

UNITED WISDOM

A Shared Step With an Unknown Outcome: Agreement Without Equal Confidence

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-08-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A Shared Step With an Unknown Outcome: Agreement Without Equal Confidence

Epigraph

> *“Mutual obligation”.*

Hugo Grotius, The Rights of War and Peace, II.XI.XV; short fragment of A. C. Campbell's 1901 translation, with editorial initial capitalisation. The selected historical argument distinguishes accepting a promise from communicating acceptance. It is neither current contract law nor a requirement to agree to an uncertain outcome.

What this article is about

A shared undertaking sometimes has to begin before all its conditions are understood. People agree to prepare a small glossary for a difficult text, hold a discussion or examine a project's possibilities without knowing its eventual scope. Uncertainty does not necessarily make agreement meaningless. Yet agreeing to join a trial differs from confidence in its outcome, a promise to accept every expansion of the work and one participant's right to decide for everyone else.

This article examines what such agreement contains. What does someone confirm when an important question remains open? How can shared responsibility be preserved without making each person's commitment unlimited? In selected passages of *On Liberty*, John Stuart Mill connects personal freedom with mutual obligations and other people's interests. His historical philosophy is not current contract law. Our hypothetical scenes and voluntary exercise concern small, safe tasks. They distinguish an unknown outcome from definite participation that can be offered, confirmed, clarified or declined.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. An Action Can Be Agreed Before Its Result Is Known

Several volunteers want to prepare explanations for an old, publicly available printed text. They would like to make it easier to read together. Yet they do not know how many unfamiliar words they will encounter, which passages need another source or whether the whole text can be completed. One participant suggests starting with two pages. That proposal has a definite subject despite an unknown result. Someone can confirm reading those pages, a discussion time and a form for the notes without asserting that every expression will be explained correctly or that a complete glossary will certainly appear.

The distinction between agreement and prediction matters here. Agreement concerns the part in which someone will participate. A prediction concerns what is likely to emerge. A person can accept the task without sharing the initiator's optimism. They may regard a complete glossary as unlikely while finding two carefully read pages worthwhile. If the group requires belief in success as a condition of participation, it quietly changes the proposal. The participant is now expected to supply an action and a particular judgment about the future, which the available information does not necessarily support.

An unknown result does not by itself remove responsibility for a confirmed action. A volunteer who agreed to examine two paragraphs can honestly report not understanding one of them. That differs from disappearing without a message after agreeing to attend a meeting. The work need not end with a correct answer, but may require an intelligible status: read, unclear, another source needed, participation ended. This status does not guarantee quality. It allows others to base their next step on the actual state of the work instead of assuming that silence means successful progress.

Agreement to uncertainty therefore needs no solemn promise to endure everything. Sometimes it is much more modest: a person knows that an answer is missing and still chooses a specific attempt to find out. The choice concerns an available action, rather than imagined possession of the future. This avoids demanding impossible knowledge from participants while also avoiding complete freedom from commitments merely because something is unknown. Two pages remain two pages even when the larger project has no final boundary yet.

II. Name the Open Question Rather Than Calling Everything Unknown

Uncertainty can cover different gaps. The group does not know what a term means, how long the work will take or whether someone else's illustration can be used. These questions need different next actions. A meaning can be investigated; duration can be estimated after a small passage; permission for an illustration cannot be supplied by successfully interpreting a text. When every gap is expressed in one general phrase, participants may agree to different projects without noticing. One thinks the research concerns language; another thinks they have already accepted responsibility for obtaining every missing permission.

In our hypothetical glossary, the source text is available but one word's context is unclear. The group can state that the trial examines this meaning, rather than the accuracy of every historical claim in the article. That boundary does not devalue the work. It identifies which question the result can address. Finding several plausible interpretations after reading may be a substantial result. Calling it failure simply because no single version emerged would retrospectively give the trial a stronger aim than participants actually discussed.

What is known should also remain known. The group has two pages, an hour for a meeting and three confirmed participants. An unclear expression does not make these facts doubtful for the same reason. A definite part can be planned on their basis. If a participant discovers that the scheduled hour is unavailable to them, a different part of the picture changes: the conditions of participation. It helps to keep a difficulty of meaning separate from an organisational change. They can arise together, but need different responses and cannot be resolved by the same general appeal to accept uncertainty.

Naming a gap does not require complete transparency about another person's life. A participant can state a suitable scope without explaining personal reasons for the limit. A shared action may need only their available contribution. Further details may add nothing to the decision about two pages and an hour of discussion. Clarity should therefore relate to the subject of agreement. Asking for necessary conditions differs from demanding disclosure of everything that might ever affect participation. The latter promises a completeness that an ordinary arrangement cannot provide.

