

UNITED WISDOM

Humiliation presented as care and education

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-08-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Humiliation presented as care and education

Epigraph

> *“corrected by sweetness not severity”*

— Mary Astell, A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, part I, page 70, fragment of a proposal for correcting faults, Richard Wilkin, London, 1697. This concerns her proposed Christian community, rather than permission to educate an adult partner against their will.

What this article is about

In an imagined story, Ilya makes a mistake while filling in a travel form. His partner notices the wrong date and helps correct it. But then, in front of acquaintances, the partner says that Ilya cannot be trusted with even a simple piece of paperwork. When Ilya asks not to be discussed that way, he is told that without strict education he will never learn. The date is already corrected. Yet the conversation continues as evidence of his general inadequacy, while his right to object becomes another sign of ingratitude. Ilya begins hiding questions in advance to avoid becoming the subject of another public lesson.

This article distinguishes care for a particular difficulty from humiliation justified through a useful intention. Adults can ask for help, learn, acknowledge mistakes and tell each other unpleasant truths. Not every comment is pressure, and not every painful reaction makes a comment wrong. But help deserves consideration through actions and conditions: what is being corrected, whether the person retains a voice, and when the lesson ends. We offer no diagnoses, determine no hidden motives, and require no dangerous conversation as a means of defending dignity.

I. A mistake does not describe the whole person

A wrong date is a particular error in a particular task. It can have consequences: a delay, additional expense or a document that needs redoing. Those consequences can be named without concluding that the person is generally helpless or unworthy of making their own decisions. Specificity preserves the distinction between action, skill and personhood. This is the article’s ethical reasoning, rather than a psychological test. It allows responsibility for an action to be acknowledged without making every difficulty a reason to reconsider an adult’s standing as a participant in shared life.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

In the imagined story, seeing where the date was confused and how to check it is useful to Ilya. Being helped does not itself humiliate him or require denying the error. However, telling acquaintances that he is completely incapable changes the subject. The person’s value is being discussed instead of the form. A reader can distinguish what information a further comment adds and what role it assigns to its recipient. This does not mean assessing every phrase against an ideal standard. The concern is to retain the particular task amid a growing verdict on what the person supposedly always is.

Someone who regularly makes a similar mistake may also need a different way of learning or allocating the task. A partner can be unwilling to keep redoing another’s work indefinitely. Their burden deserves attention. Repetition, however, does not make mockery the only means of change. What is accessible to each person and which part of the work they are willing to perform can be discussed if conversation is safe and mutual. Respect for dignity does not remove responsibility; it limits using an error as permission to cause additional humiliation endlessly and without connection to a solution.

It may not immediately become clear which comment was appropriate. People differ in experience, familiar ways of speaking and sensitivity. One episode cannot reliably describe a relationship. Repetition, the possibility of clarifying meaning and the response to a request for different treatment matter. The right to notice consequences does not require proving that the speaker intended harm. Intention and action are considered separately. Sometimes it is enough to recognise that a particular way of discussing things obstructs participation, without choosing a final label for the whole person or relationship.

II. A good intention does not end discussion of consequences

A statement of care may be sincere. Someone may really want to help another find their way, make fewer mistakes or avoid trouble. But intention does not automatically explain shouting, public ridicule or constant reminders of inadequacy. The question of how help is offered remains even with a good wish. The article does not suggest reading minds or exposing every act of participation. It returns to what can be observed: what was done, which task it addressed, and whether the recipient could say that this form was unacceptable to them.

In the imagined story, the partner may regard telling acquaintances as a harmless lesson. Ilya may experience it as losing the right to be heard. These descriptions need not coincide immediately. If conversation is available, the particular episode and its continuation can be considered. Explaining a useful goal, however, should not close the question of consequences. Otherwise, help becomes an arrangement in which its author is always right because care has been declared, while the recipient can only express gratitude or confirm their own immaturity through disagreement.

The Hotline's contemporary material on emotional abuse includes humiliation, insults, intimidation and dismissiveness among the actions described. This is US information, rather than a diagnosis based on a single unpleasant phrase. It helps prevent an action from being regarded as safe only because it is called care or involves no physical force. A selected set of indicators is used within its limited context. We infer no individual probability of danger or state of health, and do not promise that the article can replace careful consideration of circumstances.

