

UNITED WISDOM

An Ethical Choice at Work: When Advantage and Permissibility Diverge

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A37 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

An Ethical Choice at Work: When Advantage and Permissibility Diverge

Epigraph

> *Rational nature exists as an end in itself.*

Immanuel Kant, Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals, Section II, short sentence preceding the humanity formula, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation. This grounds a moral argument, rather than a contemporary rule for commercial proposals.

What this article is about

In a hypothetical scene, Nina prepares a proposal for a regular customer of a small service company. Its price looks attractive, but necessary setup costs extra. Her manager asks her not to include setup in the first page's total: the customer might compare it with a competitor and leave. The information appears in small print in an appendix, so Nina is told everything is formally honest. Her bonus depends on the deal, and colleagues rely on meeting the monthly target. She notices a divergence between a desirable outcome and its means, but fears appearing to obstruct work.

The dilemma requires no advance verdict that everyone is bad. Examine the choice, actual knowledge, her role, the customer's expectations and available changes. Advantage matters: work supports people's lives. It does not establish every means' permissibility. This article determines no contract's legality, employment rights or required complaint procedure; those need applicable rules and competent consideration. Its subject is an ordinary moral decision where pressure for results encourages treating one selected method as inevitable. We explore stating a specific boundary, seeking a workable alternative and answering for one's contribution without promising that an honest choice always receives a reward.

I. Name the Action before Judging the Company

“Everything here is unethical” may express serious dissatisfaction, but scarcely identifies today's decision. Nina's action is narrower: prepare a proposal whose first sum excludes a payment necessary to use the service. Establish whether setup is compulsory, its price known and the structure understood by the customer. If setup is a genuinely optional addition, the subject changes. If the service cannot work without it, presenting a base price as complete requires different consideration. Moral reasoning begins with these distinctions rather than a settled judgement of the manager's character or business generally.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A workplace conflict often combines tasks. Nina wants income, fulfilment of an assignment, support for colleagues and avoidance of misleading a customer. These desires do not describe the action identically. The first three concern outcomes for the team and employee; the last concerns another participant's available choice. Counting people on either side does not settle it. Several interested employees acquire no automatic right to transfer significant uncertainty to one buyer. Conversely, concern for the buyer need not deny the team's labour. Consider a way to accommodate interests without covertly appropriating the customer's decision.

Nina's actual role matters. She writes the text without setting every company price and condition. Her responsibility therefore differs from the owner's, but is not zero. She can clarify inputs, propose a visible complete sum, identify separate setup or decline to present an incomplete price as final. Opportunities depend on the real process and authority. This article assumes no identical freedom for every employee. A limited role nevertheless requires a precise question about one's own action rather than automatic justification that someone above owns the overall decision.

An uncomfortable feeling can reveal a dilemma without confirming every conclusion. Nina may have misunderstood the service or missed an earlier discussion of setup with the customer. Checking should not become indefinite postponement, but prevents arguing against an imagined proposal. Identify fact, inference and uncertainty: setup's necessity is confirmed, its price known, and the customer's understanding unestablished. Discussion acquires a limited subject. It can change a document instead of becoming reciprocal judgement over who is more moral or cares more about the company.

II. Advantage Explains Desire without Granting Permission

Nina's bonus genuinely matters. Paying rent and helping family can make a lost deal serious. Calling the motive low merely because it concerns money would be superficial. Moral reasoning need not despise income. It distinguishes an outcome's significance from permission to employ a means. Needing money does not mean a customer should decide without a clear complete price. A useful company does not make every sales method useful. These distinctions preserve an adult attitude towards labour without demanding a person indifferent to material consequences.

Analects IV.16 contrasts the superior person's orientation towards righteousness with the mean person's orientation towards gain. This is a historical distinction of moral direction, rather than a modern employee-rating scale based on income. It does not establish that all profit is impermissible. The limited comparison concerns priority: does advantage become the sole ground for action? If Nina calls the bonus-winning option right while leaving no space for the

customer's conditions, success has replaced consideration of permissibility. Financial need itself does not become a vice.

The opposite self-justification is also possible. Someone may declare every advantageous decision suspicious and prefer conspicuous refusal without checking an honest alternative. Advantage and permissibility can coincide. A company can show a comprehensible total, explain setup's quality and still win a comparison. A moral boundary does not require deliberately choosing the worst commercial outcome. It limits the means of reaching one. With significant information clear, a customer can make a profitable decision for the company without losing ownership of their choice. This is a possibility, rather than a sales promise or established universal strategy.

