

UNITED WISDOM

Punishment, Repair, and the Prevention of Harm

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-26-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Punishment, Repair, and the Prevention of Harm

Epigraph

> *nor to undo a crime already committed*

Cesare Beccaria, *On Crimes and Punishments*, chapter XV, first paragraph, English translation in Farrer's edition; short fragment. Context: the author rejects torment and reversal of what has happened as punishment's purpose.

What this article is about

After harm has occurred, people may demand the same action for different reasons. They propose excluding someone from a shared workshop to acknowledge the seriousness of the incident, protect others, repair a loss, or show that rules have consequences. These aims are connected, but they do not coincide. Exclusion may end access to tools while leaving the owner with a damaged instrument. Compensation may cover a financial loss without changing an unsafe working arrangement. An acknowledgment of responsibility may matter without creating an obligation to meet the person who caused the harm again.

This article explores those differences through a hypothetical voluntary group. It does not establish a criminal procedure or offer a universal route to reconciliation. Its historical point of reference is Cesare Beccaria's argument about the purpose of punishment: reasoning about a measure's aim does not establish its present effectiveness. The question here is narrower: what should a particular measure accomplish, who bears its cost, and what outcome allows that limited task to count as completed?

I. One incident leaves several matters unfinished

Imagine a small workshop whose members take turns using shared tools. Someone takes another member's measuring instrument without agreement, damages it, and returns it to the shelf without notifying the owner. Several days later, the instrument is needed for paid work. A missed deadline adds lost time and money to the cost of repair. We know the actions in this hypothetical scene; we know nothing about fear, malicious intent, or the participant's habits. That is already enough to reveal several different subjects for discussion.

The first subject is acknowledgment of what happened. Who took the instrument, what was damaged, when did the fault emerge, and which consequences are supported? The second is

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

repair of the owner's situation: a functioning instrument, reasonably established expenses, and access to information. The third concerns future use of the workshop: could the same thing happen to other possessions? The fourth is the participant's position in the group. One decision may touch all four subjects without fully resolving any of them. Its severity therefore says little about its sufficiency.

If the discussion begins with whether to keep the person or expel them, the range of possible responses narrows before the tasks have been named. A vote on exclusion becomes an answer about loss, trust, and safety simultaneously. The owner may receive public support and still have no instrument. The participant may arrange a repair while the group maintains an unsafe storage arrangement. A failure of this decision need not mean insufficient strictness. Sometimes it addresses a different problem from the one that remains unresolved.

Separating tasks does not devalue indignation. It helps identify what indignation is actually asking for. Someone can regard the handling of their property as unacceptable without immediately proposing an entire system of consequences. The group can acknowledge a violation separately from examining possible measures. Neither step requires guessing the participant's inner state. What matters is maintaining a distinction between a supported action, its consequences, an anticipated risk, and a moral judgment. When those layers merge, disagreement with one measure easily looks like denial of the harm itself.

II. Responsibility begins with a definite subject

Responsibility becomes discussable when it has a definite subject. In our scene, the participant may answer for unauthorized use, damage, and failure to report it. It does not follow that every later difficulty experienced by the owner was caused by the instrument. The size of the loss, the sequence of events, and available ways of repairing it may remain disputed. Such disagreement does not erase what has been established. It calls for separating what is already acknowledged from what still needs clarification, rather than demanding agreement with the entire account at once.

This distinction matters especially when people's positions are unequal. Someone who speaks effectively at meetings may make their account sound definitive. Another may remain silent because of exhaustion, dependence on the premises, or concern about damaging relationships. Silence alone establishes neither agreement nor innocence. In a voluntary group, it can make sense to allow several ways of supplying facts: a short note, a conversation with one responsible person, or an opportunity to correct an inaccuracy. This is an editorial proposal for the hypothetical situation, rather than a promise of a reliable investigative procedure.

Acknowledgment of a violation also takes different forms. Saying that someone did take the instrument does not amount to accepting every claimed expense. Agreeing to pay for a repair need not mean accepting a judgment about one's character. Offering an apology does not demonstrate that it is sincere. Each action can matter without being made to say more than it does. Responsibility can then cease to depend on a sweeping confession in which facts, feelings, and promises merge into one compulsory speech.

