

UNITED WISDOM

Accountability for someone people trust

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-25-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Accountability for someone people trust

Epigraph

> *Who, then, shall rule the ruler?*

Plutarch, *To an Uneducated Ruler*, §3, 780C; H. N. Fowler's translation, a short fragment.

What this article is about

Sometimes the most uncomfortable question must be put to someone who has helped others for years. They remember every participant, arrive first and take on work everyone else declines. Asking them to show how a decision was made can therefore sound almost ungrateful. A false choice emerges: preserve trust by asking nothing, or start an inquiry and thereby declare the person a suspect. Between these extremes lies an important possibility: answering for particular actions while retaining recognition of a person's dignity and earlier contribution.

Here, accountability means a specified arrangement: what authority has been delegated, who receives an explanation of its use, what makes the answer assessable and who decides about correction. We will consider an imagined voluntary group and its trusted organiser. This is editorial reasoning, not legal guidance or a study of management effectiveness. Historical texts help expose the limits of personal virtue; they do not validate a modern procedure. We will also examine the opposite danger: inquiry can become endless suspicion, a demand for unnecessary disclosure or a way to punish an inconvenient answer.

I. People trust a person and delegate particular work

Imagine a small group raising money to equip a shared workshop. Sergei handles purchases because he understands tools and has repeatedly helped the others. Anna notices that one machine costs more than the agreed amount and asks about the difference. Sergei says he knows best and that no one has doubted his honesty before. The conversation quickly shifts from price to relationships. Anna is asked to remember everything good he has done. Yet her original question was narrower: what decision was made, on what grounds and using which funds?

Sergei's contribution is real within this imagined example, but it does not define the terms of each new delegation. He might have been authorised to choose a supplier within a budget,

increase expenditure under certain conditions or simply collect proposals. These arrangements are not interchangeable. If they were never distinguished, considering responsibility begins with uncertainty about the assignment itself. It helps to establish what was actually agreed rather than immediately seek someone to blame. Previous reputation helps explain the choice of person; it does not retroactively supply missing terms on everyone's behalf.

Sergei also deserves clarity. An unspecified instruction to buy suitable equipment leaves him making a difficult choice that may later be judged against a new standard. One participant expected the lowest price, another durability, a third quick delivery. Incompatible expectations cannot become a supposedly unified instruction known in advance. An inquiry must consider what the person knew when deciding. Otherwise the group makes its trusted member responsible for anticipating everyone's future wishes and calls an unsuccessful prediction a moral deficiency. Precision protects both sides of the relationship.

The first distinction is therefore between judging a person and identifying the boundaries of delegated work. Anna can respect Sergei, disagree with the purchase and want to see its grounds at the same time. Sergei can act in good faith while exceeding his authority or making a calculation error. Neither possibility has yet been established. A specified question keeps attention on an assessable action. It need not make relationships cold: people can acknowledge uncertainty more easily when one question does not become a final verdict on whether someone deserves trust in every respect and forever.

II. An explanation must be accessible to someone besides its author

Sergei's answer may convince him while remaining insufficient for the group. He remembers supplier calls, verbal discounts and technical differences; the others see only the final amount. Accountability requires communicating the significant grounds so another person can understand the decision. It does not require reconstructing every thought or producing all correspondence. For this purchase, relevant matters include the agreed budget, actual price, chosen option and reason for the change. The explanation's scope follows the delegated role and consequences, rather than a wish to know everything about Sergei.

This raises the question of who receives the answer. If the whole group is responsible for expenditure, someone it appoints, or an agreed small circle, might examine the information. If Anna asks from personal interest, that does not automatically give her access to every document. Accountability needs defined relationships rather than limitless publicity. The person must understand to whom they answer; the person reviewing must know why certain information is available to them. Ambiguity here can turn a useful inquiry into a contest for

influence. A dispute about a machine then conceals a different dispute: who may control shared information?

Sergei's objection may also be substantive: a document contains information about someone who did not participate in the choice. The purchase details can be separated from unnecessary personal information where the actual format permits. Restricted access does not necessarily conceal an error. Yet invoking privacy in general does not explain why the price and reason for increasing it cannot be communicated. The particular protected material must be distinguished from information required to examine the role. Neither demanding another person's biography nor closing the whole question with the word confidentiality establishes what is appropriate.

Sometimes a group lacks the resources for elaborate reporting. It can choose a modest arrangement suited to its work: a short record of a significant decision, a reference to a retained document and a clear response deadline. That will not become a universal system of control. The point is neither to promise an assessment nobody can perform nor dismiss an available opportunity because it is small. Accountability begins with an accessible relationship between action and explanation. An impressive report without a recipient or actual consideration may be less useful than a brief answer that enables examination of one significant choice.

