

UNITED WISDOM

Moral luck: consequences a person did not choose

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-01-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Moral luck: consequences a person did not choose

Epigraph

> *factors beyond his control*

Thomas Nagel, *Moral Luck*, paragraph defining moral luck, printed pp. 203–204 in the anthology read, PDF pp. 1–2. Short fragment. Version read.

What this article is about

Two people may make similar decisions with similar information and then encounter entirely different results. In one case, a mistake goes unnoticed and affects no one; in another, circumstances make it cause actual harm. A difficult question arises: why does our assessment of a person change with what they did not choose? Can we separate fair attention to consequences from attributing complete control of events to them?

This article considers moral luck as a philosophical problem rather than a ready-made justification for any act. We distinguish the decision, the conditions known at the time, the contingent course of events, and the actual result. This distinction erases no harm and proves no innocence. Nagel's historical context helps expose a tension between control and moral judgment. The contemporary scenes here are hypothetical and author-created; they are neither legal conclusions nor observations of actual participants.

I. A similar decision can meet a different fate

Imagine two participants in different small projects. Each forwards a working file without checking one line, although checking was part of the accepted task. In the first project, the recipient notices the mistake before using the file and requests a correction. In the second, the file immediately enters shared material that must subsequently be redone. The senders' carelessness in this hypothetical scene is described identically. The consequences differ, however: one needs only to replace a line; others must revisit completed work. We cannot honestly call these identical events merely because the senders' decisions resemble each other.

At the same time, the additional work does not prove the second sender decided to act worse than the first. The difference may arise from the file's later use, the speed of transmission, or the moment of discovery. If we want to assess the decision to forward something unchecked,

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

these conditions must be distinguished from it. If we want to describe harm, they cannot be removed from the account. Two connected but distinct questions arise: how well grounded was the person's choice, and what actually happened with their action's involvement?

Difficulty begins when one question quietly answers for the other. A bad outcome can make the decision look obviously worse, although both participants had the same information before sending. A good outcome can turn an equally unchecked transmission into a story of successful trust. Yet luck does not establish the quality of checking, and harm does not prove the person knew its exact scale beforehand. These distinctions are needed before explaining the participants' characters, degree of attention, or intentional attitude toward others' work.

The comparison remains hypothetical. In an actual dispute, similarity between decisions still needs to be established: the participants may have had different roles, information, and opportunities to check. We cannot declare them identical based only on a short description of the result. Our scene temporarily holds these conditions constant to expose a separate question about an action's fate. It offers no way to transfer that conclusion automatically to an unfamiliar person or release them from discussing actual differences that emerge through a more precise reconstruction of events.

We should also notice the limit of a story about what might have happened. A different possible outcome does not establish that it was inevitable or equally likely. In the hypothetical scene, we do not know error frequencies or the arrangements in every other project. We therefore calculate no degree of luck. We simply see that a result depends on an additional event. This philosophical distinction is not statistics: it cannot predict how often a participant will be lucky or assess future reliability from one favorable instance.

II. The result belongs to an event, not only an intention

A participant may say they did not intend to inconvenience anyone. That is a significant statement of their intention if accepted as their own explanation rather than verified access to an inner state. The absence of intention nevertheless does not make the rework nonexistent. People spent time, material became unusable, and an agreed stage was delayed. These consequences can be described without asserting that the sender wanted them. Between acknowledging an event and concluding intentional hostility, room remains for a more precise conversation.

The reverse distinction matters too. If the mistake was noticed early, the participant may have avoided harm through someone else's attention. This does not mean they themselves checked the line. Their decision remains unchecked despite a more favorable result. We can thank the recipient for the correction without turning that help into proof of the sender's reliability. Luck

appears here not only through a contingent external event but also through other people's actions, which the person did not choose and cannot claim as their own prudent decision.

Assessing an event therefore calls for several descriptions. What did the sender do? What were they relying on? What was known about later use? Where did the mistake arise? Who noticed it, and when? Each question can alter the account, but none is entitled to absorb the others beforehand. In the hypothetical scene, the omitted check is known; unknown intention is unnecessary to identify the omission. The omission does not yet explain every recipient's action or the project arrangement through which the mistake spread further.

Involvement also differs from permission. A sender may be a link in transmitting material without consenting to its later alteration or publication. If a later result is connected to that alteration, who chose it needs separate consideration. Otherwise participation quietly expands into endorsement of everything that followed. Our hypothetical scene establishes no rights to a particular file; it shows why an event's sequence should preserve different people's different decisions. One shared outcome does not make them a single will.