Write two separate statements: what we want to achieve and what we propose doing. The first names a contract, income and team workload. The second names a document, price presentation and agreement. Where the second is treated only as a tool for the first, its independent moral significance can disappear. Nina need not choose between having no wish to earn and blind compliance. She can want the deal while recognising a condition of her participation. That requires clarity about the decision's cost and guarantees no managerial acceptance of her boundary.

III. The Customer Is More Than a Means to a Target

In Section II, Kant considers a rational being an end in itself and prohibits treating humanity merely as a means. His argument differs from aggregate utility calculation and is not merely a wish for pleasant service. His lying-promise example considers another person's inability to assent to the actual way of acting. This provides limited philosophical support for our scene: the customer participates with their own purposes, rather than existing only as a bonus source. A particular price format and editorial checking procedure remain present-day tasks, rather than Kant's commercial regulation.

An ordinary transaction necessarily involves people as means: one person's work supports another's goal, while payment supports the company. The problem is not exchange itself or both sides gaining. It arises where one participant deprives another of significant opportunity to understand and accept cooperation's method. The customer may prefer an expensive suitable service, refuse or select a competitor. Nina need not like these choices. Respect does not mean securing a convenient decision with pleasant words; it leaves the other party their place in the transaction, including disagreement with the terms.

An informative appendix matters without settling the whole presentation. If the first page promises a final cost while the appendix adds an unavoidable payment, the two messages conflict for the decision-maker. Establish the document's actual structure and the customer's

expectation. This article determines no disclosure's legal sufficiency. Its moral question is narrower: is formal availability of text being used to preserve profitable misunderstanding? A line's accessibility and a decision's comprehensibility differ. Nina can propose making the structure visible without declaring the contract unlawful beforehand.

Respect also requires accurate outcome promises. A clear price does not justify invented speed, unconfirmed quality or certainty about a service's effects. Correcting one detail leaves other concealments to examine. This does not require Nina to investigate the entire market and company history before every letter. Checking is proportionate to her own message and available data. An unknown deadline can be described as uncertain or submitted for confirmation. Humanity as an end is no ground for endless testing; it grounds refusal to convert an unknown into a convenient promise for closing a deal.

IV. An Assignment Does Not Cancel Participation

A manager may believe Nina should simply format agreed text. An assignment carries weight: employment involves coordination and allocated decisions. It does not make an action morally neutral. An employee noticing a specific discrepancy can question it within her role. Every refusal is not automatically courageous, nor every execution complicity. Consider subject, knowledge and actual opportunity to change one's contribution. Nina is not responsible for circumstances unknown to her, but is responsible for presenting something as established where she already knows a significant incompleteness.

Distinguish discussion from accusation. A request to add a total can be specific: the customer may mistake the base price for complete, although setup is necessary. Management can examine the document instead of merely defend its identity. The wording guarantees no calm response, but keeps objection attached to action. Calling everyone fraudsters adds conclusions needing separate grounds. Speaking only of personal discomfort can erase the customer. A precise objection lies between an unsupported verdict and dissolution of the subject into one's mood.

Written clarification can preserve which wording was proposed and which decision accepted. This article does not prescribe collecting secret documents, bypassing access limits or sending materials outside. Real information rules and employment duties need separate consideration. Do not invent a history of agreement: a rejected amendment should not be described as accepted. If Nina agreed to part of the assignment, distinguish that part. Accuracy concerning state obstructs later self-justification without making an ordinary objection an independent investigation.

Limited authority may make the choice expensive. A lost bonus, dissatisfaction or changed role are possible. No protection from such consequences is promised, and readers are not asked

silently to accept every risk. Understand actual support options and applicable conditions without substituting philosophy for professional consultation. Cost alone does not establish an action's permissibility. The moral question remains: what contribution am I willing to make, on what grounds? Orders cannot settle it, but neither can an attractive appeal to courage that overlooks another person's living conditions.

V. Loyalty to a Team May Require Objection

Colleagues rely on the target. They may see Nina as causing failure, although the proposal's structure arose earlier. Distinguish an immediate delay from its grounds. If an amendment delays sending, that is a real cost. It does not establish that honest pricing harms the team more than retained incompleteness. Future complaints or losses cannot be predicted as inevitable. Possible consequences can be named while uncertainty remains. Care for colleagues includes the result's method and what employees will subsequently need to uphold in customer communication.

Loyalty is not continual approval. One can value a company while objecting to a particular document. Declaring every clarification hostile leaves no space for moral discussion. Conversely, an objection is not the only form of care. Colleagues may know circumstances Nina missed; their explanation deserves attention to its subject. Loyalty can involve seeking a workable permissible option rather than refusing to hear sales difficulties. Clarification may reveal that part of the conflict arose from different understandings of price and document format.

