

UNITED WISDOM

Embarrassment and the Right to Be Visible

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-09-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Embarrassment and the Right to Be Visible

Epigraph

“slow in his speech”

Confucian Analects, IV.24; a fragment from James Legge’s translation. This belongs to a saying about the relation between speech and conduct, rather than a command to remain silent before others.

What this article is about

You prepared a question, raised your hand, and suddenly felt you were taking up too much room. You have not asked anything yet, but already want to apologize: for your voice, for the attention, for being there at all. In another situation, things are simpler: you calmly explain something complicated to someone you know. “I cannot speak to people” may therefore be too broad a description of what is happening right now.

Embarrassment varies. Sometimes it accompanies meeting someone new, sometimes it protects personal space, sometimes it involves anticipated judgment. We will not infer a single cause from a brief scene. We will try to distinguish the right to participate, the desire to speak, actual safety, and the demands people place on themselves under another’s gaze.

Being visible does not necessarily mean addressing an auditorium. It might mean asking someone to repeat an explanation, putting your name on your work, or declining an inconvenient offer. None of these possibilities becomes compulsory. The point is to keep your decision from automatically collapsing into disappearance, and to leave room for your voice within modesty.

I. A place you do not have to earn through perfection

Imagine a small work discussion. You understand part of the issue but not the whole picture. When your turn comes, a condition arises: you may speak only after ruling out every possibility of error. While you work to satisfy it, the conversation ends. Later, you realize that other participants were allowed to clarify, doubt, and correct themselves. You created a much stricter entrance requirement for yourself.

You can examine that requirement with one question: what does this situation actually ask of a participant? In a discussion, it may be enough to describe an observation and its limits: “This

happened in my part of the work; I do not know about the rest." A consequential decision really will require evidence and checks. The right to participate and readiness to deliver a final answer are different things. Confusing them can deprive you of the chance to ask precisely what would help you understand.

This is not an invitation to speak without preparation in every situation. Errors can have consequences, and other people's time deserves respect. But preparation need not automatically become an examination of your acceptability as a human being. You may occupy the ordinary place of someone who knows something specific, is learning the rest, and can honestly identify the limits of their competence. Those limits do not cancel your presence; they make it clearer to others.

II. What exactly is frightening about attention

"I feel awkward" sometimes conceals several different concerns. One person struggles to start speaking, another to tolerate the silence after an answer, a third to appear in a photograph that will be circulated without permission. These situations call for different decisions. A prepared opening question does not solve unwanted image publication; declining a photograph says nothing about your ability to discuss work. It helps to name the particular event instead of judging yourself as a whole.

In an imagined first meeting, you might notice: "I am afraid there will be silence after I speak." The question then becomes more precise: must every pause count as proof of failure? Sometimes someone is considering an answer, did not hear, or became distracted. We do not know the reason beforehand. You can repeat the question, let the pause pass, or finish the conversation. No option guarantees a pleasant response, but there are more options than immediate self-blame.

In another scene, the concern may be quite concrete: the other person has mocked you before, or a manager uses personal information against employees. Here, caution should not be explained solely through inner embarrassment. Choosing a safer channel, limiting information, bringing a supportive person, or declining contact can be reasonable. The right to be visible includes deciding to whom, where, and to what extent you show yourself. Openness does not have to be unconditional.

III. Restraint in speech and the speaker’s disappearance

Sometimes the difficulty starts before a conversation: you are invited to present your work and decide that the invitation must be a mistake. Ask the organizer which part of your experience they want to hear. It may turn out that they need a brief account of a particular task, rather than proof of universal competence. You can then accept with agreed limits or decline for a clear reason. If expectations remain vague, clarification helps both sides. It does not oblige you to agree, but lets you decide about the actual offer rather than an imagined examination. Uncertainty about your voice and an objective lack of knowledge may coincide, but they remain two questions. One concerns the form of participation; the other requires an honest limit on content.