III. A favorable outcome grants no permission to repeat a risk

Suppose that, after the first case, the participant decides checking the line is unnecessary: everything turned out fine. This conclusion uses a favorable result as permission for another unchecked transmission. The result showed only that someone noticed the mistake in time on that occasion. It did not prove someone would always be available to notice it or that a new line would enter the same working arrangement. A favorable ending and grounds for the next decision therefore need separate consideration; one lucky case should not become a property of every future action.

This does not demand checking everything indefinitely. Everyday tasks can involve limited checks, agreed roles, and acceptable limits on preparation. The question is not complete protection against every possible outcome. It is which check belonged to this agreement and whether its absence was noticed. If participants decide to change the arrangement, that new decision needs discussion. It cannot be presented as already accepted because another person previously happened to remove an error.

In a hypothetical project, the group may agree on a second review if appropriate and if time is available. It may choose another format or reduce the scope. Such decisions belong to the participants rather than luck itself. A new arrangement does not guarantee the absence of every mistake. It changes only a particular part of preparation that can be named and checked. Past success remains a past fact: it should become neither a license for carelessness nor proof that any additional check must produce a good result.

IV. Nagel leaves the tension open

In the selected Nagel context, moral judgment persists although an action depends substantially on what is beyond control. He considers consequences as one form of this dependence and claims no satisfactory solution to the problem. This is a philosophical argument rather than a legally established measure of responsibility. We next propose our own distinctions for hypothetical scenes; they neither eliminate the paradox nor constitute Nagel's final answer. It is especially important not to turn his difficult question into a simple formula claiming that incomplete control always cancels every assessment.

In our scene, we can regard the omitted check as identical for both senders while recognizing a difference in what happened. The question remains, however, of how that difference should influence assessment of the person. Some will emphasize that the second case required actual repair. Others will emphasize that harsher condemnation depends on a contingent chain of use. Renaming an event alone cannot reconcile these arguments. Their grounds for disagreement must remain visible rather than every dispute being declared a product of insufficient understanding or unwillingness to be fair.

An open difficulty does not make discussion useless. Even without a final moral formula, we can clarify the sequence, acknowledge the omitted check, and agree on available work now. This is a narrower task. It does not require first deciding whether the person deserves a precisely defined measure of condemnation in every possible world. Sometimes a practical agreement emerges while philosophical disagreement persists. This does not refute moral luck's problem; it shows that resolving the current task and finally grounding a moral judgment need not conclude together.

Nor should philosophical openness become a mandatory demand placed on someone affected. They may not be ready to discuss a paradox when they need corrected material. Lack of interest in theory does not imply inability to understand circumstances. An available action can be discussed more narrowly without requiring acceptance of a single conception of moral luck. This preserves the difference between voluntary philosophical conversation and an ordinary agreement about a current task. The source helps pose a question; it grants no right to prescribe another person a compulsory lesson.

V. Later knowledge did not exist beforehand

After discovery of a mistake, a person may be told they should have understood where everything would lead. Sometimes there are grounds for this: later use was known, checking was available, and a warning had arrived. Sometimes, however, the resulting chain became visible only afterward. Information that could have been considered must be distinguished from details arising later. Otherwise, the result becomes an imagined memory of the participant, as though they saw the file's entire subsequent path when sending it and consciously chose every stage.

In a hypothetical case, one sender knows the file will immediately enter shared material while another regards it as a draft for review. Their decisions can no longer be described as identical. The difference arises from initial information and the transmission's purpose rather than luck alone. In another version, both know the same things, but only the second file is unexpectedly used early. These versions do not establish culpability; they demonstrate that reconstructing knowledge changes the object of comparison. The outcome itself does not reveal which version is true.

Nor can every decision be defended by appealing to unpredictability. A person may not have known the exact outcome but may have known about the omitted check and possible rework. Uncertainty about scale does not mean a complete absence of grounds for attention. We need to name which risk was known and which was attributed later. This precision promises neither simple exoneration nor accusation. It retains different degrees of knowledge, allowing discussion without demanding that everything be known beforehand or treating every unknown as equally excusing.

Finally, information being available differs from its actual receipt. It may have been in a shared folder without being communicated; a participant may have known where to look but deliberately not opened it; instructions may have been clear or contradictory. Each version raises a different question. A file's existence does not establish knowledge; lack of reading does not establish unavailability. Reconstructing conditions therefore requires describing the communication route. We gain no ready-made moral answer but stop replacing particular differences with one imprecise word: could.

VI. Regret and acknowledgment of an omission are different

A person can regret their involvement in an event even when no omission of theirs is established. In an invented scene, they deliver valid material that is later altered without their knowledge. They may find it unpleasant that their work became connected to someone else's rework. That feeling does not prove they omitted a check or chose the alteration. An account of regret cannot automatically establish authorship of an error. Equally, the absence of a public expression of regret gives no reliable knowledge of inner indifference.