III. Shared Work Does Not Require Equal Confidence

One volunteer thinks the word has an obvious meaning. Another believes its meaning changed over time. A third is unwilling to choose between these versions. They can still agree to compare contexts. If one person's preliminary view automatically becomes the group's position, agreement to do the work is replaced by agreement with their conclusion. The distinction is especially clear in an inquiry: participants arrive to explore something unknown, rather than confirm a confidence already built into the result's name. Different judgments sometimes make reading together useful in the first place.

In the selected opening of Chapter IV of *On Liberty*, Mill distinguishes personal decision from relations involving others' interests. Care and assistance do not thereby provide unconditional authority to subordinate someone to another person's idea of their good. This is a historical argument about limits on social power. We use it for a bounded comparison: discussing a shared action does not require turning each participant's internal judgment into the group's property. It yields no ready-made rule for every contemporary organisation.

In our scene, different assessments can be preserved while the presentation of the result is agreed. The note might show two versions and the grounds for each. This agreement concerns how material is presented, rather than forcibly making disagreement disappear. If the initiator needs one answer, they can name that requirement. Others may then decline that role. The requirement needs to be stated before the work, rather than appearing afterwards as an accusation of insufficient decisiveness. An open question is not always a participant's deficiency; the material may genuinely allow several readings.

Conversely, a right to doubt does not permit a hidden change to the agreed publication format. If the group promised readers different versions, one author should not present their own as the final shared position. They can propose a change and explain its grounds. But a proposal differs from an accepted decision. Shared responsibility thus concerns an available statement about the result, rather than compulsory uniformity of belief. Participants can assess the expression differently while remaining responsible for allowing readers to see the actual status of their joint note.

IV. The Word We Needs Several Definite Roles

When people say they accept uncertainty together, it can sound as though each promises to perform everything that becomes necessary. Shared responsibility need not be arranged that way. One person reads the source passage, another checks a dictionary and a third assembles the note. They can depend on each other while having different actions and authority. Naming roles does not destroy cooperation. It reveals which participation actually exists and where the group merely hopes to find someone for a further part of the work.

Suppose the note's compiler discovers that explaining the word requires a text nobody has read. They can report the gap without announcing that the dictionary checker must now find and study that text. A new project need does not automatically create the worker's agreement. An expanded role can be proposed, a conclusion reduced or the question left open. Each option preserves a shared undertaking. What changes is the way the unknown is handled, rather than a person's degree of devotion to the group. This distinction prevents expansion through an unspoken obligation.

A role also differs from authority to speak for everyone. Someone can assemble the material and send it to participants without acquiring the right to publish the note in their joint name. If the result needs confirmation, that confirmation must be distinguishable. Access to a file and the technical ability to press a button do not replace the decision. Our hypothetical task can distinguish a working version, a proposed publication and an agreed text beforehand. These statuses establish no truth of content. They show which part of the joint action has occurred.

Distribution of roles should not become an arrangement in which nobody answers for the whole message either. If a shared note is promised to readers, someone needs to understand its current status and how responses are obtained. This can be voluntarily accepted coordination limited to one document. It need not mean personally resolving every gap. Its purpose is to make dependencies visible and avoid presenting unconfirmed material as complete. Shared responsibility becomes substantial where participants have definite actions and intelligible connections between them, rather than merely a collective team name.

In the selected discussion of accepting a promise, Grotius examines acceptance, communication, an intermediary and an attached condition separately. We are reading Campbell's 1901 translation of a 1625 treatise, rather than current contract law. The author's legal conclusions, including authority and irrevocability, do not become rules for our voluntary work. A limited comparison asks another question: who agreed to which participation, and did the others learn of it? It establishes neither that every spoken assent is binding, nor that an intermediary may decide for someone absent, nor that leaving a project requires a legal justification. For our small shared step, communication and acceptance are editorially distinguished while revision remains possible.

V. Agreement Has Conditions for Continuing

A trial can start with two pages and reveal a need for one more. Sometimes the continuation is genuinely small and suits everyone. Sometimes it involves another week of work. Rather than decide by an impression that the next step is minor, it helps to name the condition for moving on. What changes: the amount of text, the deadline, publicity, accuracy requirements or the participants? A change in any point does not always cancel earlier agreement, but may create a part it did not cover. Continuing then needs separate confirmation wherever another person's role is affected.