Proverbs 11:1–4 contrasts accurate and false weight before God and does not present riches as final protection. This is a religious evaluation of honest exchange, rather than proof of transparency's market effects. It supports distinguishing profit from accurate representation of measure. It does not establish that an honest seller invariably earns more. Retaining the religious ground matters: the text evaluates action before God, rather than recommending honesty only as an efficient customer-retention technology. A moral boundary keeps significance under an unfavourable outcome too.

Nina can offer a route recognising the commercial task: place base and necessary additional cost together, explain setup's purpose and preserve understandable comparison. This editorial option illustrates an objection with an alternative without guaranteeing acceptance; it is no universal contract template. If management retains the earlier version, Nina reconsiders her contribution. She need not prove superiority to colleagues. She needs to decide which message she will sign or send, and accurately identify her participation boundary.

VI. An Alternative Must Change Means, Not Merely Labels

After objection, a document may change only verbally. An incomplete sum becomes “starting price” while other lines continue to promise a completed service at that cost. The earlier misunderstanding can remain. Check the resulting picture: does the customer understand the compulsory part, compare proposals and know what remains uncertain? This is a moral examination of meaning, rather than a legal test. Renaming helps only where actual clarity changes. Nina should evaluate the amended document anew rather than treat every managerial movement as a complete solution.

The proposal itself can honestly change. Setup can become genuinely optional where the service permits it. Cost can be combined, scope altered or stages agreed. Optionality should not exist only on paper where payment will remain unavoidable. An alternative must correspond to the actual service. Where Nina controls no technology, she asks a competent person for confirmation. Wanting a deal and having authority to announce feasible changed terms differ. An ethical objection does not permit inventing a convenient product the company does not provide.

Discussion may reveal a limit: the company cannot offer a full price before inspection. A moral decision then need not demand an invented precise sum. Preliminary status and a later agreement method can be made clear where they reflect actual conditions. Uncertainty is not deception; concealed uncertainty represented as settled promise is another matter. Nina can preserve limited data without stopping all work. The customer should know which decision is possible and what remains undetermined. Accuracy and honesty require no imitation of absent knowledge.

After amendment, check one's own communication. A corrected first page is insufficient if Nina's email still calls the earlier price final by habit. An agreed document and actual sending are distinct actions. Direct verification needs no complex system: read the final text and compare its stated cost with real conditions. If the customer already received an incomplete impression, the new version may need explicit clarification. Quiet file replacement does not guarantee corrected expectations. Responsibility concerns what was actually communicated, rather than merely the last document in a team folder.

VII. Refusal Also Needs Precision

Without a permissible option, Nina considers refusing particular participation. The boundary can be narrow: I will not send a message presenting unavoidable payment as absent. This differs from declaring all work at the company impossible or demanding that every colleague immediately act likewise. A broader conclusion may arise but needs its own grounds and decision. Precision avoids expanding conflict unnecessarily and concealing what remains accepted. Nina may be willing to prepare a clear proposal while rejecting the old wording; state those separately.

Refusal makes no person flawless. One questionable action can be rejected while another remains, personal advantage overlooked or excessive accusations conveyed to a customer. Means therefore remain subject to examination afterwards. In particular, the customer should not become an audience for a personal management conflict. A statement of service conditions and stories about internal relationships have different grounds. This article does not determine when wider disclosure of wrongdoing is required. Its current subject is that a boundary concerning one's commercial message grants no automatic permission to circulate all workplace information.

A theatrical refusal can leave actual action unchanged. Nina might proclaim principles and then send the old proposal without clarification. A declaration does not replace conduct. Conversely, a quiet clear amendment is no less moral for lacking a loud announcement. Check what was signed, sent and communicated, rather than how worthy someone appeared during an argument. This editorial distinction between state and image preserves practical meaning. It establishes no business success and promises no recognition or appreciation of responsibility.

Finally, a person can consider consequences for their life. Another role, support discussions and competent advice concerning working conditions may be sought. This neither betrays principle nor automatically justifies delayed participation. Name what is decided now, what remains uncertain and which part is still being performed. The article prescribes no single choice of resignation or endurance. Lack of a convenient exit should not be presented as absence of a moral question. An adult decision considers cost without letting it conceal the action's content and another participant's position.