The person offering care may also have feelings: worry, fatigue or fear about an error's consequences. Those feelings can be acknowledged without turning them into an entitlement to humiliate. Someone can request a pause, decline an unmanageable task or name a personal limit. The distinction concerns responsibility for action, rather than a ban on feeling. A useful intention can remain respected when the form of assistance can be examined. If it becomes a final justification for everything, the recipient loses participation in determining what help they actually need.

III. Learning need not mean surrendering personal judgement

An adult can recognise that another person knows more about a particular subject. That does not remove the ability to ask questions, understand reasons and choose how to use a proposal. Passing on knowledge differs from passing over authority over a whole life. A good explanation may help someone act independently later, but need not make them immediately skilled at everything. The article sets no single learning model. It considers whether the recipient remains a participant or their lack of knowledge is used to lower their position indefinitely.

In the imagined story, Ilya can be shown the relevant line and a way to check dates. If that is all he asks for, assistance need not include a general review of his character. He can decline advice or choose another approach, taking responsibility for particular consequences within the circumstances. That does not mean the partner must support every option chosen. Both retain their own decisions. The question of dignity is whether a difference in skill becomes permission for one to speak for the other and define their maturity forever.

Mary Astell describes the leaders of a proposed religious community as people capable of governing themselves and caring for the community's good rather than arbitrary power. Nearby, she prefers gentle correction of faults to severe reprimands. These are selected pages of a seventeenth-century Christian proposal. Discipline, authority and a goal of religious perfection remain within it; it cannot be presented as contemporary equality between partners. The limited question for this article is why holding a role as a guide does not already justify an arbitrary way of treating someone.

The historical text need not serve as a seal proving our position infallible. It can be read alongside differences and limits. United Wisdom's editorial ethics preserve an adult's personal judgement even when assistance is needed. This is neither a scientific law of development nor a claim that gentleness is always sufficient for every difficult task. Work quality can be required, consequences named, and additional burdens declined. A requirement about the task, however, differs from declaring someone incapable of understanding without humiliating education.

IV. A public lesson changes the conditions of conversation

A comment before others can mean something different from a private discussion. The recipient has to address both the mistake and their position before witnesses. Silence may occur because further argument would increase attention and discomfort, rather than because of agreement. This is a possible context, not a universal explanation of silence. Publicness does not make every comment wrong: sometimes information important to everyone needs quick correction. But the subject, necessity and form of discussion deserve separate attention, particularly when the mistake has already been put right.

In the imagined story, the partner's account does not help acquaintances correct the date. It tells them that Ilya is fundamentally incapable. When Ilya answers, his objection becomes part of the demonstration. A circle closes: making a mistake means needing education; requesting a different form means needing even more education. The article considers this imagined pattern without establishing it from every family joke. It helps to distinguish whether a specific clarification can release someone from an assigned role, or whether every answer already confirms the verdict.

Humour can be mutual and voluntary. People may laugh at their own awkwardness without finding it humiliating. Participation and being able to stop a joke matter. When one person is constantly its object and a request to stop produces another mocking lesson, the word humour does not end discussion. Nobody has to prove that someone entirely lacks a sense of humour, or must tolerate everything to keep the atmosphere light. A particular form and its consequences can be considered. Where risk exists, public self-defence is not required for one's observation to become valid.

A supportive witness may notice what is happening but need not turn the scene into an argument to rescue someone. An unsolicited intervention can increase attention and risk. If suitable contact is available, participation can be offered later and the recipient asked what they need. The article gives no single command to intervene in every case. Help concerns returning choice, rather than replacing one person who speaks for someone with another. Even when a witness is confident in their assessment, the recipient's knowledge of their conditions and acceptable contact retains significance.

V. Needing help does not create a debt of obedience

When one person knows more or helps materially, gratitude may naturally belong to the relationship. But it is not agreement to any treatment. A recipient can value a useful action while refusing humiliation. That is neither a logical contradiction nor proof of ingratitude. The article establishes no legal terms of assistance. It distinguishes particular participation from a demand to surrender one’s voice as an unspecified payment. An adult does not stop being an adult when an explanation, care or access to another person’s resources becomes necessary.

In the imagined story, Ilya thanks his partner for correcting the form while asking not to be described as an incapable person. He neither denies the error nor demands a perfect partner. If every such distinction is rejected, assistance becomes a basis for judging his whole life. It helps to notice which commitments were actually agreed and which are added later. This is not a suggestion to conduct a hidden test or conspicuously refuse assistance. With dependence, refusal can have substantial consequences that need attention to actual possibilities.

