

UNITED WISDOM

The right to challenge someone of higher status

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-25-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The right to challenge someone of higher status

Epigraph

Grant freedom of speech

Isocrates, *To Nicocles*, §28, George Norlin's 1928 translation, Perseus digital text, CC BY-SA 4.0; a short fragment of counsel addressed to a monarch.

What this article is about

At an editorial meeting, a young colleague notices an inaccuracy in an experienced director's text. They know where the supporting document is, but first wonder whether mentioning it will look presumptuous. People in the room have benefited from the director's help; he has a position, a recognised name and authority to select the final wording. The error concerns a date, while the tension concerns relationships. The colleague speaks more cautiously until a substantive correction becomes a vague suggestion to look again. They were formally allowed to speak, but the question itself remained unnamed.

Here, the right to challenge someone is an ethical and organisational distinction, not a claim about a particular law. It means that lower status alone does not make a relevant argument inadmissible. It does not mean commanding a senior person, cancelling all work or being correct without examination. Through an imagined editorial scene, we consider how to identify the issue, retain people's dignity and understand an available route for consideration. Ancient counsel to rulers supplies comparison; it neither validates a contemporary procedure nor promises protection against consequences.

I. Seniority defines a role, not the truth of every answer

Imagine a catalogue for a small exhibition. Its curator, Leonid, has studied the subject for years, while the archivist, Alina, recently joined the group. A caption says a letter was written before the exhibition opened; Alina has seen the date on the letter and thinks the sequence was different. Leonid replies that he knows the project's history well. His knowledge matters, but does not settle the question about this document. Considering the objection does not require first proving that experience is useless. It requires identifying which conclusion the experience supports and what the available evidence shows here.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Status can express position, length of service, age, public recognition or a teaching role. These have different relationships to the question. An experienced curator may understand the context better; his position may authorise an editorial choice; his age does not establish the letter's date. Mixing these grounds makes any objection look like rejection of the group's entire order. Alina asked about one caption and now has to explain her respect for the profession and her elders. Distinguishing roles preserves authority within its actual scope without making it an immovable answer to every new issue.

The opposite mistake is possible: a junior participant treats lower status as proof of independence and dismisses Leonid's experience in advance. That adds a ground the objection does not possess. A newcomer may notice an overlooked document, but may not understand its provenance. The letter might have been dated later, the caption might concern a draft, or the account might refer to another exhibition. Until these possibilities are checked, Alina's confidence is limited too. She retains the ability to state her argument under uncertainty; speaking need not first turn her into the winner of a historical dispute.

The initial step therefore concerns the subject rather than people's rank: which line needs checking, and what information bears on it? Leonid can answer substantively without relinquishing his whole role. Alina can acknowledge an error without thereby agreeing to remain silent in future. Decision-making hierarchy differs from the reliability of grounds. Whoever signs off the catalogue is responsible for its wording; that does not make their memory an independent document. Whoever finds a document does not automatically acquire signing authority, but the discovery cannot be dismissed merely by referring to their job title.

II. An objection starts with what can still change

Alina does not know whether the catalogue is being discussed before printing or presented as a completed work. In the first situation, a correction can enter the text; in the second, another arrangement is needed. An invitation to comment can be ambiguous. Leonid may expect suggestions for a future exhibition while Alina examines a current caption. It helps to identify the decision's state: what is being considered, what remains possible and who authorises a change? This makes an appropriate response easier to choose. Limited time is not always suppression, but an unclear decision state leaves a junior participant unsure whether the argument has a place.

Once a catalogue is printed, the date does not become correct because correction is expensive. The response may nevertheless change: a note, an amendment to the electronic version or consideration for a later printing, if these options exist. An available remedy cannot be promised without knowing actual conditions. Equally, inability to reprint immediately is not an answer to the historical question. Reliability and scope for action concern different matters. Alina can accept printing constraints while retaining a request to describe the document

accurately. Leonid can explain correction costs without demanding that everyone regard the original line as indisputable for convenience.

Urgency sometimes genuinely narrows discussion. With only minutes before a file must be sent, participants may be unable to investigate a complicated account of the letter's provenance. They then need to identify what is known and what provisional choice is possible. They might remove an unsupported detail, use narrower wording or retain the question separately, if their editorial arrangements permit it. No option is universal. Urgency need not prohibit a question, but may limit its present resolution. Stating that boundary is more honest than inviting discussion whose results cannot possibly influence anything.

A junior participant can also limit their work. Alina may show the document without undertaking to recheck the entire catalogue overnight. An objection does not create an endless obligation to find the perfect remedy for a director's mistake. It supplies particular information and a question. Additional research can be commissioned separately under intelligible terms. Otherwise, speaking becomes a penalty of extra labour: whoever notices a problem becomes solely responsible for eliminating it completely. People may then learn not to mention matters they do not yet know how to resolve alone.

