

UNITED WISDOM

Witnessing Injustice and Choosing Forms of Involvement

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-29-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Witnessing Injustice and Choosing Forms of Involvement

Epigraph

> *against my Conscience*

John Woolman, Journal, chapter I, pp. 26–27. A short fragment from his account of participating in a document selling an enslaved woman. This historical action's scale is not equated with ordinary contemporary disagreement.

What this article is about

At an open meeting, a facilitator repeatedly mocks a newcomer's pronunciation. Another participant hears this and notices that discussion no longer concerns the work. They want to help, but do not know the relationship or which response would be useful. They could object publicly, approach an organiser, invite another conversation, or offer support later. Conditions and consequences differ between these options.

This is an authored example, not an observed meeting. It examines a witness's position: seeing part of an event, having particular capacities, and gaining no ownership over the whole situation. Involvement can matter without its form being determined solely by indignation. Consider information, the affected person's wishes, safety, and actual role. Direct confrontation is not the sole measure of moral seriousness.

The article considers choosing a form without promising effectiveness, requiring heroic contact, or presenting general reasoning as emergency instructions. Which limited action is available now, and whom should it help? This preserves the person's dignity, their answer, and the distinction between intending to support and involvement actually agreed.

I. Seeing part of an event does not reveal the whole history

A witness has a particular viewpoint. Here, several remarks and a response were observed, while past relationships remain unknown. That limit does not erase the words heard. Name an interaction without asserting its entire history. Distinguish heard words, supposed effects, and unknown context. Choose through facts rather than move from a short scene to final portraits of everyone. Leave room for the answer of the person support is intended to reach.

Uncertainty does not require complete investigation before any step. Sometimes a simple check is available: whether a separate conversation or company is wanted. A facilitator may

have an obligation to preserve the meeting's subject that can be recalled without biography. Match action's scale to information. Asking to return to work differs from declaring years of persecution established. Strong feelings do not supply missing information or authorise certainty about an entire situation.

Missing information should not become a ready excuse either. A relationship history may exist, but that remains an assumption. Discuss humiliating words without inventing a version in which their recipient necessarily enjoys the tone. Feelings are not known beforehand. Preserve two boundaries: treatment can be observed while the recipient's entire experience cannot. Familiarity and confident group laughter do not automatically establish someone's voluntary participation in such a scene.

Check later accounts too. Hearing particular words differs from knowing someone always humiliates others. One concerns observation; the other needs further history. Preserve accuracy when reporting to organisers. Do not strengthen an account through conjecture for persuasiveness. Limited information may suffice for a particular check without making a witness the sole possessor of complete truth. Support begins with attention to actual knowledge and unknowns.

II. Role shapes available involvement

Participants, facilitators, and organisers have different capacities. One offers support, another changes their own treatment, and another checks event rules. This concerns possible actions rather than human worth. Require no powers a casual witness lacks. Nor can incomplete authority explain away one's contribution to humiliation. Laughing or repeating a remark is already an action that can stop without immediately transforming the whole meeting.

Roles have limits. Someone may lack a safe channel, time for examination, or independence. Consider conditions without turning them into final moral characterisations. Support is not measured exclusively through public bravery. Seek a genuinely available step: stop repeating, report precise information to a suitable responsible person, or offer agreed presence later. Possibility must be real rather than derived from demanding everyone act identically regardless of position and risk.

An organisational role may carry duties. A facilitator can return discussion to its subject and limit inappropriate treatment. An organiser offering a reporting channel should check that it works. Actual process matters more than a caring community's name. People need to know where to turn and what response is possible. Promise neither protection nor outcomes where procedures are absent or unchecked. Honest limits are better than assurances making decisions depend on nonexistent options.

Roles can change afterwards. A witness becomes a conversation partner when someone agrees to talk; an organiser receives information and must consider the part of the work for which they are responsible. Neither becomes a permanent rescuer or passive recipient. Clarify each step's subject and scope. What can I do, what is promised, and what remains unknown? This keeps support feasible and proportionate without creating unagreed obligations merely because initial intentions were benevolent.

