

UNITED WISDOM

A creator’s responsibility for the use of an idea

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-25-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A creator’s responsibility for the use of an idea

Epigraph

> *truth and fidelity to promises and agreements.*

Cicero, De Officiis I.7.23; excerpt from the account of good faith, translated by Walter Miller. The ancient context establishes no contemporary legal liability.

What this article is about

Once an idea has a form others can use, its life no longer matches every intention of its maker. What can a creator answer for without controlling every later action? This article follows Leonid’s hypothetical cards for willing adult conversation about a neighbourhood. He describes their purpose, notices possible expansion into evaluating openness and considers a report of changed use. Responsibility is discussed through form, proportionate promises, available knowledge and a present action. Cicero, Plato and Mary Shelley offer different historical questions about good faith, writing and duties after creation. Comparing them establishes no legal fault, guaranteed benefit or lifelong obligation to be present everywhere. The practice preserves recipient autonomy and distinguishes changing a version, notifying others and actual receipt. Benevolent intention does not replace examining use, while incomplete control does not erase a particular choice now available to the maker.

I. What the maker offers others

Leonid has devised cards for a small conversation about a neighbourhood. One asks which place someone noticed afresh in the past year; another asks which familiar route changed. A participant can choose a question, answer briefly or pass. In this hypothetical scene, the idea has a form another host can use. Giving it to an organiser, Leonid realises that his explanation will not accompany every use. He needs to describe the offer: prompts for willing conversation about observations, not a test of sincerity, courage or the quality of participants’ lives.

The same wording may invite different depths of response. Someone can name a new sign, describe a move or touch on a loss. The maker cannot know everyone’s choice. A clear purpose therefore should not become required content. Leonid can leave room to answer about a visible place without explaining personal reasons. That promises no absence of difficult feeling. It clarifies the offered action and disclosure that is not required. Responsibility begins with the invitation the maker actually creates and transfers.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Transferring an idea includes more than an attractive card face. It involves use order, sample host wording, audience description and benefit claims. Saying the cards reliably bring all people closer adds an unsupported promise. Identifying an ordinary voluntary adult conversation gives a clearer limit. It is not clinical practice, personal assessment or a universal conflict solution. Those areas should not silently attach themselves to a creative form. The maker is responsible for describing it within available knowledge, distinguishing intention from what has actually been examined.

Responsibility here does not establish legal fault for every later gathering. The article examines ethical participation: the form offered, what could be noticed, promises made and actions now available. Particular legal, professional or contractual questions need their own relevant examination; three historical texts cannot settle them. That limitation still permits Leonid to attend to his wording and decisions. He can clarify the purpose, reduce a promise and decline support for a use he sees departing from the task and people’s freedom.

II. Intention does not describe every use

Leonid wanted to make conversation easier to begin. Another host may use the cards to fill a pause, and a participant to discover a place. These intentions may coexist without being identical. If the host requires everyone to answer in turn, the invitation changes: passing disappears in practice. A benevolent original idea cannot explain the whole event. The actual use needs examination. Intention remains part of the history without replacing information about what is now offered to a group and expected from it.

The maker should not attribute every unwelcome outcome to misuse. A question may already be ambiguous, passing hidden in small print, or sample wording sound compulsory. Leonid examines his form before blaming another person. That does not make him responsible for every other choice. Description, the host’s decision and a participant’s response have different places. One report cannot establish the whole causal chain, but it can identify a particular mismatch and the information available about it.

In Plato’s Phaedrus, written discourse cannot answer new questions by itself. It travels to different people and needs assistance when misunderstood. This philosophical dialogue concerns writing and living knowledge. Here it prompts a question about explanations available with the cards. It proves neither that every written form is dangerous nor that it requires its maker’s physical presence. Leonid can provide clear guidance and a way to ask questions without promising to answer every use everywhere forever.

The practical conclusion remains bounded: description should make the idea’s purpose and significant limits visible. If ordinary use requires elaborate spoken qualifications, the form itself may need changing. Leonid might revise a question, remove an ambiguous example or narrow

the audience. A long warning does not always correct demanding wording on the card face. Examine what users actually encounter. He chooses a manageable change and an honest account of what it enables rather than claiming that one guidance page eliminates every future use.