In the hypothetical group, the two pages were intended only for discussion. Later, someone proposes releasing a note to a wider audience. Its author may be confident that publication is useful. A participant who accepted a freely prepared working version may not want a public signature under an interpretation that is still unchecked. This does not necessarily reject the original undertaking. Its subject has changed: publicity and a different expectation of quality have appeared. The conversation can continue, a separate version can be prepared or publication declined. Attendance at a trial meeting cannot count as advance agreement to every later format.

In the selected Chapter V context, Mill discusses mutual obligations alongside changes of will and effects on other people. He does not derive unconditional cancellation of agreements from personal freedom. Our application is narrower than his historical argument: revision should consider expectations already created, while earlier confirmation confers no right to unlimited new participation. This is an editorial orientation for a fictional task, rather than an account of current law or a promise that every departure will be convenient for others.

Sometimes the condition for continuing can be set in advance. After the first meeting, for example, participants will decide separately whether another passage is needed. Ending the trial then need not look like betrayal of a complete project that appeared suddenly. Yet a preliminary boundary does not remove attention to current information. If a significant error is discovered, the material cannot continue to be presented as reliable simply because the next decision date has not arrived. An agreed procedure provides a place for discussion, rather than permission to ignore an event that has already changed the available result's meaning.

VI. A Majority Decision Is Not Each Person's Agreement to a New Role

The group can choose a format by majority vote. That is an intelligible way to settle a shared question if participants accepted the procedure and it fits the task. But the vote's result says which option was chosen, rather than which additional work each person confirmed. A volunteer might agree to accept the collective design choice while limiting their contribution to checking two terms. If the chosen format requires five new texts from them, a separate proposal has appeared. A rule for collective choice should not quietly expand an individual commitment.

In our scene, the majority wants detailed historical comments. One participant is willing only to read the source passage aloud. That smaller role may be insufficient for the new idea, but does not establish dishonesty in their previous participation. The group can seek another resource or reduce the commentary's scope. It can also recognise that the chosen project cannot yet be assembled. These options describe how the undertaking works. Reproaching someone for being obliged to support the decision with work of any scope adds a condition absent from the original trial.

The minority need not, in turn, acquire a right to cancel every collective action. A dissenter can state their boundary without presenting it as everyone else's agreement. If others continue permissible work without that person's additional contribution, the dissenter can retain a different view. Choosing one's own part, determining the collective direction and authorising a particular resource are different rights or powers. They do not always belong to the same person. Distinguishing them reduces the need to portray disagreement either as a complete veto or as something that does not exist.

Honesty about the group's name also remains. A message can state that the majority accepted a format while not everyone supports an interpretation. Only the confirmed part can be published instead. The chosen statement depends on the task and participants' agreement, but should create no imaginary unanimity. This boundary does not guarantee a calm atmosphere. It does allow the collective result to remain connected to actual decisions: who chose the form, who accepted a role and where substantial disagreement still lacks a shared resolution.

VII. A New Circumstance and a Change of Desire Need Different Explanations

A person may change their participation after learning that the work is larger. They may simply realise they no longer want to continue. Both events can require conversation, but should not be presented as each other. In the first case, the description of the task changed. In the second, the participant's relationship to the previous proposal changed. A safe voluntary trial still allows refusal, while its effects on expectations already created remain. Someone can state the present limit and discuss handing over the finished part without inventing an external fact to make the explanation more persuasive.

Suppose the first meeting reveals that the available dictionary covers a different historical period. Checking the meaning now requires additional sources. This provides a new reason to refine the conclusion and plan. If the dictionary is suitable but a volunteer preferred another activity, the description is different. One choice need not define them as a bad person. Yet the remaining participants need an accurate message, rather than being sent to search for a nonexistent flaw in the source. A precise explanation helps reorganise the task instead of making a final judgment about character.

Revision can have several effects at once. A participant no longer wants to read and has also noticed an inaccuracy in the completed note. Leaving the role does not make that inaccuracy disappear. They can report it where appropriate and possible without promising personally to correct the entire document. The group can consider the information without demanding that willingness to work be restored first. New information retains its significance separately from relations with its bearer. This matters particularly under shared uncertainty, where knowledge is already distributed between different people.

Not every revision needs a detailed account of an internal desire. Sometimes stating an available completion time or an inability to continue is enough. Honesty here does not equal complete confession. What matters is leaving no false confirmation with others and using no invented circumstance to direct their decision. If discussing reasons is unsafe or becomes pressure, the voluntary trial should end. This article proposes neither preserving contact at any cost for an attractive model of agreement nor demanding personal disclosure from a participant.