III. Historical testimony concerns one's own action

Woolman's early journal recalls writing an enslaved woman's sale document at an employer's request. He voices disagreement and writes the document, but later thinks it would have been clearer to ask to be excused from writing it; subsequently he refuses a similar document. This is Quaker moral testimony. Woolman, chapter I, pp. 26–27. We use selected historical context without treating it as proof of every contemporary intervention's effectiveness.

Our authored example gains a question about personal involvement: what am I doing? Attention may concern others alone while one's laughter, shared recording, or fulfilled request also matters. This does not equate an everyday meeting with enslavement; history and harm's scale differ fundamentally. Comparison concerns one's own action. General disagreement does not always describe continuing participation or identify the particular step available to stop or change within a role.

A moral account is no universal refusal instruction. Today's request can have other consequences, including safety and obligations. Examine its subject. The journal does not establish that every collaboration with an unpleasant person participates in injustice, or that internal discomfort accurately identifies harm. A feeling can direct attention; answers still need a task, its relation to the situation, and available grounds for change.

The historical voice retains religious foundations rather than becoming contemporary psychology. Woolman describes conscience and personal decisions, not measured results for every witness. Our meeting analysis independently applies a question. This boundary avoids an attractive but inaccurate transfer. A source may make a choice more visible while the actual step still needs today's conditions, capacities, and the affected person's response.

IV. Direct response and inaction are not the only possibilities

Right To Be's guide presents several forms: distraction, seeking help, documentation, later support, and direct response. It separately addresses safety and permission to use recordings. Right To Be, The 5Ds of Bystander Intervention. This practical guide does not establish that every method will be effective in every situation.

Translate options into actions in our example rather than choose appealing names. Ask the facilitator to return to work, report observed words to an organiser, or offer conversation afterwards. Each has conditions and limits. A list does not identify usefulness. Information about roles, possible responses, and wishes is needed. Indirect action does not promise safety; changing circumstances can alter even a calm offer's significance.

A direct response may be appropriate without becoming a lengthy public dispute. Stopping an interaction and restoring a subject differ from winning a moral debate. Public argument can add attention someone would prefer to escape; a clear boundary may also be needed. Do not preselect the answer. Ask what a step changes now and whether support has become expression of indignation regardless of consequences for its recipient.

Indirect involvement should not excuse empty promises. Reporting needs clarity about the information shared and the task now awaiting response. Offering later conversation must fit real availability without requiring permanent accompaniment. Naming a form is not completed support. Involvement needs actual action, a checkable limit, and opportunities for clarification. Its scale can be small where that is genuinely available and wanted.

V. Agreement does not hand the whole situation to a witness

Asking about support leaves room for an answer: conversation, help reporting, company, or no further involvement. Refusal does not establish harmless treatment. Reasons may be unknown and need not be investigated. Offer a definite option without requiring explanation of the whole choice. Noticing injustice and feeling ready to help does not authorise controlling someone's subsequent story.

Agreement concerns a particular step. Talking afterwards need not permit public discussion. Reporting to an organiser does not permit posting to the whole group. Helping formulate something does not authorise changing its meaning unchecked. These distinctions matter especially under urgency and confidence. Clarify what is conveyed, to whom, and why. This is not endless permission seeking, but respecting an actual decision instead of assuming complete trust in every future action.

Immediate danger may require urgent assistance and another sequence. No universal ban on acting before conversation belongs here, nor should public-harassment guidance become a law for every threat. Emergency conditions and professional obligations need separate checking. Our ordinary example concerns selecting support after observed treatment. Agreement preserves authorship without becoming a reason to ignore concrete danger or invent unchecked local rules.

A witness may decline unavailable promises. If ongoing accompaniment is wanted but one conversation is possible, say so. Limited support does not cancel respect; it permits choices

based on real resources. Do not turn a request into a general judgement of excessiveness. State capacity and help consider another route if wanted and possible. Consent and resources concern both people, making support a shared choice rather than endless sacrifice exchanged for correct gratitude.

