

UNITED WISDOM

Responsibility under limited circumstances

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A10 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Responsibility under limited circumstances

Epigraph

> *according to the circumstances of the case*

William David Ross, *The Right and the Good*, Chapter II, printed p. 19, paragraph concerning several prima facie duties. Short fragment. Version read.

What this article is about

A person may be bound by a promise yet lack the time, authority, or information needed to fulfil it completely. Sometimes another obligation arises that cannot be postponed without harm. In this situation, responsibility cannot be reduced to a choice between unlimited demands and complete release from participation. We need to establish what was accepted, which conditions changed, who can make the decision, and what remains possible within actual limits.

This article treats limited circumstances as a reason to clarify responsibility rather than automatically cancel it. We distinguish acknowledging one's contribution from claiming ownership of the entire outcome, explaining an obstacle from justifying every act, and revising an agreement from making it disappear unilaterally. A historical argument by Ross helps identify a conflict between different grounds of duty. The contemporary scenes here are hypothetical and author-created: they establish no particular person's legal liability and do not promise an infallible moral decision.

I. Taking part does not mean controlling the entire outcome

Imagine a small group preparing an open discussion. One participant agrees to collect questions, another to provide a room, and a third to inform the guests of the date. The first completes their part, but the meeting does not happen: the room becomes unavailable. It would be inaccurate to conclude that the person collecting questions has no connection to the event. Their work belongs to the shared undertaking. It would be equally inaccurate to hold them solely responsible for the meeting's absence. Participation and complete control of an outcome are different relationships to an event, even when others find it convenient to approach one familiar person.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

To speak precisely, we must first reconstruct the scope of the role accepted. Did the person promise to prepare material, organize the entire event, or merely find out whether participation was possible? These alternatives may sound similar in conversation but require different actions. If the scope was not discussed, that uncertainty itself becomes part of the task. We should not retrospectively turn it into an unconditional obligation supposedly clear to everyone all along. It helps to acknowledge the difference between an expectation someone heard and an agreement actually confirmed, without deciding beforehand that one party is at fault.

Limiting responsibility need not make participation less serious. On the contrary, a stated boundary helps reveal a particular omission. If the questions were collected but not delivered in time, delivery is the issue, rather than the person's ability to ensure a room exists. If they saw a risk and could report it, that communication becomes the subject. Such clarification does not guarantee the group's agreement. It simply gives the dispute a more definite object: an action available within a particular role, rather than a general demand to answer for everything that happened after taking part.

Sometimes a role arises from an established arrangement rather than a separate promise. If a person usually sent the reminder, the group might have expected it again. That expectation deserves discussion, but habit does not explain which changes the participant knew about. They may not have known a new meeting was scheduled at all. Checking the earlier arrangement therefore includes asking what information was communicated. This distinguishes a forgotten action within a familiar role from a new task nobody communicated and which was assigned to the earlier participant only after the failure.

II. An obstacle needs a name rather than a general label

References to difficult circumstances can mean entirely different things. Information may be missing; permission to use a resource may be absent; time may already be occupied; or the task itself may exceed the agreed scope. These limits cannot all be assessed in the same way. Missing information can sometimes be requested; another person's authority does not arise through extra effort; another participant's time cannot be freed by one's own decision alone. Until the obstacle is named, advice to try harder may address a completely different part of the situation from the one preventing action.

Return to the hypothetical meeting. The person collecting questions cannot open a locked room if someone else holds the key and the right of access. They may nevertheless be able to deliver the completed material, clarify the meeting's status, or tell guests the date remains unconfirmed. The availability of these small actions does not prove they controlled the room. Their lack of control over the room, in turn, does not prove that no actions were available. Responsibility becomes more precise when we retain both points, without substituting a small feasible task for the large impossible outcome.

