

UNITED WISDOM

Disagreement without humiliation: what makes an argument substantive

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R24 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Disagreement without humiliation: what makes an argument substantive

Epigraph

> *to seek them for himself*

John Morley, On Compromise, chapter III; excerpt. The pronoun refers to the aims of inquiry, rather than a position chosen in advance.

What this article is about

In this fictional scene, members of a book club are choosing a meeting format. Sveta proposes more online meetings because several people find evening travel difficult. Pavel thinks meeting in person allows more living attention. Within a few replies, the discussion changes. Sveta is accused of wanting to turn social contact into another screen; Pavel of ignoring other people’s circumstances. Both may have been pointing to real limits, and neither has yet explained the exact arrangement proposed. They now defend an image of themselves while the meeting calendar remains empty.

A substantive argument keeps its subject, reasons, and the opportunity to respond in view. Participants can understand another claim, check facts, distinguish preferences from decision conditions, and acknowledge corrections. This promises neither a pleasant conversation nor an obligation to endure humiliation for truth. We consider how disagreement can become work on a question rather than a contest of personal worth. The practice is voluntary; agreement may not emerge. The result may be a clearer difference, a changed decision, or a limit on participation. New clarity should not be bought by giving up permission to object or leave.

I. The claim should be recognizable

Before objecting, check which proposal the response addresses. Sveta did not propose canceling every in-person meeting; she wanted a regular option for participating from home. Pavel did not say absent members were unwanted; he doubted whether discussion quality would be maintained. This excuses neither person’s later replies, but an accurate beginning allows disagreement with the actual proposal. Replace a claim with a convenient extreme and it becomes easy to defeat while the shared question stays untouched. A participant can win an exchange without answering what the other person actually suggested.

Keep a restatement brief and open to correction. Sveta checks whether Pavel fears losing attention in a remote format. He adds concern about who will guide the discussion. The subject has changed: it concerns organization as well as screens. If restatement becomes a trap requiring acceptance of our wording, it ceases to be a check. Accuracy is determined by whether the other person recognizes their question and can correct an important detail, rather than by the elegance of the summary. Even then, participants may assess the proposal very differently.

Understanding a claim creates no duty to consider it sound. Pavel may hear the proposal accurately and notice a difficulty Sveta overlooked. Sveta may understand his concern and find it insufficient to retain the previous format. Respect for a person and assessment of a claim do different work. Agreement cannot be demanded as proof of attentive listening. Disagreement also does not remove the need to address the actual reason when someone voluntarily joins the discussion. Otherwise every objection remains beside the question without meeting it.

Sometimes a claim is not yet formed. Sveta knows the current meetings are inaccessible to some people but has not devised a suitable format. Pavel sees a weakness in remote discussion but does not know how to address it. They can explore before demanding a complete defense. Lacking a full plan does not prove a problem absent. Naming a problem also does not justify every solution. Distinguish reporting a difficulty, proposing a trial idea, and making a final recommendation. Each requires different questions and a different degree of confidence.

II. Make room for a strong objection

A weak objection is convenient to defeat. Pavel can answer an incidental remark that the internet simplifies everything while ignoring access. Sveta can show that physical presence does not guarantee attention while ignoring organizational difficulty. Honest work notices what actually changes the assessment. If several members cannot travel, the existing format has a cost. If no one is willing to guide a remote meeting, the proposed format has a cost too. A strong objection need not destroy a claim; it may clarify the conditions under which it makes sense at all.

Invite the other person to name the most consequential difficulty in your option, but do so only with actual willingness to hear the answer. If every drawback is explained by the objector’s poor character, the invitation was decorative. Sveta may discover Pavel lacks suitable equipment rather than simply preferring tradition. Pavel may learn that travel takes others several hours rather than reflecting little interest. New circumstances require no immediate concession. They require us to stop defending a decision as though the information had never appeared.

There are limits to constructing the strongest version of someone else's position. In an ordinary, safe dispute, checking a strong reason is useful. Under humiliation or threat, a person need not keep providing intellectual service to an attacker. They may set a boundary and end the exchange. Nor must they supply convincing reasons for a claim its speaker cannot or will not support. Ask for clarification and allow an inadequate answer to remain inadequate. Honesty does not require making another claim stronger than the available information for the sake of a beautiful appearance of equality.