VI. Check safety through conditions, not a brave self-image

Consider surroundings, a facilitator's role, whether discussion can end, and suitable responsible people. These concern our example, not an exhaustive threat assessment. Personal calm and an uneventful past do not establish safety. Nor does every discomfort automatically prohibit involvement as danger. Name the anticipated consequence, grounds, and whom it may affect. State uncertainty instead of confidently promising that benevolent action is necessarily safe.

Risks concern recipients too. Public objection can add attention, disclose information, or alter someone's standing in a group. These effects are not known beforehand. Ask about preferences where possible; otherwise account for uncertainty. Do not use supposed protection as an excuse for convenience, or personal readiness for confrontation as proof another accepted its consequences. Support attends to several people rather than only one's image of bravery.

Choices can change. An initially suitable form may become unsuitable as circumstances shift. Attention does not make the first option a moral obligation at any cost. Stop a dispute, change channels, or approach a suitable role. This guarantees neither results nor total witness responsibility. It avoids continuing merely because one began. Support's subject matters more than proving the consistency of someone who always finishes public objections regardless of changed conditions.

Do not promise safety retrospectively. An uneventful attempt cannot establish universal suitability. An unhelpful attempt establishes neither personal inadequacy nor every form's futility. Examine actual conditions and knowledge limits. A result may be small: a report accepted, a separate conversation chosen, or personal repetition stopped. Describe it accurately rather than call it full protection, professional acceptance, or proof another similar scene will resolve identically.

VII. Later support need not become a report of heroism

Afterwards, offer conversation about what was seen and ask whether a step is wanted. No one need revisit a scene for the witness's understanding. State an option and accept refusal without demanding a detailed emotional report. Someone may prefer an ordinary subject or leaving. Until an answer arrives, usefulness is unknown; correct gratitude should not be prescribed beforehand.

Conversation may shift towards the witness: difficulty deciding, indignation, or missed intervention. Feelings can be real while concerning another subject. The affected person need not comfort a helper or confirm their moral seriousness. Examine your choice elsewhere where suitable rather than making the recipient a compulsory listener. Preserve what they need now, instead of focusing solely on describing yourself after an unpleasant scene.

A later step does not automatically repair absent action during the event. It may help independently or fail to meet a need. A conversation does not guarantee restored justice. Its subject can be limited: words were noticed, a reporting option offered, or feasible company accepted. These do not fully resolve conflict. Limits need not make them meaningless where actually offered and agreed without requiring a life story to evaluate someone else's involvement.

VIII. Recording an event differs from permission to share it

A recording or notes do not confer ownership of another's story. Distinguish what is captured, completeness, and proposed use. A few phrases cannot reveal whole relationships. A note may reconstruct treatment without explaining the facilitator's motive. Accuracy includes a limit: an observed segment rather than the entire picture. Preserve that when sharing instead of increasing certainty with the number of recipients.

Publicity may change consequences. One organiser conversation differs from spreading a scene to unknown audiences. Someone may want treatment examined without becoming a recognisable figure in public dispute. Good aims do not automatically authorise publication. Local recording and evidence rules are not comprehensively considered here and require checking. Ethical agreement and legal conditions differ; permission alone should not be presented as establishing legal admissibility.

If you shared material without an agreed basis, examine feasible correction. What went where, and what can still be limited? Do not promise removal of every copy where that is unavailable. Stop personal circulation, clarify information, and explain actual limits. The affected person need not comfort you or offer convenient forgiveness. Correction concerns your action and effects rather than public proof that the original intention was sufficiently benevolent.

IX. Reporting requires a real route

An organisational channel must actually exist. Who receives information, what may they examine, and what response is promised? A channel name does not establish operation. An organiser may check meeting rules without controlling everyone's future life. Reporting should fit that remit. It then has a practical subject instead of expecting a formal role to eliminate every harm and remove uncertainty for all.