In Analects IV.24, Legge’s translation commends restraint in speech and earnestness in conduct. This is a historical ethical saying about someone seeking worthy behavior. It does not describe a modern meeting, social anxiety, or the need to respond to humiliation. We can relate it to our question only within limits: caution in promises can coexist with actual participation, and the number of words spoken does not determine a person’s quality.

For example, a project participant does not promise to finish everything in one evening. She clarifies the deadline, identifies the work she can do, and then does it. Her speech is restrained, but she does not disappear from the allocation of responsibilities. If instead she silently accepts an impossible workload to avoid troubling anyone, outward quiet does not necessarily express the same virtue. The content of a decision matters more than how inconspicuous it appears.

We cannot replace one strict command with another: you used to demand silence from yourself, and now will demand constant decisiveness. Sometimes you choose to listen because you are interested; sometimes you do not answer because a question is personal; sometimes you speak longer than usual because an important detail needs explaining. The distinction is not a new standard of correct loudness, but the opportunity to understand your choice and reconsider it as circumstances change.

IV. Another’s gaze is not a complete record of you

After a brief presentation, one look from the back row remains. You thought someone frowned. Now the whole conversation is judged through that second: the content is forgotten, the questions forgotten, only the presumed evaluation remains. But a facial expression does not report an entire thought, and one listener’s thought does not represent everyone present. Even a direct comment needs clarification: what exactly did the person hear, and what is the comment about?

In Analects XIII.24, a discussion of neighbors' approval and disapproval does not end with a simple rule to follow the majority. We do not transfer the historical division of people into worthy and unworthy to contemporary relationships. A narrower question matters here: is the mere fact of popularity or unpopularity enough to evaluate an action? An answer requires examining its content, circumstances, and consequences, rather than only counting reactions.

If feedback contains a useful correction, you can accept it even when its tone is unpleasant. If it consists of mockery, you do not have to turn it into instructions for your life. Between these cases are uncertain situations: ask for an example, postpone a conclusion, talk with someone who knows the context. The right to be visible does not provide immunity from criticism. It allows you to encounter specific criticism without having to invalidate yourself completely each time.

V. A small sentence instead of a new personality

When considering criticism, account for the relationship too. A teacher's comment about an insufficient explanation may identify a learning task. The same sentence from a stranger beneath a personal photograph may provide nothing usable. You need not decide in advance that one response is true and the other false; ask whether there is a subject to discuss, a chance to clarify, and a reason to trust the evaluation. Choosing which feedback to accept does not require checking every random opinion. Sometimes ending contact makes more sense than spending an evening defending yourself against an impression. This especially applies to messages whose content amounts to demanding your disappearance: confidence in their expression does not make them substantive criticism.

Someone who finds it hard to ask for a turn is sometimes advised to become confident, charismatic, and free of others' opinions. That assignment may be larger than the situation itself. You do not have to change your entire personality to clarify a meeting time. You can choose one sentence beforehand: "I want to check that I understood correctly." It states a purpose, leaves room for correction, and does not require explaining the entire history of your relationship with attention.

Another sentence may help when you could not answer immediately: "I need a little time; I will return to this question." Check that it fits the circumstances. A pause may be possible among friends; a task with a deadline requires a realistic response time. This is ordinary coordination, rather than a universal way to remove anxiety. The other person may agree, decline, or propose an alternative. The next decision will need to follow the facts.

Your chosen sentence does not have to sound elegant. If you stumble, you can repeat it more simply. If speaking is too difficult today, a written question or a colleague's help may be possible when appropriate. We are offering an everyday opportunity to participate, rather than

a therapeutic exercise with a prescribed increase in difficulty. You decide whether the step suits you now. For substantial difficulties, an appropriate form of support is better discussed with a professional than inferred from an article.

VI. Work you can name as your own

Imagine you did an important part of a shared project. At the final meeting, someone asks about the result and you answer, “It was nothing much.” Perhaps you want to respect the team. But your actual contribution disappears from the overall picture. You can name it without competing: “I prepared the calculation; colleagues checked the initial data, and together we found the error.” Your work and others’ participation are both visible here.