III. Foreseeable use differs from everything imaginable

Leonid can imagine countless settings: a class, family evening, workplace contest or public interview. Imagination does not make every possibility equally likely or already actual. For this transfer, he knows a small adult gathering, an identifiable host and a paper set. Those facts define an initial scope of questions: how passing is explained, who selects a card and whether responses will be recorded. These relationships affect participation. He need not promise control of every future copy worldwide in order to examine the form being transferred attentively.

Some changes are visible in the set itself. Points for “openness” already introduce evaluation even if the maker calls the conversation free. Examples demanding an account of personal loss steer a place question toward disclosure. Saying that passing ruins the gathering weakens refusal through wording. Leonid can remove those elements before transfer. That examines his decisions rather than predicting every feeling. Passing needs a place in action and description, not only the maker’s benevolent intention.

Foreseeability needs context rather than an anxious guess alone. A host saying the set will be used in a compulsory workplace discussion supplies a concrete difference from the original scene. Leonid should clarify participation and purpose. He can decline to present that use as his ordinary activity. Where information is missing, a harmful outcome is not established, but missing information is no confirmation of safety either. He can limit the transfer to a known purpose or wait for clarification. Uncertainty remains uncertainty until a more precise account has grounds.

Considering foreseeable use does not forbid every new decision. A host may use fewer questions, translate them or change their order. Changes may preserve or alter the purpose. Leonid distinguishes an essential boundary from an optional detail: passing matters to voluntary participation, while two neutral cards may be reordered freely. Explain the distinction where needed. Otherwise an aesthetic preference about sequence can appear an ethical law, while a significant relationship disappears among demands to preserve every letter and colour of the original design.

IV. Transfer conditions enter the creative form

Leonid adds a brief opening card. It allows choosing another question, answering about an observed place or passing without explanation. The host states that option first rather than making it an exception to earn. The opening belongs to the form itself. Examine it with the questions: do they contradict one another, and does an example demand more than the opening promises? The maker can identify and change a mismatch. Attractive presentation alone says little about the participation being offered.

A translation needs to preserve significant boundaries too. “You may pass” should not become “try answering even if uncomfortable”; that is a different recommendation. Leonid can provide a brief account of relationships essential to the aim without making his language compulsory. A particular translation is examined through its words, not an attractive title or logo. If he has not read it, its content cannot be called agreed. He can state that limit and propose checking relevant phrases within the actual agreement.

In De Officiis, Cicero connects good faith with truth and fidelity to promises and agreements. His ancient duties include positions not adopted here. For the set, the narrow question is whether promised participation matches what people will encounter. Leonid can offer a particular form and description without guaranteeing everyone’s feelings. A host can agree not to score openness without speaking for every future user. Good faith calls for a proportionate promise rather than a grand formula covering unknown consequences.

Transfer limits need explicit agreement. Helping with one gathering does not promise endless support for every adaptation. A changed purpose raises a new question rather than automatically continuing old consent. Limits also should not conceal a known problem in the maker’s version. Leonid can limit further help while reporting discovered ambiguity. Those actions are compatible. Clear scope preserves responsibility at an available scale without turning an idea into a lifelong promise to attend every other person’s decision.

V. A reported problem creates a new choice

Later, Leonid hears that the host added “the bravest answer.” Some participants did not want to say more but felt a group expectation. This hypothetical report is no empirical study of the set. He asks what was added, how participation was explained and which version was used. People need not disclose more personal information to prove discomfort. The evaluative phrase may be enough for an initial decision. New information about use now exists alongside original intention. Examine it before continuing to present the gathering as an unchanged expression of the idea.

He can tell the host that scoring changes the purpose and conflicts with described voluntary participation. That is an observation about an action, not a diagnosis of a person. The host may remove points or prefer a different activity. In the latter case, Leonid can decline support or agreement claims within their actual arrangement. This article establishes no legal power over every copy. It concerns what the maker can do: not confirm an unread adaptation or support a known expansion through his present participation.

Cicero distinguishes inflicting wrong from failing to oppose it when possible. Here that questions available action rather than assigning Leonid every unknown use. He has a particular report and can clarify his position. Can he revise a description, inform a known host or stop supplying a scored version? Those actions differ in availability and relevance. The historical text's broader civic duties are not automatically transferred. Examine current participation rather than sheltering it behind benevolent original intention.

