

UNITED WISDOM

Weakness of Will: Why Knowing the Better Course Does Not Determine Action

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-04-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Weakness of Will: Why Knowing the Better Course Does Not Determine Action

Epigraph

> *not curable by a single volition*

Henry Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Book I, chapter V, §5, p.76. A short negative fragment concerning weakness of self-control. The RU text gives our own translation. This is historical ethical reasoning, rather than a diagnosis or a claim about treatment. Primary context.

What this article is about

People sometimes do what they themselves consider the worse of the available options. They may remember their reasons, acknowledge the consequences and make a convincing promise beforehand. The discrepancy is troubling precisely because an explanation seems already available: why did it fail to become an action? Yet knowledge, intention, the availability of an action and the conditions of carrying it out address different questions. When we confuse them, every lapse looks like evidence of a defective character, and every new promise looks like a sufficient remedy.

We will consider weakness of will as a limited philosophical description of a conflict between an acknowledged judgment and an action. Aristotle helps distinguish possessing knowledge from its participation in conduct; Sidgwick separates a present resolution from its uncertain future effect. This article does not establish the causes of anyone's particular behavior. It offers a more precise language for examining a recurring discrepancy while preserving the differences between explanation, responsibility and an unconditional judgment against the person.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. A Promise That Sounded Convincing

Imagine a fictional editor, Mikhail. He has decided to send colleagues comments only after reading carefully. Several earlier remarks made in haste had forced others to revise material that had already been agreed. He understands why the new procedure makes sense and sincerely wants to follow it. On Friday, just before leaving for home, he receives a disputed passage, spots what looks like a familiar error and sends a sharp message. The next morning, after reading the surrounding paragraphs, he realizes that the error was imaginary. His earlier resolution had not vanished, but his action failed to follow it.

The scene does not explain his motive. We do not know whether he was rushing, feared losing influence, misjudged the urgency or simply repeated a familiar way of responding. First, we can preserve a minimal description: there was a rule; he accepted its basis; a particular situation arose; his conduct broke the rule. Turning those four observations into a conclusion about his personality would be premature. The precision of this initial description affects the problem we will later try to address.

His colleagues also experienced the consequences regardless of the quality of his promise. A sincere intention did not return their time or make his message considerate. Examining weakness of will should not cancel that external result. Yet the result alone does not reveal the structure of his inner conflict. He can acknowledge the inconvenience, clarify the work and decline an overly broad explanation that he always chooses harm or is incapable of considering others.

Weakness of will becomes a meaningful description only when we compare the action with the agent's own acknowledged judgment. Another person's displeasure does not establish such a discrepancy. If Mikhail considers a quick response justified and has openly revised the earlier procedure, the question concerns the quality of that decision. If the procedure was imposed through threats, coercion becomes relevant. Our subject begins where he still regards careful reading as the better available course and nevertheless acts otherwise.

II. Knowing a Rule and Using It

In Book VII of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, especially VII.3, Aristotle distinguishes knowledge a person possesses from knowledge active in the situation. This historical analysis is more than advice to repeat the right sentence to oneself. It asks why accepting a general proposition is insufficient to describe an action. We need this narrower question about knowledge and particular conduct, rather than the full range of ancient character assessments. Primary text, VII.1–3.

Mikhail might have explained the new editorial procedure perfectly even while answering in haste. But the message did not arrive as an exercise asking him to recite a rule. He saw a particular paragraph, recognized a familiar expression, decided he had understood the problem and acted. Another assessment stood between the general judgment and the case: this is precisely a situation that requires prior reading. If that assessment is absent or mistaken, clarity about the general rule does not ensure its proper application.

This does not imply that people always act without knowledge or that every breach is involuntary. Mikhail may have remembered everything and consciously preferred to speak immediately. That would be another form of conflict. The distinction is useful because it does not turn one convenient cause into an explanation of every case. It leaves room for misrecognition, conflicting assessments and a refusal to carry out one's own decision. Asking whether someone knew the better course cannot, by itself, establish which of these occurred.