VIII. A Deal's Outcome and a Decision's Quality Differ

Suppose the complete price became clear and the customer selected another company. This hypothetical conclusion tests the argument: permissible means cannot depend solely on winning. Nina may regret the bonus, and the team the lost workload. These consequences matter within the scene. Failure does not make the earlier presentation right. If the customer accepts clear terms, success likewise does not establish the moral perfection of every other action. Commercial outcome and a particular decision's quality deserve separate assessment.

Several things can be checked afterwards. Were inputs understood accurately? Did the document become clearer? Did contradictory words remain in the email? Did the customer receive clarification? Which part of her participation did Nina actually change? Such evidence supports learning without claiming victory in a moral contest. It requires no guessing everyone's inner motives. Incorrect data require correction of accusation or assessment. An accepted amendment can become a working example for a similar task without turning one case into a universal rule for every service.

Management relationships also need work. Nina can acknowledge commercial difficulties and clarify future practice: how necessary extras appear, who confirms preliminary cost and who owns final wording. Agreement does not establish implementation, but provides a subject for later checking. Preserve the distinction between an adopted rule and an actual communication. Relationships sometimes worsen; this article supplies no single-motive explanation or easy restoration promise. Moral action gives no control over another's response. It grounds more precise responsibility for one's contribution.

The divergence of advantage and permissibility rarely resolves through one elevated word. It needs facts, roles, knowledge limits, alternatives and willingness to see outcomes. Kantian dignity, Confucian righteousness and religious honesty of measure are not one theory; their grounds remain distinct. Limited comparison resists reducing work to winning at any cost. The editorial conclusion is simple in subject but may be costly in execution: one can want an outcome, while permission for its means requires separate grounds. An employee remains part of shared labour while retaining responsibility towards those whose decisions it affects.

What this means in practice

Consider one assignment whose desired outcome makes its means questionable. This editorial exercise has no established empirical efficacy. Record no secrets or documents beyond your access rights. Name a particular action rather than generally judging the company: what must you write, present, sign or confirm? Separate known, inferred and uncertain matters. Identify your actual role: what you decide, what you can clarify and what needs another's decision. Limited authority should remain visible without replacing the question about your own contribution.

Write the desired outcome and proposed method separately. Who benefits from the outcome? Whose decision depends on the method? Which significant fact should that participant understand? Check whether formal availability excuses profitable misunderstanding. Formulate an alternative genuinely changing the means: clear scope, confirmed conditions, honest preliminary status or another stage. Do not promise feasibility where specialist confirmation is needed. If rejected, identify the precise participation boundary you are considering and actual consequences for your life.

After deciding, read the final communication. Do its words correspond to what you find permissible? Did the recipient receive clarification if an earlier version was sent? Have unsupported motive assessments been added? Finally, separate the deal's outcome from the action's quality. Losing does not make an incomplete promise right; winning does not erase every question. Legal, employment and professional duties need applicable rules and competent advice that this exercise does not replace.

Key quotation

> *The mind of the superior man is conversant with righteousness.*

Analects IV.16, first clause, James Legge translation. The continuation contrasts the mean person's orientation towards gain. This historical distinction of direction does not prohibit every income.

Connections between traditions

Source	Its own question	Limited comparison	Boundary
Kant, Section II	Rational nature as an end in itself	Another participant is more than a means to a target	No contemporary contract regulation
Confucius, IV.10–16	Righteousness and orientation towards gain	Outcome does not exhaust permissibility	No condemnation of every financial motive
Proverbs 11:1–4	Accurate measure and righteousness before God	Honest exchange remains significant	No promise of an honest seller's profitability
United Wisdom	Hypothetical commercial proposal	Distinguish role, alternative and actual communication	No legal or employment advice

Sources

• Immanuel Kant. Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, Project Gutenberg 5682. Selected continuous Section II context from rational beings as ends through lying promises and beneficence, web lines 418–448, was read. The epigraph is a short sentence before the humanity formula. Reading of the whole book is not claimed.

• Confucius. The Analects, James Legge, Project Gutenberg 3330. IV.10–26 context was read; IV.10–16 are used, and the key quotation is IV.16's first clause. The superior person does not become a modern classification of employees' dignity.

• Proverbs, King James Version, Wikisource. 11:1–9 context was read; 11:1–4 are used. Accurate measure's religious grounds remain; market success is not promised. Full texts are not imported, and worldwide rights in historical editions are not declared established.

Tags

work, ethics, advantage, permissibility, profit, means, outcome, price, customer, agreement, role, assignment, responsibility, dignity, honesty, clarity, uncertainty, alternative, refusal, team, loyalty, bonus, boundary, verification, Kant, Confucius, Proverbs, decision

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

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.