Matthew 18:21–22 in the neighbouring context read	Religious instruction is not disclosure efficiency and guarantees no reconciliation in the editorial scene.
How should present disclosure be limited and corrected?	Editorial comparison of the two sources	The article develops audience, document extent and visible clarification; four rows mean no four traditions.

Sources

1. John Stuart Mill. On Liberty. Project Gutenberg 34901, English original with displayed pagination. A selected continuous passage in chapter IV was read at displayed lines 640–672, pages 140–150: social authority's limits, personal conduct, unfavourable opinion and harm to others. The epigraph is nine English words from line 662; the Russian translation is our own. No entire chapter IV reading is claimed for this article. Historical philosophy supplies no legal publication rule or ready digital protocol. Worldwide edition rights are unestablished; raw import and indexing are not authorised.

2. Bible, King James Version: Matthew. English KJV, Wikisource, chapter 18. Continuous context 18:15–22 was read at displayed lines 1186–1197. The key fragment is five English words from 18:15; the Russian translation is our own. Private approach, witnesses, community and neighbouring forgiveness are considered. This religious subject is no universal notification procedure for modern wrongdoing. Historical KJV rights have jurisdictional particulars; no worldwide licence is asserted and raw import is not authorised.

Tags

public disclosure, proportion, truth, responsibility, exposure, audience, evidence, fact, supposition, accusation, documents, context, privacy, bystanders, shared interest, accountability, agreement, consequences, correction, chance to answer, trust, forgiveness, witnesses, community, measure, history, warning, Mill, Matthew, 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.