III. An inner moral restraint does not replace an external question

In *To an Uneducated Ruler*, Plutarch places power under the demand for reasoned self-restraint. Particularly relevant in the passage read is the question of what governs the governor. His answer concerns inner reason and character, rather than a modern reporting system. We cannot derive a ready-made workshop procedure from it. It helps name a different limit: possessing authority does not make every desire a sufficient ground for action. The argument remains historical and normative; its religious language does not become evidence for our practical proposal.

Sergei might indeed be guided by demanding personal standards. He dislikes unnecessary spending, checks quality and tries to protect the group's money. That is a potentially valuable basis for conduct, but others have no direct access to his intentions. They learn about them through words and actions that may be incomplete. Trust in an internal restraint therefore does not remove an external question about a particular result. Two kinds of work can coexist: the person evaluates their choice and the group examines the delegated authority. External examination does not establish an absence of conscience; conscientiousness does not guarantee a correct calculation or complete explanation.

A strong counterexample remains. The group could create numerous forms, signatures and meetings while significant decisions still escape examination. Sergei carefully fills in a table, but nobody knows what its categories mean; the reviewer confirms that boxes contain entries without reading their grounds. The procedure then creates an appearance of clarity. External arrangements cannot be considered sufficient merely because they exist. They must be assessed by the work they make possible: can people understand the action and its limits? Personal honesty still matters, but it cannot justify abandoning substantive assessment of the procedure itself.

The comparison is not a contest between inner and outer restraint. One concerns what a person considers permissible; the other concerns what participants in a delegation can know and examine. Moral language can conceal a refusal to answer, and reporting can conceal empty compliance. Their names establish nothing automatically. In the imagined workshop, it is more useful to determine which grounds Sergei retained and how the group can assess them. A philosophical question thus acquires a limited contemporary application while preserving its difference from the ancient author's answer without promising to make every exercise of authority infallible.

IV. A document establishes its contents, not the entire history

Sergei shows the supplier's invoice. This is important new information: it states a particular price. The invoice alone does not say who authorised an increase, whether options were compared or what the package contained. The opposite error is also possible: Anna sees a larger amount and immediately concludes that money was appropriated. The document does not support that conclusion. It must be read within its own scope. A record's existence, authenticity, connection to a decision and support for a particular claim are distinct questions; checking one does not resolve every other uncertainty.

In our example, delivery and additional accessories turn out to be included in the total. The group previously compared only the machine's price. That explains part of the difference without resolving authority. Perhaps the extra expenditure was necessary and permitted; perhaps it required agreement. The dispute is now more precise. Sergei can correct a mistaken assumption about the equipment price without requiring acceptance of the whole decision. Anna can accept the explanation of one item while retaining another question. Such an intermediate result is not a weakness: evidence seldom settles an entire situation in one movement.

The absence of a document also matters. If verbal approval was not recorded, uncertainty remains; this does not prove the conversation never happened. Sergei's recollection does not automatically establish the group's answer either. Participants may remember differently. An honest account then includes the known action and unresolved part of the history. A future

decision can be made without presenting it as a recovered fact about the past. Accountability does not require inventing confidence to complete a report. Sometimes its most accurate result is identifying a ground that can no longer be checked and changing how future approval is recorded.

Uncertainty need not stop every activity. The group can decide about its next purchase using available information and stated limits. Whether this is enough to assess the earlier action remains a separate question. Urgency and the cost of delay matter, but they do not convert the unknown into established fact. A practical choice with incomplete information differs from a full reconstruction of events. Keeping that distinction prevents a decision from appearing stronger than its grounds. People can continue shared work without rewriting a contested past as though every document and answer had been received on time.

V. The person examining an action also has limits

Anna may be mistaken, prefer another machine or feel irritated by a previous conversation. These possibilities do not cancel her question, but remind us that inquiry confers no unlimited authority over the person answering. The relevant information and proposed conclusion need to be specified. If the request changes after every answer, Sergei may face endless work: an invoice prompts demands for every call, then every previous purchase, then explanations of personal relationships. A new significant question is possible, but broadening the inquiry needs its own grounds. Starting an examination does not justify every subsequent expansion.

Suppose Anna discovers recurring differences across three purchases. That supplies a different basis for wider consideration if the information is genuinely comparable. Such a transition should not be forbidden merely for Sergei's convenience. But what changed must be shown: which actions are connected, what is known and why the earlier scope is insufficient. Expansion can then become a specified inquiry rather than personal pursuit. The reviewer retains the ability to notice a new problem, and the person answering retains the ability to know the question. Neither gains final correctness merely by asking or by having been trusted before.