A strong objection can be our own. Sveta sees that regular remote meetings need another facilitator; Pavel notices that in-person meetings exclude part of the club. Naming a drawback in one's proposal makes work more accurate. It need not be a confession of defeat or a reason to exclude someone from decision-making. Recognizing a limit can improve a particular proposal. Do not turn this into a ritual in which everyone must demean their view before being allowed to speak. Show the known cost and what remains unknown honestly.

III. Facts, preferences, and criteria

Substantive disagreement distinguishes what is being asserted. Travel times can be checked. A preference for meeting in person belongs to its holder and is not refuted by someone else's preference. A club's decision also requires criteria: whom to include, what counts as sufficient discussion, and how much organization is available. Mixing facts, taste, and criteria lets the rules change endlessly. Pavel demonstrates that he enjoys in-person contact; Sveta answers with the number absent. Both answers may be true at different levels, without either determining the shared choice alone.

Name a criterion before judging options, or make it visible when a difference emerges. If access for current members is the main aim, certain decisions will look more reasonable. If the aim is deep in-person discussion for a small group, the assessment may change. Choosing the aim remains open to disagreement too. Do not present a personal preference as the club's sole objective interest. Acknowledge which value carries greater weight for you and ask whether others accept the cost. The dispute may remain, but concerns different priorities rather than a person's supposed lack of reason.

Make a factual claim definite enough to check. Sveta says many stopped attending; Pavel asks how many and over which period. That can serve the decision, or humiliate if used only to mock any imprecision. Instead of competing memories, clarify available information: ask members about times, check attendance, and examine technical conditions. Do not invent numbers to strengthen a morally appealing position. The absence of a ready table also does not make a report of a concrete difficulty meaningless. Keep the question open pending a check.

Some criteria resist reduction to a number. People describe attention, participation, and convenience differently. That is no reason to declare everything subjective and abandon comparison. Choose an observable part: how many spoke, who could not connect, or which question remained unfinished. Such information does not exhaust quality, but helps discuss it without claiming mysterious knowledge of someone's engagement. A quiet person may listen closely; a talkative person may not address the subject. A substantive argument retains these limits when turning an overall impression into a reason for a decision.

IV. Respect does not equalize reasons

Different claims may have different support. A checked schedule and a rumor that everyone is unhappy do not become equivalent to preserve atmosphere. Sveta may ask who reported a difficulty; Pavel may correct a date. Checking concerns the assertion rather than human worth. An error in one fact does not make every future statement from that person unreliable by definition. Correct it and reassess the proposal. The participant remains entitled to speak even if a particular reason was weak; that reason need not retain its former weight.

Equal tolerance is not required for a checkable assertion and humiliation. If one participant discusses format while another mocks appearance, origin, or a vulnerability, the subject has changed. Requesting a return to the question or ending the exchange is no intellectual defeat. Substance requires conditions in which objection is possible without punishment. When those conditions are absent, telling someone to find a more convincing reason is inadequate. Good reasoning need not protect against every aggression. Safety and permission not to participate remain regardless of the strength of an available claim.

Participants may also have unequal influence. A club organizer can set the schedule while formally offering free discussion. A newcomer may fear objecting if participation is at risk. A polite tone does not remove that arrangement. Name who decides and how objections will be considered. If the decision cannot change, discuss consequences honestly rather than simulate choice. Declaring open debate after a decision is made creates uncertainty: participants spend effort on reasons that were never going to carry weight. Substantive discussion requires clarity about the work actually available.

A question does not always permit compromise between equal halves. If an option excludes someone through a condition they cannot voluntarily change, examine that concrete cost rather than equating it with a preference for a comfortable chair. If available facts clearly refute a claim, half an error does not make a fair conclusion. Compromise may distribute practical conditions, but creates no truth. Participants can retain different values while choosing a limited arrangement without pretending every reason has equal strength. Honest differences in support differ from humiliating the holder of a weaker argument.

V. Change a view without losing dignity

A substantive argument permits revision. Sveta learns that some members prefer occasional in-person meetings though they cannot travel weekly. Pavel learns that regular online participation would bring back people nearly absent. Both can refine the proposal: Sveta suggests alternating formats, and Pavel agrees to try one remote evening. This is a fictional possible outcome, not proof of the best format. What matters is the transition: new information need not threaten personal dignity. Part of a decision can change while remaining doubts may still be explained.