III. Permitted counsel to an ancient ruler differs from an equal voice

In *To Nicocles*, Isocrates advises a monarch to allow frank speech from people of good judgement and value those who identify his mistakes. The context read preserves inequality: permission comes from the ruler and serves his benefit. This is not a theory of a universal contemporary right to an equal voice. It nevertheless makes visible how an absence of critical responses can disadvantage someone leading even within that arrangement. The whole ancient political model should not be transferred to an editorial group or presented as a proven decision-making technology.

For our scene, the comparison raises a question for Leonid: what responses can he actually receive from people dependent on his assessment? If only those whose comments are already pleasing are invited, checking the caption becomes unlikely within the arrangement itself. But sparse objections do not establish that he deliberately selects flatterers. Silence has different causes that remain unknown. The available opportunity to raise the issue needs examination. The historical text helps formulate the question; information about present participants must come from their actual conduct and accounts, rather than an ancient characterisation of kings.

The formulation concerning good judgement also has limits. If only someone whose correctness the senior person has already recognised may speak, an inconvenient new argument may never enter consideration. Competence nevertheless matters: the document

needs reading and connecting to the relevant event. The quality of its grounds can be examined without requiring prior status as an infallible adviser. Alina can state that she is uncertain about part of the context. Her words then claim no more than she knows while still giving the group material. An uncertain question can be more useful than confident agreement, particularly when it reveals a need for further checking.

Our contemporary editorial proposal is narrower than the historical model: a relevant argument is admitted irrespective of junior rank, and its strength assessed through its grounds. This is our normative distinction, not Isocrates' literal principle. It does not abolish responsibility or oblige the group to accept every hypothesis. Leonid may reject Alina's conclusion after checking. But if the issue concerns the document and caption, the answer should concern them too. Respect for seniority remains; it ceases to require representing every answer as already established before a newly found piece of evidence has been considered.

IV. Accuracy does not require flawless delivery

Alina is nervous, speaks too quickly and initially confuses the archive's name. Leonid notices and tells her to understand the subject first. His correction may help locate the document. But an inaccurate name does not establish an inaccurate date. Parts of the statement need distinguishing: what has been corrected, what supported and what remains unknown? A junior person can speak unevenly and make a correct observation. A senior person can sound calm and be wrong. Delivery matters for communication, but does not replace examining grounds or distribute reliability according to outward confidence.

This does not mean accepting every form of address without limits. Alina might insult another participant or disclose information that is not hers to disclose. That action needs its own consideration irrespective of the letter's date. The specific conduct and its relationship to further discussion should be named. Invoking disrespect should not automatically prohibit every renewed clarification. Someone may repeat a question because no answer arrived, or continue arguing after an intelligible conclusion. These cases differ. This article sets no universal number of exchanges and does not infer motives from a listener's irritation.

A more workable format might be a short note identifying the document precisely, followed by a later discussion of the caption. Writing can reduce the burden but does not guarantee consideration either. Its recipient and next steps need to be known. A delivered message cannot be called an argument heard merely because it arrived. Nor should junior participants be required to submit written justification for every question while senior people freely rely on memory and assumptions. Different formats can suit different tasks; their cost should not conceal an additional requirement to earn the ability to speak.

Sometimes Alina prefers checking her own understanding before returning with clarification. That is a reasonable possible choice, not a compulsory ritual of humility. Leonid can also take time to read the letter without losing dignity. Shared work becomes clearer when a pause is named as a pause rather than a final refutation. An answer not yet given should not be invented from silence. The issue can remain in an available form. The right to challenge includes an imperfect initial question and later correction; otherwise junior people may only recite a flawless text real people often do not possess.

V. Disagreement with a statement does not cancel a role

Alina thinks the date is wrong but continues preparing the name index. Leonid can expect agreed work to be completed if the role's conditions remain. Disagreement about a caption does not mean general refusal to participate. Completing the index does not establish agreement with the date either. These relationships need to remain separate, or every practical contribution becomes a forced admission that the senior person is right. Someone can cooperate while retaining a question, or decline new work without cancelling earlier help. Each response retains its scope instead of automatically extending across the whole shared activity.

The opposite extreme exists too. Alina demands that the entire catalogue stop until her view is accepted. If she lacks that authority and the grounds do not warrant that scale, objecting does not itself create a general veto. Possible consequences of an error can be identified and a proportionate examination proposed. Sometimes stopping will be an available group decision; sometimes it will not. The article does not preselect the outcome. Protecting a voice differs from holding power over the result. Rejecting an indefinite veto does not destroy the argument, just as recognising an argument does not require accepting it completely and immediately.