VIII. Refusal Need Not First Remove Uncertainty

A person can decline participation without proving that the project will fail. Sometimes the conversation demands exactly that proof: if inevitable failure cannot be demonstrated, they supposedly have to try. But the future result and their own available role are different questions. The trial can be reasonable for the group and unsuitable for a particular participant in time, scope or form. Their refusal establishes no verdict on the project as a whole. The absence of such a verdict does not make their time an available resource.

Our hypothetical volunteer is unwilling to sign historical explanations. They may acknowledge that others will understand the subject better and create useful material. They need not declare the entire undertaking mistaken to keep a limit on their participation. The group can continue with people whom the task suits. The conversation need not become a contest of final predictions. One person has no duty to prove failure; the others have no duty to convince them of guaranteed success. Distinguishing that person's role from the undertaking's possibility without it is enough.

Declining also need not involve obtaining agreement with the refusal itself. Others may regret it, find the explanation incomplete or prefer continuation. These reactions do not always constitute pressure, but they do not replace confirmation of new work. In a safe voluntary scene, a person can state a limit and offer an available handover. If the offer is declined, that creates no endless obligation to offer further options. What matters is clearly ending the part that can actually be ended, rather than promising continued participation merely to suspend an unpleasant conversation.

People can be bound by other obligations that our voluntary discussion-group example does not cover. This article's conclusion cannot cancel them. Legal contracts, professional rules and dangerous situations requiring specialised procedures are outside the present discussion. Our narrow subject is agreement to a small, safe trial involving identified participants. Even here, refusal may be inconvenient and require a revised plan. But inconvenience should be described as a change in available action, rather than proof that someone must first discover the entire future before deciding their own part.

IX. A Status Message Supports Shared Responsibility

Participants cannot always supply an answer, but can often report that an answer is missing. The difference matters to shared work. If the person checking a term writes that two versions were found and neither chosen, the compiler understands the material's current boundary. Silence may be mistaken for continuing research or a completed answer not yet sent. A message should not imitate completion. Its usefulness is that the next action receives a more precise basis even when the content remains uncertain.

Status should relate to the confirmed role. A participant can report on two pages without promising to account for every minute of work. The group can agree on one check-in time where the task needs it. Uncertainty does not justify endless monitoring of people. If a new request changes no decision, it may merely increase the workload. Communication therefore needs a subject: passing on an available result, naming a dependence or warning about changed availability. Frequency alone establishes neither responsibility nor the quality of an inquiry.

The glossary needs to distinguish what was found, proposed and confirmed. Its compiler can retain a possible meaning, mark it as a working hypothesis and indicate the clarification needed. Readers then receive no certainty the authors lack. If publication in that status does not suit the task, publication should be delayed or the content reduced. That decision concerns the message, rather than a demand that each participant become confident sooner. Cooperation can be preserved alongside an honestly identified unfinished question.

An unfavourable outcome should not rewrite an earlier status. If an error is discovered after publication, it matters which conclusion was regarded as checked at the time and why. Responsibility for knowingly presenting unconfirmed material differs from responsibility for an honestly identified hypothesis. A successful result does not retrospectively verify an earlier assurance either. This precision about time helps people learn from the work's arrangement: where a qualification disappeared, who did not receive the open question and what needs to change in the next message, rather than demanding that no answer ever remain unknown again.

X. Definite Participation Is Possible With an Open Outcome

Agreement to uncertainty is no single shared internal attitude. In a joint task it consists of several confirmations: which question remains open, which action someone chooses, where an additional role begins and who decides the next step. These confirmations can be small. They do not make the future known, but help avoid filling it with other people's obligations. Action without a guarantee can then preserve responsibility for participation that actually exists, rather than a promise that everyone together will answer for everything.

Such agreement also permits different levels of confidence. One participant sees a complete glossary ahead; another wants to check only two expressions; a third is willing to discuss alternative readings. Their cooperation can lie in a definite part, rather than an identical picture of the final project. If that part is insufficient for someone's aim, the gap needs to be named. Differences need not be concealed for an upbeat beginning. An honest conversation sometimes reduces an idea and sometimes reveals a new, voluntarily accepted contribution. Both results contain more than a general promise understood differently by each participant.

An open outcome does not remove other people's opportunity to rely on a confirmed action. Yet an expectation already created does not make every expansion accepted. Between those extremes lies handling change: reporting a new fact, clarifying availability or proposing a handover or completion of a part. This does not always produce agreement and need not remove regret. Its purpose is that the present message match present participation, while the group's decision rests on people and means actually available, rather than the strength of an original intention alone.