Dependence may arise through temporary circumstances, illness, care, relocation, task allocation or different skills. The article does not explain an individual history or attribute weakness. Nor does it require immediate complete independence as a condition for deserving respect. Material and everyday independence may need time and accessible conditions. Receiving assistance does not turn necessity into permission to govern every decision of its recipient. At the same time, the supporter can name their limit and need not perform an unmanageable task indefinitely.

This distinction can be difficult when help and unpleasant treatment have long been mixed. Someone may feel love and gratitude, remember good things and still notice pressure. They need not choose one feeling as the final truth before seeking information or support. A separate useful act does not establish the acceptability of the entire arrangement, while an unpleasant episode does not automatically erase the whole history. The article leaves room for complexity while keeping attention on repetition, risk, the terms of assistance and the availability of another answer.

VI. High expectations need a particular subject

Shared life includes tasks where a mistake really is unacceptable or requires serious reconsideration. Someone can decline to entrust a particular job to another who cannot yet perform it. This is not necessarily humiliation. An understandable subject, reasons and limits matter. Restricting a task should not automatically extend to every ability and wish. The article does not require pretending competence exists where it does not. It invites a distinction between a real need for quality and an indefinite role as someone supposedly requiring education on every occasion.

For example, in another imagined scene, partners discuss complex technical work. One lacks the necessary experience, and they choose a specialist. The decision concerns a particular risk and requires no mockery. In another version, the same lack of experience is used to deny the right to choose friends, clothing and activities. The scenes are invented to distinguish scale. Reality may be more complex, and a useful requirement does not always sound gentle. But the connection between a restriction and its task must remain open to consideration instead of disappearing behind the educator’s general authority.

An unpleasant truth can be spoken respectfully even though it remains painful. A conversation’s outcome is not measured only through the absence of negative feelings. A recipient may feel disappointed, angry or disagree. That does not prove that a comment humiliates. Content and manner can be distinguished: a particular action, consequences, the right to answer and the possibility of clarification. The article promises no form of speech that will always be received calmly. Respect remains through the treatment of an adult participant, rather than an obligation to give them only pleasant experiences.

The supporter may have grounds to stop a task, decline a particular form of contact or change an agreement. Their limit need not wait for the other’s agreement. Naming a limit, however, differs from declaring another person’s character defective and requiring correction through submission. Sometimes no compatible option exists. The article does not make preserving a relationship the compulsory outcome of good conversation. It distinguishes deciding about one’s own burden from trying to obtain control over another through supposedly teaching them how they should live.

VII. Why repetition matters

A single harsh phrase and an ongoing arrangement of communication need different consideration. Someone may make a mistake in their manner, hear a comment and change their action. Elsewhere, asking for a different form becomes another occasion for humiliation. Repetition proves no hidden motive, but shows conditions that someone has to deal with. The article invites attention to available episodes, rather than keeping a compulsory dossier. Perfect evidence or records on a device accessible to another are unnecessary for a personal question about what is happening to matter.

In the imagined story, Ilya notices that he now asks fewer questions about things he does not understand. This observation concerns his behaviour in the particular scene, rather than a clinical consequence promised for everyone. Not asking may reduce visible mistakes while closing opportunities to learn. The supporter may regard the ensuing silence as educational success. But outward quiet alone does not show that someone understands the task or freely accepts the treatment. Absence of objections differs from accessible participation; the reason for every silence is not determined in advance.

If safe, mutual discussion is possible, the future way of treating someone matters alongside explanations of the past. Can a particular comment stop recurring? Can a mistake be discussed without a general verdict? This is neither a compulsory examination of a partner nor a promise that a clear request will solve the problem. With threats, punishment or control, another conversation may be unsuitable. Attention to conditions and available support then matters more than requiring another persuasive explanation of why humiliation is unpleasant.

NHS's current domestic-abuse guidance describes belittling, blame, control and threats among signs deserving attention. This is UK information about recognition and assistance, rather than a universal solution for every country and connection. For this topic, it limits the familiar explanation that everything depends on the recipient answering more politely. Risk cannot be removed simply by requiring calmer speech. We do not use the guidance for a remote conclusion; a particular situation may need competent local support.