Finally, a definite subject protects the discussion from endless expansion. After an incident, people may recall every irritating trait, old grievance, and secondhand rumor about the participant. Some information may bear on the present risk; other information only explains accumulated dissatisfaction. It cannot automatically become one body of evidence. If the group changes the grounds of its decision, it needs to identify that change. Otherwise, answering for a damaged instrument quietly becomes answering for one's inconvenient presence in general, and repairing the original harm can no longer bring the matter to an end.

III. Punishment affects a person but needs a stated aim

For this limited discussion, punishment means an intentionally adverse consequence associated with an acknowledged violation. It might take the form of temporarily losing a particular kind of access or being excluded from a voluntary project. This is a working distinction, rather than a legal definition. Not every adverse change is punishment: premises may close for repairs, or a dangerous tool may become unavailable to everyone. Nor does a measure cease to be punishment merely because it is called protection, if it actually imposes a separate deprivation on a particular participant.

In chapter XV of his treatise on crimes and punishments, Beccaria connects punishment's purpose with preventing further harm by the offender and deterring similar actions by others. He contrasts this orientation with fruitless torment and the impossibility of undoing what has already occurred. This supplies a useful question about a measure: what future change is expected from it? The historical argument itself, however, does not show that a particular exclusion, public condemnation, or loss of access will produce the expected effect. That claim would need a different basis.

The group may also regard a consequence as necessary to acknowledge a boundary: someone else's property cannot be used without consent. It matters to state that meaning directly. Presenting every severe measure as a way of reforming a person conceals a separate moral choice. Temporary suspension may express the group's position; it supplies no knowledge about the participant's internal change. If returning depends on that change, the person is asked to prove something the group cannot verify. Access begins to depend on the persuasiveness of a speech about oneself.

A definite aim also allows punishment's cost to be bounded. Being barred from one tool differs from expulsion from every connected community. A fixed end date differs from waiting indefinitely for forgiveness. Informing members that access is closed differs from publicly circulating personal information. These comparisons do not yield a universal scale of permissibility. They show that consequences have different reaches and affect people beyond the original scene. The wider a measure extends, the less reason there is to assume that naming the violation alone justifies it.

IV. Repair concerns the position of the person harmed

Repair begins by asking what was lost and what can now be returned, replaced, or eased. In the workshop, that might mean repair of the instrument, a temporary substitute, clarification of expenses, and relieving the owner of repeated searches for information. Unlike punishment, this task centers on the position of the person harmed. Even a payment that is unpleasant for the participant has a different meaning when its amount and purpose are connected to a specific loss. The distinction does not automatically make the payment fair: both the loss and the way it is assessed require grounds.

Some harms cannot be restored to their previous state. A deadline has passed, a meeting has been canceled, or confidential information has been disclosed. Money may help with one part of the consequences without reversing another. Here it is especially tempting to declare the matter closed after an action convenient for the group. The instrument is repaired, so the owner is expected to stop objecting. But fulfilling a definite obligation completes that obligation. It creates no duty to trust again, communicate, or judge the incident as everyone else judges it.

Repair should also avoid becoming additional work that the person harmed must perform for the sake of communal peace. Requiring a detailed account of feelings, meetings, instruction of the participant, or acceptance of an apology may increase their burden. In the hypothetical workshop, a technical solution can be clarified through an authorized intermediary if the parties permit it. Someone can decline direct conversation and still provide repair information. Participation in discussing repair helps only where it is actually accessible, and declining it does not deprive a person of acknowledgment of the supported harm.

Finally, repair has contributors who can easily disappear from view. If a shared fund pays for the repair, that money becomes unavailable for another purchase. If a third member lends an instrument, they accept their own risk. If a responsible volunteer spends a day transporting it, the solution has a cost in time. None of this rules out collective help. It changes the account: the group provided part of the repair, while the person who caused the harm provided another part. Distinguishing contributions honestly allows help without presenting other people's work as fulfillment of the participant's obligation.

V. Prevention changes the conditions of recurrence

Preventing future harm requires looking at how the situation is arranged. In the workshop, tools were stored together, rules of use were spoken, reporting a fault depended on personal courage, and there was no backup instrument. None of these conditions removes responsibility for a particular action. But if the group only responds to one individual, they remain available for the next incident. The storage arrangement may need changing regardless of who was involved in the first scene or what consequences were chosen for them.