In another similar case, we could ask about the moment the rule was applied, as well as whether it was known. When did Mikhail realize he was about to send a comment? How did he decide that his reading was sufficient? Could he have seen the context before answering? These questions do not expose a hidden psychology. They reconstruct the sequence. Sometimes this reveals a useful difference between a rule someone supports in conversation and an action they can recognize as breaking it.

III. A Present Resolution Does Not Sign for the Future

In Book I of *The Methods of Ethics*, chapter V, §5, Sidgwick separates a present resolution from its future effectiveness. Today's confidence does not, in his account, tell us the exact extent of tomorrow's influence. We can use this point without adopting his historical examples and general moral assessments as contemporary evidence. It limits a promise: an intention may matter, but its actual effect remains to be seen. Selected primary context, pp.74–76.

On Monday, Mikhail sincerely regarded the new procedure as binding. On Friday, he faced a different combination of circumstances: a text he had not finished, the end of the working day, an open message window and the feeling that he had already found the answer. His intention linked the two moments without making them identical. Saying that he had promised does not explain how the promise was supposed to participate in Friday's action. This missing transition often disappears behind the demand simply to resolve more strongly.

He could make his promise louder, more public or stricter. Greater expressiveness, however, does not necessarily alter what happens at the next difficulty. If he adds a solemn formula without clarifying sufficient reading and the order of response, he may face the same uncertainty again. This is neither a law of behavior nor a prediction of his future. It is a question

of logical sufficiency: the new promise still contains nothing that addresses the identified question about carrying it out.

A limited effect does not make a resolution useless. Mikhail might remember the procedure earlier, notice his haste and leave the message as a draft. We can describe this possibility without promising it will occur. A resolution acquires testable content when an observable form of participation is added. It is more accurate to speak of the next available case and its conditions than to declare an entire future character repaired. The scale of a promise should fit the scale of what someone can actually check.

IV. Two Meanings of Better

In a conflict of will, better can mean an acknowledged general preference or whatever seems more attractive right now. Mikhail regards a thoughtful comment as more useful for the shared work. An immediate reply may nevertheless seem convenient because it closes the conversation and lets him leave. These descriptions need not coincide. They concern different consequences and different time horizons. Understanding the discrepancy requires more than calling one desire authentic and the other foreign to the person.

We can clarify the comparison. Better for the text's accuracy, for today's convenience, for relationships with colleagues or for a sense of completion? This does not make the options equally valuable. It identifies the reasons someone acknowledges and those they actually consider. Mikhail may regard convenience as important, but he cannot simply call it the same reason for which he adopted the editorial procedure. When words conceal a change of subject, the conflict seems more mysterious than its description warrants.

There may also be a genuine change of judgment. New information could lead Mikhail to conclude that delaying the comment would now cause more harm than a brief check. His earlier decision need not then operate mechanically. A candid reassessment is needed: what fact changed, why is the new course preferable, and what remains unknown? Without such a change, calling the action a revision would be excessively generous if the earlier reason returns only afterward. Even here, though, the facts must be examined rather than guessed.

An examination should therefore not demand that every preference remain fixed forever. People can change decisions, acknowledge mistakes and clarify circumstances. The difficulty arises when a supposed revision is named without the reasoning itself, while the earlier judgment remains accepted. This boundary preserves the freedom to reconsider without dissolving one's participation. Otherwise, every action could be called a new choice and every new promise a continuation of the old one, even after the substantive connection between them had disappeared.

V. We Cannot Assume an Action Was Available

Before speaking of choosing against a better judgment, we should consider the available options carefully. Mikhail might have been able to read the neighboring paragraphs, or he might have lacked access to them. He might have been able to postpone his answer, or someone might have demanded immediate approval. Such circumstances alter the discussion. Ignoring them turns weakness of will into a universal explanation applied equally to a free, hasty message and conduct under pressure from others. That language is insufficiently precise for either case.