VIII. When an ordinary conversation is not the first step

Someone may be advised to announce directly that they will no longer allow humiliation. That is accessible in some circumstances and may intensify pressure in others. The article does not make confrontation a condition of dignity. If requests already lead to threats or deprivation of necessities, actual consequences, resource access and privacy need consideration. Being able to explain persuasively guarantees no change in another person's behaviour. What is happening can be noticed and information sought before a final decision about the future, without announcing intentions to another participant.

The Hotline warns that internet use may be monitored. This practice therefore does not require saving an account of events, sending detailed messages from a shared phone or keeping notes to confirm a conclusion. The article offers no universal recipe for safe contact. An appropriate local specialist service may help consider individual conditions within its capacities. A service link does not prove availability, confidentiality of particular contact or a guaranteed result. Those questions need clarification according to location and circumstances.

With immediate danger to life or safety, seeking accessible emergency help in one's location matters, if contact can be made safely. The article gives no common number for every country and does not replace assessment of a particular situation. Nor does it require immediately leaving, reconciling or disclosing personal information. A practical path depends on resources and conditions that an outside observer knows only partly. Being unable to take a large step now does not mean agreeing to humiliation or losing the right to receive manageable support.

If a reader recognises their own treatment of another in the story, a particular action can become the focus. Responsibility does not require a global verdict on oneself. One can stop publicly discussing an error, name a personal burden without mockery, and ask about an

appropriate form of help if contact is available. The recipient need not immediately trust, accept an apology or confirm change. The article does not promise to restore a relationship through one acknowledgement. The other's participation remains their choice, while responsibility includes subsequent actions and their actual limits.

IX. Support should not become another course of education

Someone close may want to explain to the recipient of humiliation how to answer properly and why they are still staying nearby. But this lesson risks assigning them the role of someone unable to decide again. The Hotline's support guidance emphasises respecting the person's decisions and agreeing assistance. For this article, that means attention to the request, alongside the supporter's confidence. Manageable participation can be offered and limits honestly named without requiring a particular view of the partner as payment for conversation or practical help.

In the imagined story, an acquaintance later asks whether Ilya wants to discuss what happened. Ilya can answer briefly, decline or request help with an ordinary task. The acquaintance neither analyses his character nor demands to hear everything. Together, they can clarify suitable contact with attention to risk. The scene is fictional and guarantees no safety. It shows a small possibility for support where the recipient retains control of the extent of participation, and lacking a ready, major decision does not make them undeserving of attention.

Negotiating with the partner on someone's behalf without consent and suitable conditions is best avoided. Unsolicited intervention can disclose information and increase risk. Complete rescue, guaranteed accommodation or assistance the supporter does not actually have should not be promised either. Finding a competent local resource can be helped, distinguishing information about a service from a confirmed opportunity to use it. A supporter can have personal limits. Those limits, however, do not require humiliating someone who has not yet chosen the expected path.

Support can be ordinary and small: attention to one question, manageable help with a task, or calm contact without a compulsory report. This is neither treatment nor a guaranteed way out of pressure. Its significance lies in preventing need from creating a new debt of obedience. Someone can doubt, change their mind and retain feelings for the person whose treatment concerns them. A supporter need not agree with every decision to respect an adult's right to make it. Personal limits can be named honestly while preserving both people's dignity.

X. Returning from a verdict to the particular question

At the end of the imagined story, Ilya distinguishes three things: the form error was real, assistance with the date was useful, and publicly describing him as incapable deserves separate consideration. He need not deny the first two to notice the third. He does not yet know what will change in the relationship. But a general verdict no longer replaces a description of the action. Dignity becomes a more specific question: can he learn and answer, or does every difficulty confirm another's right to educate him indefinitely?

This distinction promises no simple outcome. A familiar way of speaking may change through accessible, mutual clarification. Or requesting a different form may repeatedly bring threats and require another source of support. The article chooses neither version in advance. It retains attention to the comment's subject, repetition, the terms of help and the cost of another answer. Even where speech contains many words about love and care, actual actions deserve consideration. Equally, an unpleasant truth does not automatically become humiliation because it is difficult to hear.

Care remains humane when it leaves room for the recipient's needs, limits and judgement. This is United Wisdom's editorial ethical position, rather than a proven law of relationships or a promise of agreement among historical traditions. It requires no identical skills and forbids no serious comments. Its subject is treatment of an adult who needs assistance. A mistake can be seen without erasing the person, and a personal burden chosen without declaring oneself the final educator of another's life.