A preventive measure needs a connection to a stated risk. A separate shelf for personal instruments reduces uncertainty about ownership. Recording permission in advance makes use visible. An understandable way of reporting a fault facilitates the transfer of information. These connections describe the proposals' purposes, rather than measured effectiveness. We do not know in advance whether the arrangement will be convenient or followed. It therefore helps to limit a trial to one instrument and a few uses, instead of announcing a new system as the final solution to trust across the group.

Prevention may impose costs of its own. Recording every movement takes time, a locked cabinet makes work harder, and collecting personal information expands access to other people's lives. Sometimes these costs are accepted knowingly; sometimes people who were never asked bear them. If preventing one kind of loss makes participation almost impossible for newcomers, a new subject needs discussion. Calling the measure preventive is insufficient. We need to see whose actions became harder, who received the monitoring work, and whether a similar limited result could be obtained with a narrower reach.

A particular difficulty arises when protection is aimed at a specific person's unknown future conduct. A group can assess the conditions of its voluntary project, but an anticipation of the future is not a fact about the past. It may decide not to provide access to a particular object; that decision cannot supply knowledge of someone's permanent dangerousness. This distinction allows contact to be limited without a psychological verdict. It also allows a measure to be reconsidered when circumstances change, without portraying reconsideration as an admission that the original harm was trivial or invented.

VI. Apology, forgiveness, and restored access

An apology may identify an action and acknowledge its consequences. It can give the person harmed important information: the participant no longer denies what has been established. Yet an apology does not repair an instrument by itself or replace the conditions for safe access. If the group values it only as an indication of willingness to fulfill further obligations, that connection should be stated. If it must be public, a separate question arises about who needs publicity and what cost it creates. The same form of speech can perform different tasks in different circumstances.

Forgiveness belongs to a different order. Someone may stop wanting punishment and still decline to work together again. They may accept sharing a space without regarding the harm as forgiven. They may choose not to use the word at all. The group does not acquire the authority to prescribe the victim's inner state merely because it wants the conflict to end. Payment deadlines, access conditions, and storage arrangements can be described; forgiveness should not become a compulsory document someone must produce as proof of maturity.

Restored access likewise does not establish the full return of trust. Using a shared table under supervision, independently using an inexpensive tool, and borrowing the owner's personal instrument are different relationships. Consent to one does not automatically extend to the others. In our scene, the owner may continue declining to lend personal possessions while the group admits the participant to other activities. This may be inconvenient to organize. Inconvenience alone does not establish that the person harmed has a duty to remove it by extending their consent.

The reverse distinction is equally important: the absence of shared work does not always mean punishment is continuing. Sometimes a relationship simply does not resume, although definite obligations have been fulfilled. Seeking the restoration of former unity at any cost can leave everyone dependent on another person's decision. If a project permits withdrawal, ending limited participation may sometimes be clearer than working indefinitely toward reconciliation. This offers no guarantee of relief. It acknowledges that answering for harm, replacing losses, and future closeness have different conditions of completion and different decision makers.

VII. A measure's fairness includes those who carry it out

Someone must carry out every measure. An agreement to repair requires checking, changes in storage require organization, and a temporary restriction requires communication and observance. When these actions are described only as the group's decision, the actual work disappears. One volunteer may spend months reminding someone about payment and arranging meetings while everyone else regards the conflict as finished. This uncertainty affects more than the executor's convenience. It affects the measure itself: a consequence that exists only in minutes differs from a restriction that actually operates.

A limited response therefore includes the executor's authority as well as its subject and aim. Who can accept a repair report? Who can change a deadline? Who can see information about the incident? Who answers if the original decision rested on an error? These questions need not create an elaborate administration for one instrument. A small group may need only a few clear connections. Their value lies in reducing dependence on the unofficial mood of the most persistent person, while giving the executor permission not to assume every subsequent difficulty.

An accidental change of executors can alter a consequence's meaning. One responsible person regards the restriction as temporary until repair; another regards it as permanent until sincere repentance. The participant fulfills the stated condition and discovers a different one. The owner has to explain again why a promise remains unfulfilled. To avoid this particular uncertainty, it can help to record the grounds, reach, and end condition of a separate measure. The record does not itself make the decision fair. It makes changes visible so they can be discussed as new decisions.

The distribution of work also reveals the group's limits. If nobody is willing and able to conduct a difficult discussion safely and voluntarily, a meeting cannot create that resource by voting. If the matter exceeds the project's competence, an improvised procedure may simply give confidence to ignorance. This article does not select an external route for a particular country. It preserves a narrower conclusion: the absence of an accessible procedure does not oblige the person harmed to build one themselves, or justify declaring the group's response a definitive solution to every consequence of the harm.