If one's own omission is established, it can be acknowledged precisely: an accepted check was not performed. This does not require claiming to have caused everything that followed. The person can offer to correct the available part. The acknowledgment and proposal do not remove others' right to discuss actual harm. They may have encountered consequences that replacing one line cannot repair. Moral luck should not be used here to demand that affected people stop noticing what actually happened to their work.

Distinguishing regret, omission, and assistance protects conversation from exchanging ready-made labels. A person can help without accepting an accusation of intentional harm. They can acknowledge the missed check without knowing how to restore all lost time. They can decline an additional task beyond their abilities without denying their earlier action. These combinations call for discussion rather than automatic conclusions about innocence or lack of conscience. They allow particular responsibility to remain visible without making an expressed feeling the sole evidence of a fact.

A person may also keep their regret out of public view. They can deliver the necessary correction and discuss a particular omission without publicly describing feelings. Others may find this behavior less understandable, but incomprehensibility supplies no reliable access to an inner state. A hypothetical group can agree on further action while keeping emotional disclosure private. This neither erases harm nor demands trust in every explanation. It simply prevents checking events from being replaced by judging how convincingly a feeling is expressed.

VII. Luck works through others' decisions and working arrangements

In the first hypothetical scene, the sender's mistake is not all that matters. Who opens the file, when it is checked, and how a draft becomes shared material also matter. Sometimes this arrangement is established in advance, sometimes habitual, and sometimes unknown to the participant. The sender does not control all these decisions. The group can nevertheless discuss them separately from the sender's omission. This need not diminish checking's significance. It shows why one mistake stopped at a line while another acquired an opportunity to affect subsequent work.

We cannot conclude that the collective arrangement is at fault instead of the person. The sender's hypothetical action and the project's structure may matter simultaneously. If every discussion of transmission is declared self-justification, we lose an opportunity to see a recurring point of difficulty. If every mistake is explained only by the group's structure, the particular omitted check disappears. A precise inquiry retains both levels without requiring equal allocation of responsibility beforehand. Their share cannot be established by counting participants or wishing to end the dispute with a peaceful compromise.

Nor can arrangements necessarily be changed alone. One participant proposes marking a file as a draft; another decides whether that mark suits their work. The proposal remains a proposal until agreed. It does not make its author director of all later actions. Initiative here means identifying an available change rather than promising to eliminate contingency. A new arrangement may reduce a particular uncertainty if actually adopted and followed; the article does not present this conditional expectation as a verified effect or a guarantee of every project's safety.

VIII. Assessing harm does not mean assessing the entire person

When an outcome is painful, attention easily shifts from the action to the person. One mistake may generate a description of someone as permanently unreliable. That expansion requires additional grounds absent from the scene itself. It contains a missed check and particular consequences. It says nothing about the participant's entire history, other decisions, or ability to change arrangements. The article therefore remains within the action and event. This does not forbid distrust; it limits an assertion that can be supported by available information.

A favorable outcome does not establish general virtue either. If someone else's check saved the material, the sender may be in a more comfortable position without becoming someone who always acts attentively. Project success and assessment of all its participants are different questions. We can celebrate completion, thank someone for correction, and still

discuss the absent check. Symmetry matters here: if we do not infer an entire character from harm, we should not infer it from luck either. Otherwise, personal assessment remains dependent on a contingent outcome, merely with a pleasant sign.

Limiting an inference does not require continuing earlier cooperation. Another participant may decide they are unwilling to continue or need different conditions. This is a separate decision about a future relationship rather than proof of a universal moral characterization. Conditions for continuing can be discussed without first agreeing about every motive and feeling. Conversely, refusing continuation does not automatically grant a right to circulate a personal explanation beyond the agreed people. Considering an event and publicly describing a participant also require different grounds.

Assessments may differ because people answer different questions. The recipient speaks of lost time, the sender of intention, and the coordinator of future arrangements. Each can communicate something important without refuting the others. If these parts appear as competing complete explanations, however, conversation easily becomes a dispute over who is entitled to notice an event. Naming each assessment's subject can help first. This does not guarantee reconciliation but prevents a report of consequences from becoming proof of knowledge of someone else's intention, or the reverse denial of consequences.

IX. Repair addresses the present, not a different past fate

After an unfavorable outcome, a person may want to demonstrate that slightly different circumstances would have let everything turn out fine. This can help reveal contingency's role but cannot give the event another fate. People have already redone material or lost time. Distinguishing possible from actual should therefore lead to a question about an available present action if the parties want continuation. A participant can correct a line, transmit information, or acknowledge a limit to assistance. A precise philosophical explanation alone cannot make past harm never have happened.