Transmission differs from results. A report may be received while checking remains unfinished; a reply may leave procedures unchanged. Describe states separately instead of presenting a witness's step as achieved protection. Where reporting was agreed, explain what happened and remains unknown without unnecessary disclosure. Transparency concerns an agreed action rather than requiring every conversation or private detail to be shared beyond one's authority.

A channel may be unsuitable or distrusted. Doubt does not automatically reject justice. Clarify reasons if discussion is wanted, consider other available routes, or state your limits. Alternatives cannot always be promised. An inconvenient channel does not make public exposure the only compulsory option. Preserve choice rather than adding a situation where accepting another's preferred involvement becomes necessary for one's experience to count as serious.

X. Limited involvement can remain responsible

Witnesses need neither complete power and knowledge nor limitless readiness. Distinguish personal action, available steps, and unknowns. Accuracy does not cancel moral attention; it gives it an appropriate form. Stop laughing, return to work, use an agreed channel, or offer later support. None is declared sufficient everywhere. Responsibility concerns actual involvement and limits rather than a compulsory impressive gesture.

Wanting to support does not establish a need. Seek an answer where conditions permit. After acting, explain what was done, received, and remains unknown. Correction remains possible. If help was unsuitable, adjust rather than demand recognition of goodwill. Refusal does not make an episode insignificant. Support remains an option rather than new witness authority over the event's meaning and another's decisions.

Historical testimony and practical guidance raise different questions: personal involvement and varied forms. Today's conditions remain necessary. Our conclusion is neither always confront nor always wait. Restore the subject: what is known, what is my role, what is available, whom does it help, and which boundaries matter? A small answer can remain meaningful, preserving

the person's authorship, honest witness capacity, and unresolved tasks that do not vanish through a moral label.

What this means in practice

Identify the observed segment separately from an entire history. What was heard or seen, what is assumed, and what remains unknown? Clarify role and personal contribution: can something stop or change without claiming ownership of the situation? Public volume alone does not measure seriousness.

Choose one available option through circumstances and safety. Ask whether it is wanted where possible and accept limited answers. Conversation, reporting, and sharing a story concern different agreements. Immediate threats need suitable emergency assistance; this article replaces neither local-condition checks nor professional obligations.

Describe an action's result and limits. Reporting, receiving a response, and changed circumstances are different states. Promise neither guaranteed relief nor compulsory gratitude. Adjust unsuitable forms and honestly state exhausted capacity. The aim is feasible involvement preserving authorship, accuracy, and further choice.

Key quotation

> *desired to be excused*

John Woolman, Journal, chapter I, p. 27. A brief fragment of declining the next document concerning enslavement. It concerns the author's own action, does not guarantee an outcome, and supplies no universal instructions for witnesses.

Connections between traditions

Woolman's Quaker testimony preserves conscience's religious meaning and a specific historical subject. Right To Be offers a contemporary map of involvement. Comparison neither equates events' scale nor turns moral testimony into effectiveness proof.

Our meeting example applies questions about role, agreement, and limits. Genres differ: a source directs attention, while action needs current conditions. Neither a single tradition of compulsory heroism nor a guaranteed way to eliminate injustice follows.

Sources

• B17-R-29-N02-S1. John Woolman. Journal. Chapter I, pp. 26–27. Selected displayed context, pp. 24–28, especially two document-writing episodes, read; not the whole journal. Historical Quaker testimony without contemporary empirical guarantees.

• B17-R-29-N02-S2. Right To Be. The 5Ds of Bystander Intervention. Entire displayed substantive guide read, including five forms and safety, documentation, and consent conditions. Practical framework without universal effectiveness or local legal-rule claims.

Tags

witness, injustice, involvement, support, consent, safety, role, capacity, conscience, action, boundaries, assistance, choice, meeting, conversation, dignity, privacy, recording, circulation, responsibility, channel, result, distinction, traditions, history, guidance, Woolman, Quakers, Right To Be, 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.