Clarification can also uncover what is unknown. We do not always know whether the participant could have obtained an answer earlier, noticed a change, or had a safe way to communicate. Unknowns should not be filled with assumptions about laziness, indifference, or a hidden wish to disrupt the meeting. We can ask about the sequence of events if the person is willing to discuss it. We can also leave part of the question open. A demand for certainty gives no right to invent facts, while acknowledging a gap does not require abandoning discussion of what both sides already know reliably.

Finding a resource does not always remove the obstacle either. An available file may be inaccessible to the person who needs it; someone else's completed work may require permission for use; spare time may already belong to another undertaking. In the hypothetical scene, a second room's existence does not mean the group has the right to occupy it. We therefore check not only whether a means exists but also the conditions of access. This avoids a misleading simplicity: we may acknowledge that a resource exists without confirming that using it is permitted or possible.

III. An earlier promise does not disappear when a new difficulty arises

When fulfilment becomes difficult, it is tempting to declare the promise nonexistent: doing everything as intended is now impossible. Yet changed conditions and the absence of an earlier agreement are different events. Others may already have based their plans on confirmed participation. This does not mean a person must do the impossible or accept any cost. It does leave a question about what should be communicated to those counting on their action and what revision can be proposed instead of silently ending participation.

In a hypothetical group, a participant promises a complete overview by a specified date. Later, some source material has still not been delivered. They can explain that limit and propose preparing only the available part. But a proposal is not yet everyone else's agreement to the new scope. They may need the full overview, a different deadline, or another contributor. Clarifying responsibility therefore includes more than describing one's own obstacle: it identifies where someone else's decision is required. A person may state their limits without acquiring the authority to alter everyone else's expectations unnoticed.

The timing of communication matters particularly. An early warning sometimes leaves the group able to reorganize; a late one may not. This is not about being available around the clock or forbidding unforeseen circumstances. The narrower question is when the change became known and which means of notification was then available. If the participant themselves avoided a clear conversation for a long time, that may be their separate contribution to the

difficulty. Acknowledging it does not make them the author of the missing material. It separates the source of the obstacle from their own handling of information about it.

Not every loss of time arose independently of the participant. They might have voluntarily accepted another assignment after confirming the first. In that case, present busyness is insufficient as an explanation; the decision that created it also needs consideration. Yet even established poor planning does not restore vanished hours. The conversation has two subjects: the earlier expansion of the workload and the current limit on fulfilment. Acknowledging the first does not make the second imaginary; the second does not cancel discussion of why incompatible obligations were accepted and who was not warned in time.

IV. Several duties can make different demands

For Ross, a promise and assistance may make different demands, while the resulting judgment remains limited. This is a historical philosophical position rather than a ready-made algorithm, current law, or a measured behavioral model. The reasoning that follows is ours: one obligation's presence does not establish the absence of all others, and a general slogan cannot replace consideration of particular conditions. Moving from the source to a contemporary scene does not make that scene Ross's own example or add his authority to the unknown circumstances of our invented group.

In an invented everyday scene, someone promises to check a text by evening, but another previously accepted task arises that cannot be postponed without substantial loss for another participant. Repeating that promises matter is insufficient. So is appealing to the importance of helping people. We must establish which tasks conflict, what is known about their urgency, whether part of the work can be transferred, and who needs to hear about the change. This scene is our reasoning, rather than an additional example attributed to Ross or confirmed by observation.

Acknowledging a conflict does not give the first difficulty mentioned decisive weight. Sometimes the new task is merely more attractive than the earlier one. Sometimes its urgency has not been checked. Sometimes a person really must choose between demands that cannot be reconciled. This difference matters: an explanation should show the grounds of preference rather than only the intensity of the pressure experienced. Others may disagree with those grounds. Discussion of the particular decision and its consequences then remains, rather than a promise that the right description will automatically eliminate disagreement or establish the participant's moral blamelessness.

Removing an obstacle does not itself fulfil the obligation. If the group finally supplies the material, the overview does not appear at that instant. Reading and preparation are still needed, and the earlier deadline may no longer make sense. Even a favorable change of

conditions therefore requires another examination of the plan. The parties discuss the remaining action rather than merely celebrating the arrival of a resource. Otherwise, a person may be regarded as free of every limit precisely when they have first gained the opportunity to start work that still takes time.