Threats, coercion or professional danger may exceed an ordinary conversation with a maker. This practice requires neither dangerous confrontation nor independent resolution of specialist cases. Leonid can identify his role's limit and seek an appropriate response to actual circumstances. In the everyday scene, distinguish what he controls from what others decide. Incomplete control does not erase every choice. An available action also does not prove that all consequences are resolved or require anyone affected to consider the matter closed.

VI. A correction needs to reach its recipient

Leonid changes the opening and removes an ambiguous example. A new version now exists on his computer, while the organiser retains an old file and another host a printout. Correction is not delivered merely because editing ends. He can tell known recipients what changed and why, provide a clear new version and request retirement of the old description. That is an available action through known relationships, not a guarantee that every copy disappears. Distinguish revision, notification sent and actual receipt rather than assigning all three results to one event.

"The set is better now" may hide a significant boundary. Leonid explains the change: passing appears on the card face, a scoring example is removed, and comparing personal openness is not a claimed use. That informs user action without a lengthy account of the maker's anxiety. He can acknowledge previous ambiguity without inventing motives or demanding gratitude. Precise correction helps recipients identify their version and reconsider a gathering; it does not confirm that later use will be appropriate.

In Frankenstein Chapter 10, Mary Shelley brings duties back to Victor after creation. He agrees to hear his creature's account in a meeting containing hatred and threats. This fictional situation is no rule to fulfil every demand made by someone citing our contribution. Card users

are not beings Leonid created. The limited comparison concerns responsibility over time: finishing a work does not prevent new information arriving. Responses require actual roles and circumstances, with attention to safety and participants' autonomy.

Some circulation information may be unavailable. A general notice does not make unknown recipients known. Leonid uses available channels and states the result's extent: his version changed, and people actually connected with him were notified. Continued old-version use is a separate fact that should neither be concealed nor assumed without grounds. Clarity avoids both promising complete elimination and declining available action. Responsibility stays concrete: what was done, whom it reached and which further uses still depend on others or unknown conditions.

VII. Limited control does not remove precise participation

Another host may make a set inspired by Leonid's idea, changing questions without involving him. That does not establish his approval. Resemblance, origin and agreement are different relationships. Resemblance alone cannot become an invented collaboration. If his name implies endorsement, he can clarify the absence of agreement through available means. That gives no universal control over adaptations. He can still describe his participation accurately and decline claims expanding it beyond what actually occurred.

"It is no longer mine" may also be inaccurate. Supplying material, promoting a gathering or helping introduce points preserves current participation. Examine actions rather than the adaptation's name alone. Leonid can change involvement, decline particular assistance and explain why. Earlier contribution remains historical. An honest account holds both times: what he previously did and what he does now. It requires no eternal involvement while preventing ongoing support from being described as a complete absence of relationship to the use.

This examination distributes responsibility without erasing people. The host answers for offered actions, the maker for form and participation, and participants retain choice within the actual situation. "They agreed" cannot shift everything to a user when an invitation concealed evaluation. Using another idea also does not remove a person's autonomy. Ask what was offered and what someone could understand. These are editorial distinctions for the ordinary scene, not a legally established duty table for every project or society.

A role limit sometimes calls for declining a promise. Leonid may be unable to assess specialist use and refuse to present the set as suitable for it. That is more precise than confident approval to preserve cooperation. Actual commitments to supply guidance or correct an error need separate consideration. Limited knowledge does not automatically remove an accepted task, but it prevents adding unsupported guarantees. Creative responsibility includes

identifying where an informed authorial claim ends and leaving further decisions to people with relevant information and an actual role in that use.

VIII. Responsibility has a continuation and a measure

Leonid’s idea may live in different gatherings, but this article proposes no continuous surveillance. Such control is often unavailable and can itself undermine autonomy. More definite work is possible: state purpose, remove known ambiguity, transfer proportionately and examine a particular problem report. Each action has a limited result. Clarification guarantees no compliance; declining support erases no old copies; a new version is not confirmed by old responses. Recognising limits values action without turning authorship into a promise to manage every future outcome.

The sources retain different grounds. Cicero considers justice, good faith and available action; Plato writing and knowledge in dialogue; Shelley a fictional encounter where duties arise after creation. None studies the cards or establishes contemporary legal responsibility for an idea. Their connection belongs to this editorial scene. It reveals questions without proving efficacy. Leonid seeks answers in wording, actual agreements and information about use; historical differences do not disappear into one convenient slogan about creators.