Availability is not the same as ease. Reading can be unpleasant, take time and require admitting that the first guess was mistaken. Yet unpleasantness and impossibility are different claims. Mikhail can name a particular obstacle before choosing between complete self-blame and complete exoneration. Missing text, missing time, an unclear criterion and difficulty tolerating a pause mean different things. An honest examination begins by distinguishing these possibilities rather than searching for one explanation that will cover them all.

A philosophical distinction also gives an outsider no right to dismiss the obstacle. A colleague may see only the sending time and know little about Mikhail's working conditions. Mikhail himself may remember the sequence imperfectly. We can preserve the boundary of knowledge: a breach is established; some circumstances are known; causes remain open. This caution does not remove the need to correct the message. It prevents correction from becoming a claim that every internal and external condition is already understood and no further conversation is needed.

When threats, coercion or substantial risk are involved, a voluntary exercise in self-observation may be inappropriate. The issue then exceeds a private discrepancy between intention and action. Better self-management cannot substitute for safety or needed support. Our fictional editorial case was chosen because it permits discussion of an ordinary, reversible act. Applying it to severe life circumstances without further grounds would be mistaken, even where some of the words happen to sound similar.

VI. Acknowledge a Consequence Without Passing Sentence

Mikhail needs to correct a particular message. He can do that before completing a philosophical explanation: say that his initial assessment was inaccurate, withdraw the mistaken requirement and clarify which changes are actually needed. His colleagues may need this sooner than a long account of his inner conflict. Responsibility has a practical object here. He participates in restoring the shared work rather than presenting the depth of his self-analysis as a substitute for correcting the inconvenience.

Acknowledging a consequence can easily become an excessively broad statement about oneself. After the mistake, Mikhail might conclude that he is wholly unreliable. The scale and evidence for that claim differ from those of an action description. One case shows a breach of one procedure in particular circumstances. Repeated cases call for closer attention, but they too do not reveal an entire personality. A general verdict can sound severe while leaving the actual working procedure entirely unexamined.

Self-compassion need not erase the consequence either. Mikhail can acknowledge fatigue and still correct his hasty demand. He can find the situation difficult and consider how to mark insufficient reading in advance. There is no need to choose between harsh condemnation and unconditional justification. Both extremes bypass the precise question of what occurred and what participation is now available. A narrower language leaves room to act without promising that understanding alone will solve the whole problem.

His colleagues cannot be required to restore trust immediately. If similar breaches have occurred before, they may retain reasonable doubts. Mikhail earns no right to demand a fresh start merely by expressing the correct thoughts. Trust belongs to a relationship among people, rather than to one participant. He can propose a clear commenting procedure and follow it in subsequent cases. Whether others accept the proposal, and when they consider it sufficient, remains a separate question that his inner effort cannot settle on their behalf.

VII. Explanation Should Not Be the Final Action

Reconstructing the sequence can help, but description itself can replace the next step. Mikhail could write a detailed note about haste defeating intention while leaving his inaccurate comment in the working discussion. His analysis might then be precise in some respects, yet the situation would remain uncorrected. Once again, thinking about an action differs from acting. This matters especially here: an account of weakness of will can itself become a way of continuing the original discrepancy.

It helps to identify the purpose of the examination. To clarify a fact, reconstruct the reading and the message. To change the next response, develop a procedure usable in a similar case. To examine a relationship with work, have a broader conversation that cannot be reduced to one habit. These tasks may coexist, but they should not silently replace one another. Completing one does not establish completion of the others. This is an editorial distinction, rather than a promise of a universal self-control method.

Mikhail might agree to mark a comment as provisional whenever his reading is incomplete. The procedure neither makes him infallible nor guarantees restraint. It changes the available description of the action: a testable hypothesis takes the place of a final demand. His colleagues can assess its degree of confidence and respond accordingly. If the procedure

proves inconvenient, they can reconsider it together. The value lies in an agreed clarity, rather than in someone's perfect victory over all their impulses.