When every correction prompts a victor’s celebration, admitting error becomes harder. Pavel revises an assumption, and Sveta uses it to prove he has always understood people poorly. The next correction becomes more costly. This excuses none of his earlier words, but distinguishes revision from public destruction. Note that a particular reason has changed and return to the subject. A participant need not prove entitlement to respect after every mistake. Otherwise the argument encourages defending face more than working with reasons, even while everyone declares devotion to truth.

A change can be described narrowly. Pavel recognizes the value of a remote option for some members while still preferring in-person discussion of a difficult book. Sveta acknowledges organizational workload without abandoning access. Both revisions can coexist with continued disagreement. Complete conversion to the other side need not be demanded as proof of hearing. A small concession also proves neither renewed trust nor closeness. It is concrete work on one decision, valuable without promising different responses to every future subject.

A view may remain unchanged after honest checking. Participants distinguish reasons and costs yet choose different priorities. Record the difference and decide on a practical arrangement: a trial format, separate meetings, voluntary participation, or leaving the current organization. Not every argument must end in a shared conviction. A substantive outcome may mean people stop attributing extremes and know where they differ. That description is legitimate only when responses are actually free. Forced silence cannot be renamed mature acceptance of difference.

VI. Independent judgment and careful speech

In On Compromise, John Morley distinguishes forming a conviction, expressing it, and acting upon it. His account of independent inquiry belongs to historical intellectual and political responsibility; we do not transfer it wholesale to family or club conversation. Our limited question is whether we check the basis of our view or merely the convenience of defending it. Independence does not mean confidence without sources. It can include acknowledging what is unknown and considering an objection that clarifies the subject, without requiring adoption of the other position.

In Proverbs chapter twenty-five, instruction about dispute appears alongside preserving another person’s confidence and the image of a fitting word. This is religious wisdom rather than a modern public-debate code. Our comparison highlights limits on means: a personal detail may make an answer striking without belonging to the subject or becoming available for disclosure. Sveta knows a difficulty in Pavel’s life but should not use it to explain his entire position before the club. We infer no complete modern privacy rules from the verse; this practical limit is the author’s proposal for the scene.

Morley and Proverbs neither speak with one voice nor prove a single technique. One examines intellectual responsibility in its political era; the other retains religious instruction about conduct. Place them beside one another only with the difference visible: independent judgment and limits on response both matter to our question while having different foundations. Substance grants no right to humiliate, and care removes no need to check. This is an editorial synthesis readers may assess, revise, or reject, not a hidden consensus among traditions about how an argument must end.

Distinguish confidence in a value from confidence in a solution. Sveta may strongly value participation while doubting which combination of formats helps. Pavel may value attention without knowing whether a remote meeting would actually be worse. The distinction does not weaken concern for the aim. It leaves room for a trial and later assessment. If a value defends every chosen means, the argument closes: every drawback becomes an attack on what matters. Substantive work preserves the question of whether our proposal really serves the value in whose name we defend it.

VII. An audience changes the cost of replying

In public, participants answer more than each other. Pavel notices the others watching his reply; Sveta notices friends' reactions. A wish for the cleverest answer may appear even when it barely concerns the subject. This is a possible observation in a fictional scene, not a universal account of public behavior. Check what the next remark does: clarify a decision, answer a reason, or create a spectacle? Humor can ease a setting, but audience laughter proves no claim true. It may simply make another person's next reply more costly.

Return to a small subject without publicly analyzing someone's character. The organizer asks which two conditions are needed for a trial remote meeting. Sveta names access; Pavel names facilitation and duration. The audience now has a task with room for several participants. This is no duty to keep peace at any cost. Humiliation can be named and limited separately. Reciprocal humiliation is not the only move available. A boundary may be brief: that form prevents continuing, so another form or a stop is needed. No one must prove invulnerability to insult.

Moving part of a conversation elsewhere may help when both agree and it is safe. A proposal to discuss everything privately can also deprive someone of witnesses or support. Private conversation is not automatically more mature. A club can discuss shared terms openly while keeping personal circumstances outside the decision. If a separate exchange is needed, clarify the subject and the possibility of ending it. Choose the form by available freedom rather than assuming decent people must always agree without others present. An audience has costs; its absence can have costs too.