Shared responsibility can then cease to require pretended certainty. A person can lack a final answer and still state a role clearly. They can decline the next part without declaring the previous one meaningless. A publication method can be revised without requiring identical beliefs. These distinctions preserve space for inquiry and participants' personal decisions. A joint undertaking remains possible because its unknown result supplies no basis for taking possession of someone else's future participation, while freedom to choose supplies no basis for concealing an action already accepted.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one small, voluntary shared trial with a safe subject: reading a short passage, discussing a draft or checking the availability of ordinary material. A task involving coercion, threats, substantial danger or a specific professional obligation is unsuitable for this example. You can decline the exercise entirely without explaining personal reasons.

Formulate two separate statements: which question remains unanswered, and which part of your participation you actually confirm. Do not replace the second with a promise to guarantee the result. Then name one condition requiring a new discussion: a larger scope, a public signature, another deadline or transfer of a role. This condition becomes no collective rule without others' agreement; initially it expresses your proposed boundary.

If a conversation is appropriate, compare your understanding of this part with another participant's. They may expect a different result. You need not convince them immediately. You can clarify the subject, reduce the offer or leave further participation unconfirmed. Demand no equal confidence in success and present no silence as agreement. One intelligible answer about the current role is enough to begin.

The narrow observable result is a clearer distinction between an open question, a confirmed action and the next condition for choosing. It establishes neither the project's reliability nor resolution of every disagreement. Stop if pressure arises, personal disclosure is demanded or you are expected to continue after declining. An unfinished trial requires no further proof that your limit was serious enough.

Key quotation

> *“Burdensome condition”.*

Hugo Grotius, The Rights of War and Peace, II.XI.XIX; short fragment of A. C. Campbell's 1901 translation, with editorial initial capitalisation. Naming the condition identifies a separate question about the participants' agreement. Historical conclusions about legal obligation are not transferred to our voluntary trial; declining and revising participation remain possible.

Connections between traditions

Mill discusses individual freedom alongside other people's interests; Addams considers social ethics and participation by those affected; Grotius examines promises in a historical legal treatise. Their subjects and grounds differ. Our agreements about small voluntary work are not presented as a common technique of the three authors.

Read source	Limited comparison	Substantial difference
Mill, On Liberty IV–V	Personal choice does not exhaust the question of others' participation	A historical political argument establishes no current project participants' rights
Addams, Democracy and Social Ethics I–II	Shared work calls for attention to the experience of those affected	Social-ethical reasoning does not test our sequence's effectiveness
Grotius, Rights of War and Peace II.XI	Acceptance, communication and an attached condition differ	Historical legal argument does not make voluntary discussion an irrevocable contract
Our distinction between action and forecast	Participation can be specified with the outcome still unknown	This is our editorial conclusion, rather than a retrieved quotation or empirical guarantee

Sources

1. John Stuart Mill. On Liberty.1859. Metadata and selected IV655–679 and V840–862 contexts were read, rather than the entire book. Its role is comparison of personal freedom with others' participation; no direct quotations here, and known shared use is not reset. Courtney's editorial introduction is not attributed to Mill. Historical exclusions and political conclusions do not become current project rules.

2. Jane Addams. Democracy and Social Ethics.1902, Gutenberg15487. Metadata, preface and selected introductory passages on process and outcome were read, with the continuous II402–407 passage on cooperation and the unknown value of participation; neither the entire book nor chapter. Limited paraphrase only, without new quotations or appropriation of the visiting lecturer's embedded words. Social-ethical argument does not validate our practice.

3. Hugo Grotius. The Rights of War and Peace. De jure belli ac pacis1625, translated by A. C. Campbell, M. Walter Dunne1901. Metadata110–136, chapter heading1079–1081 and selected continuous II.XI1136–1161 on acceptance, communication, an intermediary and a condition were actually read. Neither the entire book nor Latin original. The short quotations are Grotius's own argumentative phrases in this English version; Russian translations are editorial. Prior7 and the new words here share one reserved budget.

Online access and a US library designation establish no universal reuse permission. Underlying works are not imported or vectorised. The contemporary scene is hypothetical; a voluntary trial replaces no legal or professional decision.

Tags

agreement, uncertainty, shared action, forecast, outcome, participation, consent, role, information, condition, continuation, revision, message, refusal, majority, voluntary participation, authority, expectation, responsibility, boundaries, confidence, risk, freedom, cooperation, communication, practice, Mill, Addams, Grotius, 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 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 among people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.