The difference between accurately acknowledging a contribution and taking someone else’s credit is not determined by using the pronoun “I.” Sometimes a clear account of roles prevents unfairness. If you got the allocation wrong, it can be corrected. If a dispute concerns the evaluation of work, documents, agreements, and a conversation with responsible people will be needed. Embarrassment should not be the sole reason to relinquish facts, but effort itself does not automatically establish the amount of compensation.

In creative work, authorship may bring a particular vulnerability: people will see your choices as well as the result. You may sign your work, use a permitted pseudonym, or leave it unpublished for now. These decisions involve aims, safety, and the platform’s conditions. You do not have to turn everything you make into a public statement. What matters is that, as far as possible, the decision about visibility belongs to you, rather than to a presumed duty to stay behind the scenes.

VII. Epictetus on action, and the limits of application

In collaborative work, specific agreements about visibility before the result can sometimes help. Who presents the project, whose names appear, who answers questions? These details can be discussed without explaining personal awkwardness. Preferring a colleague’s presentation should not automatically mean losing authorship. Wanting to present your own part makes it reasonable to define its time and content. Others’ possibilities matter too: one participant cannot make promises for the entire team without agreement. Visibility thus becomes a question of allocating roles rather than a confidence competition. Decisions can be reconsidered when the task changes. An initial preference for staying in the background is not a permanent refusal of acknowledgment, just as agreeing to speak once is not a permanent duty.

In Enchiridion §35, Elizabeth Carter’s translation of Epictetus advises against avoiding the visibility of an action judged clearly to be right because others may wrongly condemn it. The

saying centers on evaluating the action itself. It is Stoic instruction, rather than a promise of safe reactions or a modern treatment for anxiety. Nor does it exempt us from checking: our own confidence is not yet proof that we are right.

Suppose you report an inaccuracy in a document that can be shown and checked. Choosing a calm form and providing evidence is appropriate. If there is a risk of retaliation, choosing a channel requires separate care. You might seek advice, act with others, or postpone the report temporarily. Historical instruction should not be used to demand that someone take a solitary risk to demonstrate inner strength. Responsibility includes the conditions under which action takes place.

In an ordinary safe conversation, this thought may help change the question. Instead of “Am I liked enough to ask?” try “Does my question have a reasonable purpose, an understandable form, and a suitable moment?” Sometimes the answer will be no: the subject belongs elsewhere, time has run out, or the question has already been covered. Then another moment may work. But when conditions fit, presumed disapproval need not close every opportunity in advance. This is an editorial application, rather than a literal rule from the ancient text.

VIII. Awkwardness in close relationships

In close relationships, invisibility can take the form of constant agreement. You say “Whatever works for you,” although you are tired, want a different route, or cannot host visitors. Perhaps on one day accommodating the other person really is easy. On another, the same sentence conceals a substantial limit. Your partner cannot see the difference if both answers sound identical. Naming a preference gives the relationship factual information; it does not necessarily start a conflict.

You might say, “I need a quiet evening today; let us discuss another day.” The other person can then describe their needs, and you can look for a solution. Mutuality does not mean every wish is fulfilled. It means both people’s wishes and limits can be named. Disagreement does not by itself prove your request was unacceptable. But actual obligations, such as caring for someone dependent on you, remain part of the conversation.

If requests regularly meet threats, humiliation, or coercion, a well-phrased sentence may be insufficient. Support and safety matter more here than practicing visibility. You do not need to test your courage with someone who uses openness against you. You can choose a trusted person and appropriate help. We are not describing every kind of dangerous relationship or providing an individual plan; we are identifying a limit beyond which everyday advice no longer matches the situation’s complexity.