A senior participant may also mistake every question for an attempt to take their place. Alina is not asking to become curator; she is asking to check one line. Leonid might fear for his reputation, but that possible motive cannot be established without information. What matters is that Alina should not have to surrender the question to prove she has no claim on the position. Identifying the issue separates an editorial amendment from allocation of roles. If a role dispute actually exists, it deserves separate consideration rather than concealment within disagreement about a document's provenance.

An arrangement can leave Leonid with the final decision while requiring an accurate record of its grounds. He may choose a broader interpretation, but needs to distinguish it from an established date. Alina can disapprove and decide how to continue participating. This does not guarantee continued work or easy relationships. Dignity does not remove disagreement's cost. The group can nevertheless acknowledge the actual outcome without false unanimity: a particular person made a decision while a question remained. That may be unpleasant yet more accurate than describing all contributors as fully endorsing every line.

VI. A route for consideration matters more than a promise of openness

Leonid says anyone may object. Alina supplies the document, but nothing follows: no responsible recipient, deadline or intelligible place for an amendment. Permission remained verbal. A particular question needs an available route: who reads the information, what answer is possible and where is the decision? A small catalogue needs no elaborate system. One meeting or recipient may suffice. What matters is an actual transition from objection to consideration. A promise of openness without that transition leaves junior participants with the work of speaking while providing the group with no work of answering the content.

The route need not be public. Showing one date can involve an appropriate circle; Alina's uncertainty need not be discussed before the exhibition's entire audience. Choosing a private format should not automatically erase the result from the text's history. The corrected line and its grounds can be retained without publishing the detailed conversation. Privacy and editorial accuracy then have distinct places. Leonid need not disclose every group message; Alina need not conceal an established correction to protect his image. A particular method depends on actual access and agreements, which this imagined scene does not establish in advance.

If the recipient is the sole other party to the dispute, another perspective can sometimes help. That suggestion makes sense where someone is available who can read the document without automatically gaining final authority. Any additional signature, or Alina's friend's opinion, cannot simply be called independent. The subject, limits and relationship of an additional reading to the outcome need specifying. That opportunity may be absent. An honest account then invents no arbitrator and does not call personal confidence a completed independent check. The right to challenge does not promise ideal institutions where only a limited group and its available resources exist.

The route can also become endless postponement. Alina receives new addresses, but each recipient regards the question as someone else's concern. Where appropriate, establishing actual responsibility is then more useful than continuing merely to confirm another delivery. Failure to name a recipient is a significant limitation, although not proof of malicious intent. Alina can stop, retain the question privately or change her involvement. She need not repair an entire organisation for one caption. Those promising openness also need an answerable route: who actually receives the response, what can they do and within which defined scope?

VII. Respect can include a senior person's capacity for error

In *Analects* XIII.15, in Legge's text, a question arises about a ruler's bad statement meeting no objection. The ancient context does not equalise roles, but permits a comparison between respect and responding to authority. Alina's correction need not express contempt for Leonid. It might follow from taking his work seriously. Noble motives should not automatically be attributed to her either: grounds assess the argument, while a person retains complex feelings. Historical comparison establishes neither present intentions nor our procedure's effects.

Respect is often understood as preserving a comfortable image: seniors know and juniors learn. Learning can also involve jointly examining something neither yet understands. Leonid might explain the letter's provenance, Alina show its exact date, and both discover an earlier description was mistaken. This neither establishes equal knowledge nor abolishes experience. It changes the present issue's content. Seniority can accommodate correction when it does not require an appearance of infallibility. The article nevertheless does not promise an inevitable increase in authority through admitting error; people's reactions and consequences remain unknown until actual interaction.

A counterexample is someone using honest criticism as a language for continually devaluing a senior person. Every comment hints that experience is worthless and all earlier work meaningless. Independent thinking need not take that form. A claim's precise limits can be stated without wholesale humiliation. Leonid's discomfort alone does not establish humiliation either. The address and its recipient's experience need distinguishing, with room for them to differ. A significant argument can cause discomfort even when expressed carefully. Respect therefore cannot be measured by a complete absence of unpleasant feelings after every question involving authority or error.

Alina need not first list Leonid's achievements to show the letter. Gratitude can be sincere, but making it an admission ticket changes its function: demonstrating appreciation becomes compulsory before discussing the correction's grounds. Editorial work benefits more from a shared limit: address the document and action without passing judgement on the person. That applies to both sides. Leonid does not use age and position against the date; Alina does not use the date against his entire life. This mutual limit remains a proposal requiring an actual opportunity for implementation, rather than an attractive promise.