The group also needs to consider time and workload. If Sergei handles purchases without pay in the evenings, elaborate reporting could make the role impracticable. That is not an argument against every answer, but a significant condition of the work. The assignment might be reduced, documentation shared or a minimum information set agreed in advance. A substantial system cannot be demanded while pretending it costs nobody any labour. Accountability is part of the cost of authority, and performing it is part of the cost of shared activity. More examination means considering who will actually do the work and how.

Finally, a reviewer should not impose a sanction if that authority was not granted. They may gather information, state a concern and propose correction; the specified party decides. Roles sometimes overlap in a small group, but this should be acknowledged. The distinction becomes particularly important if Anna has an interest in choosing a new supplier herself. Her argument may be correct while the arrangement for considering it remains questionable. Accountability does not remove a conflict of interest through good intentions alone. It makes the issue visible so people can decide whether another recipient or an additional perspective is needed for a particular part of the decision.

VI. An answer can include correction without total self-condemnation

Sergei acknowledges that he did not communicate the delivery cost before paying. This is a particular correction concerning his action, not a compulsory confession of complete dishonesty. The group can discuss how to account for the expense, what limit applies next and who will retain the new agreement. A good explanation does not always justify everything; sometimes it makes an error more intelligible. The person's difficulty is to avoid defending everything else at any cost. The reviewers' difficulty is to avoid using one admission to establish every earlier suspicion that still lacks its own grounds.

Correction can take several forms. An inaccurate entry can be amended, an unfinished action stopped or changed where possible, future authority clarified. A machine already purchased cannot be made unpurchased through a new record. A promise to correct something must therefore specify the actual work and limits. Sergei might retain a comparison of options before the next purchase. This does not restore the lost opportunity to agree the previous amount, but creates a different future condition. Its partial nature need not invalidate it; nor should it be called a complete restoration merely to give the conversation a pleasant ending.

An answer without admission of error is also possible. Sergei produces an agreement Anna had not seen, removing part of her concern. Examination must allow that outcome. If every exonerating piece of information is called another trick, the question no longer serves consideration of the action. Accepting one answer does not require Anna to trust the person as fully as before. Relationships may change after an unpleasant discussion even when misconduct is not established. Factual results and personal experience need distinguishing. People may reconsider participation without turning feelings into evidence of guilt or demanding immediate restoration of previous closeness.

Correction should not depend on public humiliation. For our workshop, communicating necessary information to appropriate participants may be enough if that arrangement is agreed. Ceremonial repentance before everyone may add nothing to understanding the

purchase. A general statement about openness without an actual amendment is equally insufficient. What matters is moving from an answer to a specified action: who changes the entry, what is communicated and when can the result be seen? That is checked on its own scale. One corrected line does not establish a person's complete moral renewal, but can settle the question for which it needed clarification.

VII. Reputation must not become a prohibition on asking

In *Analects* XIII.15, in Legge's English text, the absence of opposition to a ruler's bad statement is considered dangerous. This is ancient governance ethics, not the structure of a voluntary workshop. The comparison helps reveal that silence around an influential person does not itself establish the correctness of their actions. It does not prescribe public confrontation or a contemporary legal reporting duty. Our editorial question is different: does respect for Sergei prevent consideration of his delegated work, particularly while the grounds remain unavailable?

Sometimes the person creates that prohibition; sometimes a grateful circle does. Sergei may agree to answer while others insist he be left alone: he has done so much and must not be upset. Their concern then prevents him from explaining an action and leaves uncertainty in the group. It also burdens Anna with extra guilt for asking. Sergei's contribution can be recognised and rude treatment limited without prohibiting consideration of expenditure. Reputation has a history, but protecting it should not automatically require fresh, unverified claims about every purchase, every decision and every future result.

The opposite case is a group that suspects every influential participant in advance. The more Sergei contributes, the more the group perceives that contribution as dangerous. A good reputation becomes grounds for accusation instead. That is another substitution. Substantial contributions may involve real authority and dependence that deserve specification; they do not prove abuse. Examination concerns actions and the role's arrangement, allowing both possibilities: the decision may be justified or mistaken. Trust need not be destroyed beforehand to demonstrate independence. Independence includes accepting a supported answer, rather than only voicing an unpleasant suspicion.

It therefore makes sense to distinguish accountability from a trial of reputation. The purchase question has an end; the overall image of the person may remain complex. Some participants retain gratitude, others disappointment, others uncertainty. Their feelings need not converge on one compulsory outcome. The shared record can be more precise: what was established, what corrected and what limit applies next. This provides a working basis even when the old ease of conversation has not returned. Respectful inquiry does not guarantee stronger trust; sometimes it exposes incompatible expectations or a limit previously concealed by habitual respect.