VIII. Checking an outcome differs from checking obedience

After a measure has been chosen, it helps to ask what actually changed. A functioning instrument is an observable technical outcome. Transfer of a promised amount is a separate outcome of performance. Access restricted within stated boundaries is an organizational outcome. The claim that the participant will never break any rule again concerns an unknown future. If this claim becomes a condition of completion, the matter cannot honestly close: no period supplies knowledge about the whole of someone's later life. Checking becomes an endless demand to prove reliability, rather than determining whether a task was completed.

Obedience may be a convenient sign for whoever administers the measure. Someone responds promptly, agrees with formulations, and attends every meeting. These actions are not necessarily connected to repairing a specific loss. Someone else may speak awkwardly and still arrange repair on time. This does not mean that communication never matters. It means that a new subject needs to be named separately. Ease of interaction should not quietly replace the checking of repair, just as emotional persuasiveness does not replace the instrument's working condition.

An outcome criterion may require reconsideration. The plan was to replace a component, but a service provider finds that the instrument cannot be repaired. A promised deadline turns out to depend on an unavailable delivery. Changing the means of performance while maintaining the aim differs from extending an obligation indefinitely without reference to actual conditions. Understandable reconsideration does not guarantee agreement, but it gives disagreement a subject. The parties dispute a new cost and a means of repair, rather than whether someone has shown enough goodwill for an outcome to be recognized.

Completing a limited measure leaves room for unresolved differences. The group may acknowledge completed repair while retaining a different access arrangement. The owner may confirm receipt of payment without judging motives. The participant may fulfill an obligation and then leave the project. These endings are more modest than complete reconciliation. That makes them more verifiable: everyone reports on the part of the relationship they actually command. One technical or organizational outcome need not become proof of mutual trust, moral reform, and the final disappearance of every consequence of the incident.

IX. An explanation does not erase responsibility, and responsibility does not exhaust a person

Reasons for an action may matter for future arrangements. The participant did not know that the instrument was personal, did not understand its use, or could not find someone to notify about the fault. Each explanation needs its own grounds. If supported, it may change the assessment of a particular part of the action or suggest a preventive step. An explanation does not, however, restore the instrument or remove the loss. Accounting for circumstances is compatible with acknowledging consequences. There is no need to choose between total exoneration and refusing to notice any conditions at all.

The opposite error makes the harm an exhaustive definition of the person. An established action becomes the basis for a general character judgment, a hidden motive, and an unchangeable future. Such certainty makes a collective story easier, but it exceeds what is known in our scene. The group can make an adverse decision without these conclusions. The owner can end contact without proving someone's incorrigibility. Respecting the limits of knowledge does not soften the damage itself; it makes the grounds of response more precise and keeps consequences connected to what is actually established.

The distinction also matters for the participant. If they hear that no action can change the relationship, the demand to repair the loss may lose its clear meaning. Yet promising full acceptance after payment would also be false: other people need not change their feelings on schedule. A more definite subject exists between these extremes. Repair completes the task of repair. Providing facts clarifies knowledge. Changing access regulates participation. None of these steps purchases other people's moral judgment, and none becomes meaningless simply because that judgment remains absent.

Responsibility can therefore be bounded while remaining serious. It demands at least as much attention as a general verdict: several consequences must be seen, grounds distinguished, incomplete repair acknowledged, and end conditions communicated. But it does not require possession of another person's entire biography. That is a significant limit for a voluntary project. Participants decide what is possible within their relationships and resources, rather than assigning a final meaning to someone else's life. This limit permits support for the person harmed alongside refusal to claim an infallible judgment of character.

X. Several aims can coexist without an overarching promise

The workshop's response might consist of different decisions: establish and address the damage, help the owner obtain a temporary instrument, limit independent use of particular tools, and change the way faults are reported. This is a hypothetical possibility, rather than an account of successful results. Each part has its own subject, deadline, and cost. One part may be unworkable or disputed. It then helps to identify the remaining gap, rather than regard the whole response as successful merely because the group made a single decision and felt that the conversation was complete.

Such a response can include punishment, repair, and prevention together. Distinguishing them does not prescribe abandoning the first task in favor of the others. It prevents one task from promising to perform all the rest. If exclusion ends participation, that is what can be said. If shared resources fund help, the group's contribution can be acknowledged. If a new record makes use visible, its convenience can be checked. Each outcome retains a limit, and that limit does not make the outcome worthless. A modest conclusion can still have substance.