Freedom to learn includes being imperfect without losing dignity. Someone can recognise a particular shortcoming without accepting constant lowering of their position as the compulsory price of development. A next step may be small: understand the conversation's subject, learn the terms of help or consider available support. No result is guaranteed and no impressive solution is required. What matters is returning from a general verdict to what happened and what is needed now, while retaining an adult's right to their own answer.

What this means in practice

If things are sufficiently calm now and reflection does not increase risk, mentally choose one recent instance of assistance or a comment. What was the particular task? Which mistake or need was discussed? One instance is enough, without analysing the entire relationship. Nothing needs writing down. If another can access your device or notes, create no record for this exercise. The practice is voluntary and can be skipped or stopped. It is not intended to diagnose a partner or test your ability to tolerate unpleasant treatment correctly.

Consider useful content and manner separately. What helped solve the task? Was there a general verdict on personhood, public mockery or no possibility of answering? Help can be acknowledged while some questions remain unknown. Do not test an observation through a new argument, conspicuous refusal or deliberate mistake. If remembering is difficult, stop and notice your present surroundings. The goal is a little clarity about something already experienced, rather than proof that you can immediately change another person or your entire shared life.

If a safe, mutual conversation is available, one needed form of help can be clarified or a personal limit concerning the particular task named. There is no compulsory wording. If discussion creates risk, do not undertake it for this practice. Consider appropriate local specialist support with attention to privacy; announcing intentions or disclosing all information is unnecessary. In immediate danger, seek accessible emergency help in your location if contact can be made safely. The article promises no secrecy, protection or outcome for every way of making contact.

You can finish by asking what is missing for understandable participation now: an explanation, time, a different form of conversation or manageable support? A final decision about the person and relationship is unnecessary. The practice does not treat the consequences of abuse or replace local specialists. It distinguishes error, help and dignity so that a need to learn does not disappear behind an obligation to obey. Even if the next step remains unknown, a large result need not be presented as accomplished. The right to respect does not depend on success in these few minutes.

Key quotation

> *“consulting the good of the Society”*

— Mary Astell, A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, part I, page 69, fragment describing its leaders, English edition of 1697. Astell contrasts this orientation with arbitrary power while retaining hierarchy and discipline in her proposal; this is a limited comparison, rather than an instruction for adult relationships.

Connections between traditions

Selected texts and guidance are compared here, rather than entire traditions. Historical differences are not removed to produce a single conclusion.

Source and context	Connection with the question	Limit
Mary Astell, seventeenth-century Christian educational proposal	Correction and guidance can be considered through their manner and orientation	Hierarchy, discipline and religious goals do not equal contemporary autonomy within a couple
Margaret Fuller, nineteenth-century religious and Romantic philosophy	Personal assent differs from another’s permission	Sex generalisations and metaphysics are not contemporary empirical evidence
Olive Schreiner, social criticism of labour	The capacity to act needs conditions for preparation	Historical reconstruction and biological generalisations are not accepted as science
NHS and The Hotline, contemporary practical assistance	Humiliation, threats, privacy and respect for the recipient’s decisions	UK and US contexts, without universal guarantees or legal conclusions

Sources

1. Mary Astell. A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, in Two Parts. Richard Wilkin, London, 1697. Selected passages of part I, pages 68–70, and nearby context were read; quotations from pages 69 and 70. Not the whole book.

2. Margaret Fuller. Woman in the Nineteenth Century. Essay of 1845 in a collection edited by Arthur B. Fuller with an introduction by Horace Greeley; collection print year not established from the read title. Selected passages about assent and freedom.

3. Olive Schreiner. Woman and Labour. English original, 1911; electronic version updated October 29, 2024. The chapter I opening and nearby context were read; not the whole book.

4. NHS. Domestic violence and abuse. Signs, help and supporting another person; checked October 6, 2026, UK context.

5. The National Domestic Violence Hotline. What is Emotional Abuse?. Selected description of actions, including humiliation and dismissiveness; checked October 6, 2026, US context. Not a clinical assessment.

6. The National Domestic Violence Hotline. Ways to Support a Domestic Violence Survivor. Emotional and material support and the digital warning were read; checked October 6, 2026, US context.

Tags

relationships, humiliation, care, education, dignity, mistake, assistance, learning, judgement, adult choice, responsibility, emotional pressure, public mockery, consent, freedom, personal boundaries, gratitude, dependence, privacy, safety, support, high expectations, respect, conversation, repetition, Mary Astell, Margaret Fuller, Olive Schreiner, historical sources, 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.