IX. The right not to become public

In a family conversation, a boundary sometimes takes the form of requesting a different way to participate rather than refusing. Someone may want to congratulate a relative but feel unready to speak before everyone. They can suggest a private conversation, a short letter, or help preparing the gathering. These options do not make their feeling less sincere. Relatives may value the shared moment itself and say so; then the task remains to find a suitable form without treating a preference as a moral flaw. If you know an unexpected invitation to speak will be difficult, you can tell the organizer. This agreement does not guarantee freedom from awkwardness, but clarifies expectations. The relationship receives more information than when refusal appears unexpectedly and everyone invents a reason for it.

Contemporary visibility is often measured through posts, appearances, and responses. Refusing to upload a photograph or tell a personal story can then be treated as a lack of development. But participation in your own life is not the same as availability to an unlimited audience. You can make decisions confidently, care for people, do interesting work, and prefer a limited circle. You need not prove to society that your absence from a feed has an acceptable reason.

If you do want to share, it helps to define a boundary beforehand. What belongs to your story, and what involves another person? Which details are you willing to leave accessible after your mood changes? You can choose a small audience and omit sensitive information. These are questions of consent and privacy, rather than a guarantee against unpleasant reactions. Even a limited message can travel beyond its initial circle; consider the platform’s particular conditions before sending.

The opposite extreme also occurs: someone has agreed to appear and now believes withdrawing is impossible because it would prove cowardice. Yet a changed decision sometimes reflects new risk, illness, overload, or unsuitable conditions. Communicate cancellation honestly and take agreements into account when possible. The right to be visible does not itself create a duty to remain visible at any cost. Its other side is the right to choose the extent of participation.

X. When embarrassment substantially limits life

One unpleasant evening is not enough to diagnose yourself. At the same time, substantial difficulty should not be dismissed as “just being shy.” NIMH describes social anxiety disorder as a condition in which fear of evaluation can significantly interfere with daily life. This is general information, rather than a conclusion about the reader. Professional assessment considers history, duration, impact, and other circumstances; recognizing an isolated sign in a text establishes nothing automatically.

If attending work or school, asking for necessary help, or interacting even when you want to becomes difficult, you can discuss the situation with an appropriate professional. You do not have to wait for the duration stated in diagnostic descriptions to ask for help. An article and a small sentence you choose yourself do not replace assessment or treatment. NIMH notes that care choices depend on needs, preferences, and medical circumstances; we prescribe no method, medication, or sequence of confronting fears.

Thoughts of suicide, self-harm risk, or immediate danger require urgent assistance where you are: local emergency or crisis services, or someone able to help you contact them. The US numbers in NIMH's publication are not universal. If explaining details is difficult, begin with how much the situation interferes with your life and what help you need now. Your right to support does not depend on giving a persuasive performance before a professional.

XI. Evaluating an attempt without another examination

After a conversation, you can ask not only "How did I look?" but "What did I want to communicate, what did I communicate, and what remains unclear?" These questions do not require analyzing every second. Sometimes it is enough to note that you requested an explanation and received it. Sometimes a short clarification is needed. If analysis becomes prolonged replaying in search of every possible mistake, it stops producing new information and may call for a different kind of support.

A small attempt does not have to end in relief. You can ask your question and still feel embarrassed. This proves neither treatment success nor its absence: we are not conducting treatment here. In everyday terms, the action's result and the feeling's change can be distinguished. Necessary information was obtained, a request made, a boundary named—even if body and thoughts do not yet match the desired image of a confident person.

Choose the next step by circumstances, rather than a demand to keep increasing difficulty. Perhaps tomorrow you will repeat the same form, use a letter, rest, or seek help. Visibility need not become a daily quota. If a situation went badly, you can correct a particular misunderstanding and retain the right to participate later. One setback does not have to become the final story of what kind of person you are.