Difficulty arises where aims conflict. Publicity may support acknowledgment of a boundary while increasing the harm caused by circulating information. A quick financial return may require work that someone cannot presently obtain. Thorough checking may delay help for the person harmed. This article supplies no general formula for resolving those conflicts. It proposes making them visible: which aim was preferred, what cost remained, and whose consent was actually accessible? A hidden cost does not disappear because a decision was made in the name of repair or collective safety.

Finally, some matters end without a shared account of what happened. The parties may disagree in judgment while preserving the established facts and fulfilled obligations. A voluntary group may continue within changed boundaries, while someone leaves. Neither reconciliation, reform, nor the absence of further harm is promised here. A narrower possibility remains: respond to a known incident by distinguishing the situation of the person harmed, the conditions of future participation, and adverse consequences for the participant responsible. That distinction makes each of the three aims separately available for checking.

What this means in practice

If a small, definite loss occurs in a safe voluntary activity, you can try examining one decision already being discussed in terms of its tasks. The trial is suitable only where participation can be declined freely, information can be provided without dangerous disclosure, and the matter does not require competence the group lacks. Direct contact stops in the presence of threats, coercion, or danger; this exercise creates no duty to meet the person responsible or investigate a serious incident yourself.

Take one measure that is actually proposed and separately record its expected outcome for the person harmed, future conditions, and the participant responsible. For example, temporarily closing access to an instrument may limit its use without paying for repair. Alongside this, identify what is known about the loss, what remains disputed, who performs each action, and who contributes time or money. One person need not fill every line. Where information is absent, leaving a question open is better than inventing a motive or promising a result.

Then choose one small, checkable outcome: obtain repair information, return an available object, or clarify how faults are reported. End conditions and a date for brief reconsideration can be agreed in advance. Declining a personal meeting, forgiveness, or continued participation remains a separate personal decision. The limited expected effect of the trial is a clearer description of a task and its cost. If recording increases pressure, requires disclosure of personal information, or makes the person harmed responsible for the whole process, the trial can stop without thereby declaring the harm erased.

After the selected step, compare expectation with actuality. What became known, what was performed, and what remains? Do not add a promise about future character or complete restoration of relationships. One repair can end while disagreement remains unfinished. The group's help can be acknowledged separately from a participant's failure to perform. This examination does not aim to create an ideal order. It aims to prevent one decision from presenting itself as the answer to every question that arose after harm.

Key quotation

> *injuring anew*

Cesare Beccaria, *On Crimes and Punishments*, chapter XV, second paragraph, English translation in Farrer's edition; short fragment. Context: future recurrence of harm is identified as a subject of prevention, rather than an established outcome of any measure.

Connections between traditions

The passage read from Beccaria belongs to European Enlightenment reasoning about punishment. His question about a measure's purpose helps distinguish influence on the future from an attempt to reverse the past through suffering. Our distinction between repair and the organization of voluntary activity develops a different, editorial question: how to distribute particular unfinished tasks after a loss. It does not claim that Beccaria proposed the group arrangement described here.

Historical punishment philosophy and the present hypothetical scene connect through the question of purpose, but differ substantially in authority and scale. A voluntary workshop has

no court's powers; repairing an instrument is not a model of a criminal case. Other spiritual traditions, empirical schools, and contemporary programs are not declared to agree with this conclusion. Such a claim would require separate reading and a different basis.

Sources

Cesare Beccaria. *Dei delitti e delle pene* (1764). English translation, *On Crimes and Punishments*, included in James Anson Farrer's *Crimes and Punishments*: Project Gutenberg, no. 58700. Reading covered a continuous opening passage of XV and the beginning of XVI. The epigraph uses XV's first visual paragraph, and the key uses its second. The article uses XV's discussion of punishment's purpose; historical examples and arguments are not presented as current law or contemporary findings. The whole book was not read. Short Russian quotations were translated for this article.

Tags

harm, responsibility, punishment, repair, prevention, person harmed, consequence, purpose of a measure, instrument, workshop, voluntariness, compensation, maintenance, loss, consent, refusal, safety, forgiveness, apology, access, authority, checking, outcome, limits of knowledge, explanation, cost of a decision, unfinished matters, Beccaria, Enlightenment, shared work, 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 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 real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.