A clearer opening and smaller promise may be the outcome. Leonid may pause further transfer or decline one gathering. A supposed problem might prove to be an inaccurate report, requiring precise clarification rather than general cancellation. Emotional force alone cannot determine the outcome in advance. Examine available grounds and a proportionate action. People affected by use remain involved where their agreement is needed; concern gives the maker no right to speak for them or declare discomfort resolved without their actual experience.

The practice below concerns one ordinary idea and a known transfer. It establishes no fault, replaces no specialist assessment and promises no exclusion of every unsuitable use. A possible result is a more precise account of participation and an available change. Responsibility means neither owning the whole future nor disappearing when work ends. It continues concretely as information arrives, promises remain and action is possible. That leaves room for creativity, recipient autonomy and honest recognition that some consequences remain unknown or outside the maker’s control.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary idea transferred in a known setting. Identify its form, recipient and offered action. Distinguish purpose from promised benefit: what is known, supposed and unexamined. Do not add guarantees to make the description attractive.

Examine questions, examples and the opening as someone without your spoken explanation. What is required, what may be passed and who can change the order? Freedom should not become an exception to earn. Consider known conditions without predicting everything imaginable.

Describe essential boundaries and your participation’s scope. A title, translation or adaptation does not automatically confirm meaning. Clarify agreements when a purpose changes; earlier consent covers no unlimited new use. Recipients retain their own roles and autonomy.

For a particular problem report, state available information and unknowns. Examine your form and present involvement. Clarify guidance, remove ambiguity, notify known recipients or decline support for a particular use. Threats and specialist risks require an appropriate response to circumstances; the exercise demands no dangerous confrontation.

Record the action at its actual scale. A new version, notification and receipt differ. Do not claim all copies removed or consequences repaired without grounds. This practice establishes no fault and guarantees no safe use; it helps select available action and describe the result’s limit honestly.

Key quotation

> *they cannot protect or defend themselves.*

Plato, Phaedrus, closing discussion of writing; excerpt translated by Benjamin Jowett. The pronoun concerns written discourses, not people who use an idea.

Connections between traditions

Context	Question actually read	Relation to the idea	Boundary
Cicero, I.7.23	Good faith and promises	Description corresponding to participation	No universal legal contract
Cicero, I.7.23–24; I.9.28–30	Infliction and possible opposition	Consider an available action after a report	No lifelong control of unknown uses
Plato, Theuth and Thamus	Invention and judgment of writing's use	Intention does not replace use examination	Myth and dialogue, no card study
Plato, written and living discourse	Writing cannot answer by itself	Keep needed explanation available	No writing ban or eternal support promise
Shelley, Chapter 10	Duties arise again after creation	Examine new information	Fiction does not justify threats; people are not created by an idea's maker

Primary sources

1. Cicero. De Officiis I.7.20–24; I.9.28–30, translated by Walter Miller, Loeb Classical Library XXI, 1913; LacusCurtius. I.20–41 was read continuously; argument uses the specified limited context. Translator and imprint were verified in the work index. Historical property assumptions, exceptions and civic hierarchies are not adopted as current norms.

2. Plato. Phaedrus, translated by Benjamin Jowett; Project Gutenberg 1636. The closing discussion of Theuth and Thamus, writing and living discourse was read, displayed lines 945–1009. Stephanus correspondence and a particular physical edition were not separately verified. No whole-dialogue reading is claimed.

3. Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley. Frankenstein; or, the Modern Prometheus, Chapter 10; Project Gutenberg 84. The entire chapter through the decision to hear the creature was read. Exact imprint and 1818/1831 textual correspondence were not independently established; no complete-novel reading is claimed. The fictional episode is a bounded comparison, not a duty to comply with threats.

Short Cicero and Plato excerpts were checked; RU renderings are United Wisdom's own. No literal novel quotation is used. Historical texts, translations, sites and territorial rights remain distinct; this record permits no complete import.

Tags

creator, idea, responsibility, creativity, use, form, intention, consequences, foreseeability, transfer, recipient, autonomy, consent, promise, good faith, Cicero, Plato, Shelley, Frankenstein, writing, cards, conversation, adaptation, translation, version, correction, notification, boundaries, traditions, 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.