V. The cost of acting belongs to the description of possibility

People sometimes describe possibility as if the existence of any route were enough. A person could finish the work if they abandoned rest completely, canceled other accepted tasks, or used a resource that did not belong to them. Yet these conditions change what could do means. One route fits the available time and agreed scope; another requires breaching another agreement; a third requires someone else's consent. Calling all three equally available hides the decision's cost within a short verb.

In a hypothetical project, missing material could be replaced by one's own research. Originally, however, the participant agreed only to edit an existing text. The replacement requires several additional days. It can be a voluntary proposal if that scope suits the person and the group agrees to change the deadline. It does not automatically become their earlier duty merely because it is technically possible. We should distinguish carrying out an accepted task, discussing an expanded role, and freely helping beyond the agreement. These distinctions do not prevent generosity; they prevent assumed generosity from being presented as consent already given.

Openly describing the cost has limits too. A person need not disclose every personal reason to state that a certain scope is unavailable. Sometimes it is enough to explain that a new deadline or workload is unacceptable and offer a clear alternative. Others may check whether it suits their task, but should not receive an invented promise merely to keep the conversation comfortable. Responsibility can take the form of clearly declining the additional scope and precisely confirming the remaining part. This does not guarantee convenience for everyone, but allows further planning without relying on agreement that does not exist.

VI. Acknowledging an omission means naming one's contribution

After a failure, a person sometimes chooses between two broad statements: everything was my fault, or nothing depended on me. Both can conceal important details. In the hypothetical meeting, the participant did not control the room but forgot to deliver the questions. Their omission is real, although it does not explain the entire cancellation. Naming this particular action is not a way to reduce any responsibility. It distinguishes one's own contribution from events requiring another explanation and possibly other people's involvement.

This acknowledgment should be separated from a promise to undo all harm. The participant can deliver the material now, but cannot return guests' lost time or make an already canceled meeting have happened in the past. They can apologize for the delay, clarify what others expected, and propose a limited repair. Acceptance belongs to those people too. Repair does not purchase automatic forgiveness or authorize a demand that everyone stop discussing the consequences. Equally, rejection of the proposal does not give the person impossible means of restoration.

Precise language preserves the possibility of checking. Instead of promising never to let anyone down again, a person can confirm a particular means of delivering material in the next agreed case. Instead of declaring themselves completely incapable, they can identify the unfinished action and an available way to complete it. This is no diagnosis of character or proof of future success. It distinguishes a description of what happened, one's relationship to one's participation, and the next proposal. That allows repair to be discussed without first demanding a final verdict on the person as a whole.

Acknowledging one's omission may be possible without a shared account of every event. A participant can say that they did not deliver the material by the confirmed deadline without accepting that this alone canceled the meeting. Such partial agreement should not be portrayed as evasion merely because it does not encompass an entire accusation. Nor should the participant present a precise acknowledgment of one part as a refutation of all remaining questions. Precision works in both directions: it retains what is confirmed and leaves the disputed genuinely open.

VII. Shared responsibility requires several voices

A shared task often distributes not only actions but also decision-making rights. One participant gathers information, another approves the deadline, and a third controls a resource. If the last party does not answer, the first may become the visible face of the whole difficulty: everyone else communicates with them. Visibility, however, is not authority. Discussion of responsibility must therefore establish who owned the required decision and whether that was known beforehand. Otherwise a demand for initiative may quietly become a demand to use another person's resource without the right to do so.

In an invented project, a writer waits for the topic's approval. They can send alternatives but cannot announce that their preferred one has been approved. The coordinator, in turn, can specify beforehand when an answer should count as absent and what procedure then applies. Without a procedure, participants acquire different pictures of the wait: one thinks a decision is being prepared; another thinks the project has stopped. This need not be malicious intent. But the uncertainty becomes a separate matter to address rather than a reason to assess everyone's personal decisiveness indefinitely.