VIII. The right to speak does not become a duty to take risks

Junior status may involve dependence on assessment, work access or invitations. The right to challenge should therefore not become a demand to speak immediately before everyone. Alina can think, check the document or choose limited participation first. We do not know the full cost of each action in her circumstances. The imagined scene establishes no threats but does not guarantee protection either. Where coercion or dangerous consequences are expected, direct argument is not prescribed. Dignity need not be proved through a risky experiment in a senior person's reactions; caution is not automatic acknowledgement of their text's correctness.

Even in an available conversation, the right can be used partly. Alina identifies a source without disclosing every feeling or promising endless discussion. She can ask for time or retain the issue within her note. Leonid can state when he will read the document. Honest scope matters: a pause is not agreement, a sent message not an accepted argument, a future answer not an amendment already made. Accurate history prevents a question dissolving into attractive labels and does not make participants display more confidence or availability than they actually possess at that moment.

The caption might be corrected while Alina still decides to leave the group. Correcting the date does not remove the strain she experienced or establish that the whole arrangement suits her. Alternatively, Leonid might reject her conclusion with assessable grounds and cooperation continue. Independence cannot be assessed by whether the junior person won. What matters is the issue, what was established and what scope for choice remained. Challenging does not create an automatic right to the preferred outcome, and should not disappear after one unsuccessful or mistaken objection from someone still learning the work.

Returning to the opening scene, a young colleague need not take the director's position to clarify one date. A senior person need not abandon experience to read new evidence. Roles and knowledge still differ, but no longer provide the sole answer to the question's content. The catalogue may receive a correction or a more accurate explanation. Relationships may remain, change or end. The article chooses none of these for people. Its question is specific: can a relevant junior argument be considered as an argument rather than a violation of seniority itself?

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose a small question for someone of higher status where consideration is available. In a private note, distinguish their role from the statement: what concerns you, what grounds do you know and where are you uncertain? Then separate reliability, authority and scope for correction. The issue may concern one line rather than the entire arrangement. You need not immediately devise a perfect statement or declare your conclusion final. This editorial exercise has not been tested as protection, a means of successful argument or a way to improve relationships.

Where conversation is appropriate, you can identify the passage, available information and one question. Clarify the recipient and what can still change. Do not promise to undertake all corrective work if you cannot or do not want to do it. Avoid unnecessary disclosure of others' information. Under threats or coercion, public objection and direct contact are not prescribed. A pause, another format or declining a step remain possible. Having your own question does not oblige you to test all consequences personally to demonstrate sufficient independence to other participants.

Later, check the actual result: was the document read, the date clarified, an answer received, or the question left open? Retain corrections to your own mistakes too. Delivery is not consideration, and silence is not agreement. In our imagined catalogue, one precise question can change a caption without guaranteeing transformed relationships. Its value is more modest: people's rank ceases to replace the text's grounds. The senior person retains a defined role, the junior person an opportunity to think, clarify and choose further involvement without preselecting compulsory victory or complete acceptance of another's infallibility.

Key quotation

> *those who criticize your mistakes*

Isocrates, *To Nicocles*, §28, George Norlin, 1928, Perseus, CC BY-SA 4.0; a short fragment naming advisers whom the monarch is urged to regard as faithful, rather than a universal modern right.

Connections between traditions

Text read	Question for comparison	Difference and limit
Isocrates, *To Nicocles*, §28	Can leaders need inconvenient advice?	A monarch permits selected advisers to speak; not a universal contemporary equal right
Analects XIII.15, Legge	What follows when an authority's bad statement receives no response?	Ancient governance ethics, not today's editorial procedure
Imagined catalogue	Is an argument examined through its grounds or only its speaker's rank?	Our editorial distinction, without established effects or guaranteed protection

Sources

1. Isocrates. *To Nicocles*. George Norlin, *Isocrates*, Vol. I, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press / William Heinemann, 1928. Primary Perseus Project digital text. XML metadata 0–47, §§1–8, web 133–201, and §§21–39, web 309–481, including complete §28, web 370–377, were actually read. Not the complete Greek original. The XML explicitly states CC BY-SA 4.0; attribution retained, no complete third-party text imported. The short translated quotation fragments retain the source's stated licence.

2. Confucius. *The Chinese Classics*, Volume 1, Confucian Analects, XIII.15, English text by James Legge. Wikisource. Displayed XIII.1–17 context, web 104–187, and complete XIII.15 were read; not the whole book or an independent original-language reading. Print basis unestablished; rights UNKNOWN, bounded paraphrase.

Tags

objection, seniority, status, hierarchy, authority, dignity, voice, argument, grounds, document, date, editing, curator, archive, competence, experience, position, responsibility, consideration, correction, route, recipient, deadline, respect, privacy, uncertainty, voluntary participation, involvement, Isocrates, Nicocles, Confucius, 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.