XII. A voice that does not have to defeat the others

A detailed assessment is not always needed. If you ordered an item, asked for directions, or clarified an appointment time, the situation can end with the answer. Sometimes evaluating an attempt makes an ordinary action excessively significant, as though every sentence showed progress or regression. An everyday conversation may remain everyday. If a particular correction is needed—for example, you confused the date—making it is enough. Otherwise, continue your day. This is neither a demand to stop thinking nor a promise that a thought will immediately disappear. It is permission not to turn every participation into a report on your personality. If you still want to revisit the conversation, you can notice that desire without assigning it the compulsory task of checking every possible reaction.

The right to be visible does not mean occupying all the space. Other participants have questions and limits too. You can state a thought and then listen, request time and keep to it, disagree and leave the other person room to respond. This arrangement does not guarantee ideal relationships. It makes participation more mutual: your voice joins a conversation alongside other voices, rather than replacing them.

Sometimes an important step is very quiet. You restore an author’s deserved acknowledgment, decline one offer, or ask a doctor a question you previously held back. Others may not consider it a significant event. You do not need public confirmation to recognize a particular action. Yet not every silence should be interpreted as defeat: quiet may express attention, rest, protection, or a freely chosen preference.

Embarrassment does not have to disappear before life begins. Nor must anyone overcome it alone or keep proving courage. A more manageable aim is the ability to distinguish: here I want to participate, here I want privacy, here I need help, here there is danger. When these distinctions are available, modesty stops requiring a person’s absence. There is room within it for a presence suited to their actual wishes and circumstances.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary situation in which you want to participate and that seems sufficiently safe. Do not select the hardest meeting merely to test your character. If no suitable situation exists now, you can limit yourself to reflection or postpone the practice. If fear substantially interferes with life, seeking help may take priority over an independent attempt.

Describe the aim in one sentence: clarify a condition, name a contribution, express a limit. Record the concern separately without turning it into a fact: “I think the other person will be irritated.” Check the known circumstances. Is there a real reason to fear a threat? Is the timing

suitable? Does someone else's privacy enter into this? If substantial risks appear, change the channel, find support, or decline the step.

Prepare a short sentence in your own words. For example: "I did this part and want to clarify the next stage," or "I need to think; I will answer tomorrow if that timing works." Decide what might help if you stumble: repeat more simply, ask for a pause, write. These are options, rather than a mandatory sequence.

Afterward, note only a few facts: what was said, what response came, whether clarification is needed. Do not demand proof that nobody judged you: that knowledge is usually unavailable. Nor force yourself to repeat the attempt to correct an unpleasant feeling immediately. You may stop, return to ordinary activities, or discuss what happened with someone you trust.

If the experience reveals a persistent restriction on work, study, relationships, or obtaining help, discuss it with a professional. For danger and self-harm risk, seek urgent local support. You may skip any part. The practice aims to add a choice, rather than create a new duty to be brave in front of others.

Key quotation

"earnest in his conduct"

Confucian Analects, IV.24, a fragment from James Legge's translation. The second part of the saying used in the epigraph connects restraint in speech with action. It sets no standard for publicity and describes no treatment.

Connections between traditions

The Confucian saying about speech and conduct and the Stoic instruction about evaluating an action meet in the question: what makes participation meaningful? Their historical foundations differ. Contemporary NIMH information belongs to health education and establishes a boundary for seeking help. United Wisdom compares these perspectives without declaring them a single doctrine or attributing modern clinical knowledge to ancient authors.

Sources

• S01: Confucian Analects, James Legge's translation, IV.24 and XIII.24. The named sayings, neighboring context, and edition information were read; not the entire book.

• S02: Epictetus, Enchiridion §35, Elizabeth Carter's translation. The complete paragraph and translation information were read; used in paraphrase.

• S03: NIMH, Social Anxiety Disorder: What You Need to Know. The substantive publication was read, including assessment, support, and text reuse conditions; revised 2025.

Tags

embarrassment, visibility, participation, modesty, voice, privacy, boundaries, social anxiety, attention, another’s gaze, restraint in speech, actions, flawlessness, work, publicity, closeness, awkwardness, choice, support, Confucius, Legge, Epictetus, Carter, NIMH, dignity

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