Dividing roles should not dissolve every obligation into the collective. A person may have a clear action despite shared uncertainty: communicating status, naming a dependency, or declining to confirm an unconfirmed deadline. They are nevertheless not required to create a new arrangement for the whole group alone. Their proposal can be rejected. We should then retain the difference between a proposed change, an accepted rule, and actual execution. Talk of team responsibility becomes meaningful where it is possible to see who agreed to which part and who has the authority to revise the overall plan.

Transferring a role requires a visible transition. In a hypothetical group, a new coordinator agrees to receive messages, but the previous coordinator continues answering some participants on the project's behalf. People may receive incompatible information although both are trying to help. A handover therefore includes not only choosing a new name but establishing the point after which another party confirms decisions. If that transition has not been agreed, it cannot be declared complete for the convenience of a report. Responsibility here concerns clarity of authority rather than who cares more about the shared undertaking.

VIII. A later outcome does not rewrite earlier knowledge

After the outcome, a choice often looks simpler than it did when made. If unexpected help allows the meeting to happen, we can forget that participants lacked a confirmed room for a long time. If it fails, the failure can appear to have been obvious all along. A favorable or unfavorable outcome, however, does not establish that particular information was available earlier. Responsibility for a decision should be discussed in light of what the person then knew, could reasonably clarify, and actually promised, separately from the later appearance of new facts.

This does not erase the outcome's significance. Guests may genuinely lose time after a cancellation; questions may genuinely be discussed when the meeting happens. Consequences nevertheless answer a different question from the quality of an earlier message. In one hypothetical case, a participant honestly reports that the room is unconfirmed, but others decide to travel anyway. In another, they assure guests that everything is ready without having received an answer. An identical cancellation does not make these messages identical. Nor does identical success retrospectively turn an unconfirmed assurance into verified information.

Separating the time of knowledge also guards against oversimplified self-justification. A person cannot appeal to ignorance of something they chose not to establish if clarification belonged to their accepted role and was available. That omission must nevertheless be established rather than inferred from a bad outcome. Again, specifics are needed: which message arrived, which question remained open, what could be checked, and when. The

discussion need not conclude with a general verdict on the person's moral worth. Its narrower outcome is a clarified sequence of actions and grounds for a decision.

IX. Responsibility continues after the explanation

A good explanation of an obstacle sometimes sounds like the task's completion. Everyone now understands why the work was not done, so supposedly nothing remains to discuss. Yet understanding the cause and agreeing on the next action differ. The group may recognize the limit and still need material, a postponed date, or a clear closure of the project. After the explanation, a question therefore remains: what does the person confirm now, and what is proposed for a joint decision? The answer may be small. Its size alone proves neither indifference nor adequacy for everyone.

In a hypothetical case, a participant offers to deliver the completed questions and withdraw from further organization. That can honestly conclude their available contribution if the withdrawal is stated clearly. They cannot, however, leave the role while continuing to create an impression that all organizational decisions remain theirs. Others need a status corresponding to the action. They may feel inconvenience or regret; the person need not promise those feelings will disappear. They should avoid another unconfirmed agreement if they want further planning to account for the actual boundary of their participation.

Sometimes no next step is available. The work has closed, access to the material is lost, or another party does not want continuation. Responsibility need not then take the form of imposed repair. A person can retain their acknowledgment of a particular omission and respect refusal of further interaction. Being able to offer help does not create a right to insist on its acceptance. Explanation, acknowledgment, and action thus remain connected without merging: the first describes conditions, the second concerns one's own contribution, and the third requires real possibility and, where necessary, another person's consent.

A written clarification need not become a public inquiry either. A group can retain an agreed deadline or list of remaining tasks without circulating a participant's personal explanation beyond the necessary people. Receiving information to revise a plan is not the same as receiving permission to repeat it to others. In the hypothetical scene, guests can receive the meeting's new status without details of someone else's circumstances. This is a separate limit on shared action: organizational clarity does not require turning a person and their explanation into material for unrestricted discussion.