A small change should address the identified question. If the problem was missing context, penalizing a sharp tone may leave it unresolved. If context was available but Mikhail consciously considered checking unnecessary, an extra link also fails to address the entire conflict. We are not establishing the correct explanation for any real case. We are placing a requirement on it: distinguish observable circumstances, and avoid proposing an action whose connection to the problem rests solely on an impressive name.

VIII. Repetition Changes the Question

A single mistake and a recurring discrepancy call for different attention. After the first case, someone can clarify the rule and observe the next one. If Mikhail repeatedly acknowledges carefulness as preferable but answers otherwise, the earlier explanation may be insufficient. Repetition does not establish a single hidden cause. It shows that the current description or chosen change has not yet explained the transition that matters. Recognizing this limitation is more useful than repeatedly strengthening the same promise and treating it as new work.

When comparing cases, notice differences as well as the shared outcome. Hasty responses might appear near the end of the day while the procedure works at other times. They might concern one disputed kind of text. There may be no stable connection to either condition. Each possibility needs facts. A few recollections are not a study and cannot predict every future action. Yet a careful record of particular situations can make the next conversation less dependent on general character judgments and more attentive to established circumstances.

Endless self-observation should not be a condition of dignity. A person may decline the exercise or choose another way of working. Serious consequences, or difficulties beyond a reversible editorial situation, may require suitable professional or organizational support. This article does not prescribe its form. Its narrower point is that repetition gives reason to reconsider the adequacy of the earlier examination. It gives the author no right to diagnose a reader or impose a single correct measure of inner discipline.

Repetition also offers a way to see partial results. Mikhail may still answer too quickly while marking provisionality more often or withdrawing an inaccurate assessment sooner. This is neither a fully established new procedure nor an absence of change. We need a language that names a particular improvement without celebrating final victory. Otherwise, only impeccable performance and complete failure will be visible, and we will lose the distinctions for which the detailed examination of participation began.

IX. What the Philosophical Concept Preserves

Weakness of will remains useful while it preserves a particular tension: someone accepts a judgment as better, yet an available action departs from it. If it names every difficulty, it ceases to distinguish subjects. Missing information, a changed goal, disagreement with another's demand and an obstacle do not become one phenomenon simply because someone has not done something. Sometimes precision requires setting the concept aside. This does not abandon attention to conduct; it selects a more appropriate question about the situation.

This approach also changes how advice is received. Being told to want something more strongly may express support without adding useful content. What change is proposed, how would it appear in the next action, and which conditions have been considered? Without clarification, the advice remains a wish. We can appreciate the wish without treating it as an explanation. Neither ancient ethics nor historical moral philosophy relieves a present-day speaker of considering the actual subject and the limits of their knowledge about another person.

Mikhail's central question becomes less about whether he is a good enough person and more about the sequence. How does an acknowledged reason enter a particular assessment? How does that assessment become a message? When is the discrepancy discovered? What needs correction regardless of its cause? These questions may have no quick, comprehensive answer. Their value is to return attention to separate distinctions. Even incomplete understanding can be more useful than a final verdict that closes inquiry while leaving the act imprecisely described.

Philosophical clarity does not guarantee behavioral change. A reader may accept every distinction and face the same difficulty again. That does not invalidate precise language, but it reveals its limit. Explanation helps us avoid confusing questions; carrying out the action remains a separate event. We promise no transition from reading an article correctly to lasting self-control. Such restraint preserves our subject: knowledge of a better course should not quietly become evidence that the better action has already occurred.

X. A More Limited, More Honest Promise

After examining the case, Mikhail can promise a particular procedure for his next comment rather than complete infallibility. He will check the surrounding paragraphs, identify what remains unread and separate an observation from a demand for revision. These actions do not exhaust the ethics of collaborative work, but they address the identified questions and allow checking. If the situation changes, the procedure can be reconsidered with a stated reason. The promise becomes a comprehensible proposal for future participation rather than testimony that reliability has already been achieved.