In an invented project, the sender offers to prepare a corrected version. The recipient may accept, choose another contributor, or refuse further work. An offer does not purchase obligatory agreement. Even an accepted correction does not prove that an earlier assessment was wrong or everything fully restored. It addresses a narrower need now. That scale does not make assistance pointless. It avoids assigning assistance the simultaneous task of repairing material, another person's attitude, and the participant's entire moral standing.

Similarly, a lucky sender may revise their own check even though no one had to redo work. They need not imagine harm as already having occurred. It is enough to recognize that success depended on another person's intervention and discuss future arrangements if appropriate. Attention to one's action need not wait for a severe outcome. But a new

preparation method should not be presented as proven inner transformation. Only a particular accepted action is confirmed so far, and it still needs to be performed.

X. An open question does not cancel precision

Moral luck remains a tension between what a person chose and what they are assessed for after an event. The article does not close that tension with a general formula. We can seek to consider control while recognizing harm that actually occurred. In a particular conversation, these grounds sometimes produce different assessments. Their difference should not be hidden under a promise of universal agreement. Naming the precise subject is more useful: a decision based on earlier information, an omitted check, an actual result, or the next available contribution.

Precision also requires patience with unknowns. Without information about when a message arrived, its timing cannot be reconstructed from the intensity of someone's indignation. Silence cannot be declared an acknowledgment of intention. Absence of harm cannot establish that checking occurred. These limits create no new exonerating scheme; they maintain a distinction between fact and guess. Where information is incomplete, an assessment may remain conditional or limited. That is more honest than choosing a confident answer merely because a conversation needs a quick end.

A clearer conversation does not guarantee an easier outcome. Participants may continue to disagree or discontinue cooperation. They may nevertheless avoid one substitution: presenting an action's contingent fate as the person's complete choice, or incomplete choice as the absence of an event. Between these two extreme reductions, work of attention remains. It connects one's action, its conditions, and the actual present without promising control over luck or depriving others of the right to discuss consequences they really experienced.

If discussion concerns an actual legal decision, this article's philosophical distinctions are insufficient. Applicable rules, facts, and appropriate consideration of the particular case are required. We establish no measure a court, organization, or another party must adopt. This limit matters beyond textual accuracy. It leaves room for moral judgment, personal attitudes, and formal decisions to have different grounds. A proposed distinction cannot be presented as authority to cancel another person's demand or predetermine a procedure's outcome.

What this means in practice

If suitable, consider one small, safe working incident without threat, coercion, or painful examination of serious harm. It might involve only the ordinary delivery of a draft. The exercise is voluntary; you may decline without explaining why.

For yourself, divide the account into three parts: what was known before the action, which action was accepted, and what became known afterward. Separately mark missing information. Do not invent others' motives or infer character from one result. If an appropriate opportunity remains, formulate one present proposal: clarify the material's status, deliver a correction, or discuss a limited check. This proposal is not yet a shared decision.

The expected narrow result is a clearer distinction between earlier knowledge, one's own action, and consequences. This establishes no innocence and does not guarantee agreement, forgiveness, or the elimination of every mistake. Stop the trial if there is pressure, threat, unwanted publicity, or a demand to disclose personal information. Continuing requires no demonstration of courage; stopping is no moral failure.

Key quotation

> *we possess no satisfactory solution*

Thomas Nagel, *Moral Luck*, first continuing author paragraph on printed p. 203, PDF p. 1. Short fragment. It concerns the philosophical problem posed rather than the impossibility of every practical action. Version read.

Connections between traditions

Nagel's selected context retains the difficulty of moral assessment depending on what is beyond control. In the Adam Smith fragment actually read, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, II.III, chance's influence on assessments is considered. This implies neither identical systems nor a shared solution. The narrow connection is the question of the result's role; the boundary is a different philosophical argument and historical context. Contemporary scenes and the exercise belong to this article's authors; the sources' historical legal examples do not become a current rule for the reader.

Sources

• Thomas Nagel. Moral Luck. A selected continuous context of PDF pp. 0–4 was read, including separately identified editorial introduction and Kant quotation; Nagel's author-text is used. The anthology identifies *Mortal Questions*, 1979; the work is associated with the 1976 publication. Neither the complete essay nor the first publication was read.

• Adam Smith. The Theory of Moral Sentiments, Part II, Section III. A selected continuous context of the end of Chapter I and opening of II, web lines 24–67, was actually read. Comparison only, without new direct quotation; neither the entire book nor section was read.

Tags

moral luck, consequences, decision, control, chance, responsibility, intention, assessment, harm, knowledge, time, uncertainty, checking, mistake, action, circumstances, regret, repair, proposal, consent, refusal, boundaries, relationships, Nagel, Smith, moral philosophy, independence, cooperation, voluntariness, distinction

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.