X. A precise boundary makes a demand discussable

Responsibility under limited circumstances becomes neither infinite nor empty. It requires naming the role, changed conditions, available actions, and the part of the decision belonging to others. This work may leave a difficult disagreement. One person considers the proposed repair sufficient; another thinks it too late. One sees a serious conflict of obligations; another sees poorly organized time. The article offers no rule that automatically selects the right side. It offers a more precise subject for conversation, where differing assessments rest on identified actions rather than unlimited assumptions about a person.

A boundary also helps distinguish a demand from a wish. We may wish a participant would find an additional resource, take another role, or compensate for every consequence. The wish does not establish the existence of that resource, authority, or consent. Conversely, a person cannot use the word limit to cancel a particular accepted task that remains feasible. Clarification therefore moves in both directions: neither absorbing others' expectations as unconditional duty nor dissolving one's own confirmed participation in a general account of difficulties.

A modest but significant reference point remains: after the conversation, what happened and what is confirmed now should be clearer. Things will not necessarily become easier. Everyone will not necessarily accept one decision. The task may be transferred or discontinued. But a new agreement, if reached, should not depend on one person's imagined ability to control the entire situation. Responsibility then remains connected with action and relationships: the person acknowledges their actual contribution, states a boundary, and proposes only what they can discuss and carry out without an invented promise of complete control.

What this means in practice

If suitable, choose one small, safe agreement unrelated to threat, coercion, or a painful examination of harm to someone else. You might consider only preparing a shared list or delivering ordinary material. Participation is voluntary; you may decline the exercise without explaining why.

Describe four things for yourself: the part you actually confirmed, the condition that changed, the action still available, and where another person's decision is required. Do not add assumed motives of others. If necessary information is missing, mark it unknown rather than confidently concluding. Then, only if appropriate and safe, formulate one limited proposal: deliver the completed part, clarify a deadline, or honestly end participation. A proposal is not declared accepted before the other party agrees where their consent is needed.

The expected narrow result is a clearer distinction between an obstacle, your own contribution, and the next proposal. This does not guarantee agreement, forgiveness, or successful completion. Do not use the exercise to pronounce on anyone's culpability. Stop the trial if there is pressure, threat, unwanted publicity, or a demand to disclose personal information; neither continuation nor an explanation of refusal is required.

Key quotation

> *considered opinion (it is never more)*

William David Ross, *The Right and the Good*, Chapter II, printed p. 19, paragraph concerning consideration of a situation and choice of duty. Short fragment. The limit on certainty concerns philosophical judgment in this context. Version read.

Connections between traditions

The selected Ross context supports discussion of several grounds of duty and limits on final certainty. William James's essay *The Moral Philosopher and the Moral Life*, actually read, considers ethical deliberation through demands and lived experience; its religious horizon in the final section cannot be reduced to a secular organizational scheme. This does not claim that the two authors offer an identical solution. The narrow connection is resistance to an oversimple formula that removes the need to consider particular relationships in advance. The contemporary agreements and exercise are an author application rather than a proven procedure of these philosophers.

Sources

• William David Ross. The Right and the Good. Chapter II, selected continuous context of printed pp. 16–24; author-text in the Oxford 2002 edition, reprinted 2007. Title and publication information verified. Neither the whole book nor the entire chapter was read.

• William James. The Moral Philosopher and the Moral Life. The complete essay I–V in the published web version was actually read; original publication 1891, later collected in *The Will to Believe*. Limited comparison only, without new direct quotation.

Tags

responsibility, circumstances, promise, agreement, duty, choice, limits, authority, participation, contribution, consequences, explanation, repair, consent, refusal, role, time, knowledge, uncertainty, expectations, resources, boundaries, relationships, moral philosophy, Ross, James, shared task, revision, voluntariness, independence

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.