The proposal need not be insignificant. For colleagues, a clear degree of confidence may matter more than an impressive acknowledgment of error. For Mikhail, a definite object of action may help more than a general battle with himself. We are neither comparing their experiences nor claiming that one approach is always better. Specificity lets people discuss a promise without guessing at someone's inner strength. They can see what it concerns, what it leaves out and which cases may allow its fulfillment to be assessed.

In this language, weakness of will does not become a permanent name for the person. It remains a question about a discrepancy that needs describing and sometimes explaining. One case may require checking the situation, another reconsidering conflicting reasons, and a third gaining access to the conditions for action. The article does not select the right option for its reader. It asks that they not be confused and that present confidence not be required to know the entire future. The right to decide again remains alongside attention to past consequences.

The final orientation is simple in form but demands care: say less than you would like to promise, and be more precise than is convenient to explain. Mikhail does not yet know how all the coming Fridays will unfold. He knows which message was inaccurate, what remained unread and what check he can offer now. This is insufficient for a final assessment of character. It may be enough to begin particular work in which an acknowledged judgment and a completed action are no longer presented as substitutes for one another.

What this means in practice

If the situation is safe and reversible, and you want to examine it, choose one recent case. Avoid an event involving threats, coercion or serious harm. First record only the action that occurred and the judgment you yourself then considered preferable. Separately mark what is known about the circumstances and what remains a supposition. This is a voluntary exercise in descriptive precision, rather than a measurement of personal strength.

Check three distinctions: did the earlier judgment remain accepted; was the corresponding action available; and when was the particular situation recognized as a case for applying the resolution? You need not answer everything immediately. Mark insufficient information as such. If someone else was affected, separately identify a possible correction without requiring them to accept your explanation or restore trust at once.

For one subsequent similar case, you might propose a specific procedure to yourself or the participants: mark provisionality, check a missing fact or postpone a final demand until reading is complete. The result will describe only what happened in that case. Success does not prove a lasting trait; another discrepancy does not establish a diagnosis. You can stop without blaming yourself. If the exercise increases pressure or proves inappropriate, choose suitable support and do not use a philosophical article as a substitute for it.

Key quotation

> *the extent of our weakness*

Henry Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Book I, chapter V, §5, concluding paragraph on p.76. The RU text gives our own translation of this short fragment from a warning against self-deception. Here it concerns a realistic assessment of future performance, rather than a permanent name for the person.

Connections between traditions

Aristotle considers knowledge's participation in conduct within virtue ethics. Sidgwick discusses the limits of a present resolution when considering future actions. Both selected supports let us ask what an acknowledged judgment alone does not show. Their philosophical projects and foundations differ, however; related questions do not make them a single behavioral theory.

Mikhail's editorial scene is our own fictional application of these distinctions. It neither reproduces an ancient example nor confirms historical theories experimentally. Its subject differs from the earlier material on four directions of effort: this article concerns a conflict between an acknowledged better course and conduct, rather than the direction or intensity of practice.

Sources

1. Henry Sidgwick, *The Methods of Ethics*, Book I, chapter V, §5, selected paragraphs on pp.74–76. Project Gutenberg46743. A support for limiting promises of future effectiveness; selected contexts read, rather than the whole book. Rights for this historical version and territory are not declared identical worldwide.

2. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, VII.1–3, translated by W. D. Ross. Internet Classics Archive. Selected primary analysis of knowledge and conduct actually read; historical ethics is not adopted as a contemporary clinical explanation.

Tags

will, weakness of will, akrasia, knowledge, action, intention, promise, decision, judgment, self-control, responsibility, circumstances, availability, performance, reconsideration, consequences, trust, caution, ethics, Aristotle, Sidgwick, moral philosophy, distinction, editing, collaborative work, self-description, checking, 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.