VIII. A trusted person's role should be transferable

All workshop documents are held by Sergei, and contact with the supplier exists only through his phone. Even honest and competent work then depends on his constant presence. He may tire, become ill or simply want to finish participating; that is not betrayal. Accountability also concerns transferring the role: where are significant records, what does the next person know and which obligations remain? We are not prescribing a technical system. The imagined group needs to distinguish respect for someone unique in its personal history from continuing particular work without demanding that they perform it indefinitely.

A handover does not mean disclosing everything to everyone. An appropriate circle can be specified, necessary documents retained and the state of unfinished tasks described. Personal arrangements Sergei made cannot automatically become shared obligations after the role changes. What actually belongs to the role needs establishing. Anna, temporarily taking on purchasing, does not inherit all his acquaintances, promises or conversational habits. New responsibility starts within a specified scope. The previous action nevertheless retains its author and history: replacing someone does not erase questions about earlier decisions or make a new person responsible for an unknown past.

A counterexample involves rare expertise. Perhaps nobody else can currently assess equipment. Replacing Sergei outright would then worsen the work. Technical assessment might remain with him while someone else handles documentation or approval, where possible. Transferability does not require identical skills from everyone. It means examining dependence and available ways to reduce it. Sometimes no complete solution exists: the group may postpone purchasing or reduce activity. That is more honest than making one person obliged to continue or treating every dependency as proof that they want to retain power, without grounds for that inference.

When a role has an intelligible end, answering for its use becomes less like a threat to the person's entire life. Sergei can finish a task, transfer information and remain involved differently. Leaving is possible too. The group should not predeclare that choice an admission of guilt. A handover does not replace a necessary explanation of the purchase; the two are considered separately. Accountability thus retains both a past action and future arrangements. It does not require the trusted person's permanent presence or describe their departure as resolving every question raised during their performance of the role.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one small assignment that already exists in your voluntary work. In a private note, distinguish the person from the role: what has been delegated, within which limits and to whom is an answer expected? Keep unknown matters unknown where no agreement existed. Then identify one question about an action and the minimum information that could clarify it. This might be an amount, a selection criterion or confirmation of approval. Do not infer motives from irritation or demand unnecessary personal information. This editorial exercise has not been tested as a way to improve management or restore trust.

Where a conversation is available and appropriate, you can clarify who receives an answer, the deadline and a possible correction. Elaborate reporting is unnecessary for every small matter. If the question expands, state the new grounds. If information supports the person's answer, retain that result too. Under threats or coercion, direct contact is not compulsory, and a formal procedure does not guarantee protection. Circumstances need separate consideration. People retain the ability to pause, decline a role or limit participation; no action has to demonstrate their moral courage to everyone else.

Later, check the particular promised amendment: was the entry changed, the document communicated or the authority clarified? Do not treat a new file's existence as proof of the entire history. Returning to our imagined workshop, Anna might receive an accurate price, Sergei a clear limit for the next purchase and the group an understanding of its responsibility for approval. This is a possible result, not a guaranteed outcome. Trust retains its human meaning when it does not demand silence; accountability retains its practical meaning when explaining one action does not require destroying a person. Future relationships remain an open choice that should not be written on participants' behalf.

Key quotation

> *nor can he rule*

Plutarch, *To an Uneducated Ruler*, §2, 780B; a short fragment of the negative formulation concerning a ruler who is under no rule himself. Fowler's translation; not a standalone prescription for modern governance.

Connections between traditions

Text read	Shared question	Difference and limit
Plutarch, sections 2–4	What restrains someone entrusted with authority?	Inner reason and the ruler's moral image, rather than modern external reporting
Analects XIII.15, Legge	Can unanswerable authority be dangerous?	Ancient governance ethics, not a universal prescription for public dissent
Imagined workshop	What was delegated, to whom explained and what is corrected?	Our editorial proposal; its effects and preservation of trust are unestablished

Sources

1. Plutarch. *To an Uneducated Ruler*. *Moralia*, Vol. X, H. N. Fowler, Loeb Classical Library, 1936, pp. 49–71. Exact web version. The entire displayed treatise and introductory notes were read, web 10–141; sections 2–4 are used. Not the whole collection. The page reports US public domain status; worldwide rights are unestablished: UNKNOWN. No full third-party text imported.

2. Confucius. *The Chinese Classics*, Volume 1, Confucian Analects, XIII.15, English text by James Legge. Wikisource. The displayed XIII.1–17 context, web 104–187, including the complete XIII.15 dialogue, was read; not the entire book or an independent reading of the Chinese original. The page's print basis is unestablished; rights UNKNOWN. Limited paraphrase.

Tags

accountability, trust, authority, responsibility, reputation, role, delegation, inquiry, explanation, document, grounds, correction, approval, price, expenditure, privacy, access, recipient, deadline, handover, competence, dependence, voluntary participation, dignity, workshop, Plutarch, Confucius, character, governance, uncertainty, 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 the 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.