A written response permits refinement but does not guarantee honesty. A long text may repeatedly distort the other claim and appear convincing through length alone. A short response can name an important limit accurately. After reading, ask what remains checkable and which next step is proposed. You need not answer every inaccurate description of yourself. Correct a consequential detail, return to the question, or decline further exchange. Substance is not measured by paragraph count and requires no endless defense of reputation. It requires sufficiently accurate work on the subject within voluntarily chosen participation.

VIII. What counts as a result

The club may choose one trial remote meeting and keep the following meeting in person. That is a practical option rather than final reconciliation of views. Sveta and Pavel still prefer different forms, but now understand the reasons and what will be checked. Afterwards, examine who could participate and what discussion was possible. If the trial fails, distinguish technical difficulty, missing facilitation, and principled disagreement with the format. One unsuccessful evening does not prove remote contact universally impossible; one successful evening does not prove it fits every future task.

A clarified disagreement can be a result too. Sveta makes access primary; Pavel gives greater weight to in-person discussion. They acknowledge that no shared solution exists yet and decide on their own next actions. That clarity helps only insofar as no one was forced to accept the other value as uniquely worthy. Someone can choose another club or attend some meetings without declaring another person an enemy. Declining discussion altogether also matters. If a question carries little consequence for your life, you need not continue arguing to prove intellectual competence to every person encountered.

In the United Wisdom map, this topic connects with A10 and C07: attention to reaction and responsibility toward reasons. These indicate thematic directions rather than readiness of materials. R23 shares the possibility of finding an omitted question, but here the main work concerns a claim, a strong objection, and a criterion. R26 connects through acknowledging a concrete error, yet revising a view does not replace apologizing for humiliation. Someone can correct a fact accurately and still remain responsible for an earlier remark. The distinction helps choose further reading by the task while preserving different responsibilities.

A substantive argument remains human when it allows limits. We may be tired, insufficiently informed, or unwilling to continue. That makes no position true, but preserves permission to postpone our response. Where a shared decision is needed, the consequences of declining discussion are addressed separately. In a free exchange of views, no one owes a final justification of their entire life. The practice offers one more accurate exchange rather than a permanent examination of rationality. It may change a decision, reveal what is unknown, or permit ending with visible, honest, continuing disagreement.

What this means in practice

For one voluntary trial, choose a safe, small disagreement. State your claim so the proposal and its conditions are clear. Briefly check the other claim, allowing correction of the restatement. Separate one checkable fact, one preference, and one decision criterion where they are present. Do not artificially fill every category. The aim is to locate the actual difference. If the other person declines, the question cannot become an interrogation. An unsafe or humiliating exchange can be ended without first proving you are right.

Check a strong objection that actually affects your option. Which circumstance could change the decision? What information is unknown? Which costs are placed on the other person? A limit can be recognized without abandoning a value. If a shared step is needed, choose a small check with a clear boundary; if none is available, name disagreement without judging human worth. Afterwards, ask whether the subject became more accurate and freedom to respond remained. Winning the last reply is not a required outcome. Hearing a reason previously replaced by a convenient extreme may be enough, while honestly leaving the next choice open.

Key quotation

> *even if he seek alone*

John Morley, On Compromise, chapter III; excerpt.

Connections between traditions

Source	Question for comparison	Limit
Morley, chapterIII	Do we check the basis of our conviction?	Historical intellectual responsibility, not an outcome guarantee
Proverbs25:9–12	Does the means of response belong to the subject?	Religious instruction, not a complete modern code
This article’s proposal	Claim, strong objection, criterion, and an exit	Voluntary editorial synthesis; disagreement may remain

Sources

1. John Morley — On Compromise. Project Gutenberg digital English edition of the historical essay. ChapterIII, Intellectual Responsibility and the Political Spirit. Historical intellectual/political argument, not a modern conversation efficacy study or obligation to argue in unsafe settings.

2. Biblical Proverbs wisdom collection — Proverbs, chapter25. Updated World English Bible publisher chapter page. Proverbs25:9–12. Religious wisdom context; not an empirical debate technique or exhaustive modern privacy code.

Tags

disagreement, substantive argument, humiliation, claim, reason, objection, criterion, facts, preferences, respect, independence, judgment, correction, uncertainty, compromise, boundaries, audience, privacy, safety, voluntary participation, choice, Morley, Proverbs, United Wisdom, A10, C07, R23, R26

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 coauthor 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 everyday relationships between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.