

UNITED WISDOM

Good Intentions, Permissible Means, and Consequences

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-14-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Good Intentions, Permissible Means, and Consequences

Epigraph

> *they are context-sensitive*

Veljko Dubljević, Sebastian Sattler, and Eric Racine, 2018. The pronoun refers to the weights of components of moral judgement: characteristics of the agent, the deed, and its consequences. The authors describe participants' ratings in experiments using brief stories. Contextual variation in these ratings does not mean that any means becomes permissible if its story is persuasive enough.

What this article is about

Olga wants to help a friend find housing. Her friend has written a personal letter about a difficult conversation with relatives and the search for a separate room. Olga knows someone who might offer an option and considers forwarding the entire letter: it would explain why help matters. Her intention is kind and the possible result seems useful. Yet her friend agreed to a conversation between them, rather than sharing personal details with someone else. The means still requires a decision, even when the goal of helping is clear.

We can judge the scene too quickly from either direction. Olga meant well, so there is nothing to discuss; or a private letter must not be shared, so she is a bad person. Both answers merge questions that are more useful to distinguish. What did the person want to do? Which action did she choose, and did she have consent for it? What could she foresee, what happened, and who was affected? A good intention matters but does not replace examining the means. A consequence matters but does not reveal everything about the choice and available knowledge.

This article considers intention, action, and result together without assigning a general grade to a person. We will distinguish descriptions of moral judgement from grounds for permissibility, a kind wish from a chosen way of helping, and consequences from complete control over the future. The practice is an authorial exercise for an ordinary situation, rather than a moral maturity test, legal advice, or a proven way to improve decisions. It preserves others' consent, our responsibility, and the freedom to refine an action before help becomes a boundary violation.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Name the Intention without Treating It as a Justification

Olga wants her friend to find a suitable option more easily. This intention can be recognised directly. There is no need first to suspect hidden gain or dismiss the wish to help. Yet naming the goal does not tell us which approach will be chosen. Forwarding a letter, asking permission for a short message, passing a contact to the friend, or doing nothing now are different actions. A kind goal does not erase these differences. It begins reflection rather than providing a ready justification for whatever follows.

A person may have several motives at once. Olga sympathises with her friend and wants to end an anxious conversation sooner. Perhaps she enjoys being useful. Such possibilities cannot be declared established from one deed. We can ask ourselves what matters and which part of the action serves another person or our own convenience. Deciding whether to share the letter does not require a complete investigation of character. It is enough not to let impatience replace consent or present a conjecture about motives as knowledge of a person.

Intention is also different from seeking a good result at any cost. Olga can want to help while rejecting a particular means. Her care does not become less real. A slower permissible step may still serve the goal. It matters to distinguish an interest in the friend's well-being from a right to control her account. When someone chooses the form of help themselves, help remains connected to their own life. Goodwill creates no separate authority over that life for the helper.

After the result, it is difficult to recall our intention without the outcome's influence. If a room is found, it is tempting to say everything was carefully considered. If conflict arises, we can portray ourselves as someone who understood nothing from the beginning. It helps to reconstruct the goal and conditions actually available at the time of choice. This permits later evaluation rather than forbidding it. We can see the kind wish, the haste, and the decision lacking consent. The action's history becomes more accurate without a final verdict on personality.

II. Describe the Chosen Action Separately

The means deserves a concrete description: sharing the entire text of a personal letter with another person without separate permission. This is more revealing than helping with housing. It shows that information moves, the audience changes, and the friend loses part of her choice. The action has a goal but also exists as a deed in its own right. Expected benefit alone cannot evaluate it. A more permissible option may require changing the action itself while preserving the wish to help and the subject of the conversation.

Olga can ask whether her friend wants to contact the possible helper herself. She can suggest sharing a short message composed together, without personal details. She can first ask the acquaintance whether he is willing to discuss an available room without revealing someone else's story. These alternatives guarantee no housing and are not established here as universally superior decisions. They show that means allow choice. Reflection need not stop at a contrast between kindness and refusal: sometimes the goal can be kept while its implementation changes.

In the read chapters III.2–3 of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics, wishing for a result is distinguished from choosing available means. This offers a historical perspective on practical decision. Wanting the friend to be housed does not establish that any deed leading there is rightly chosen. We neither reduce his entire ethics to a choice technique nor derive a tested consent procedure from it. The distinction simply helps us see the action between the goal and outcome, where a person decides within what is available.

Sometimes a means is called necessary before alternatives are considered. Olga thinks that without the complete letter, the acquaintance will not understand the situation's seriousness. That remains her assumption. The friend may prefer to reveal less, reject this option, or explain the circumstances herself. Even if help becomes less likely, choosing the extent of disclosure still matters. One action cannot be declared the only possible approach merely because it is faster for the helper. Outcome uncertainty does not cancel the question of the means' boundary.

III. Keep the Other Person Involved in the Choice

Consent has a subject and a limit. Permission to mention a search for a room does not necessarily include an account of family conflict. Permission to write to one person does not necessarily include sharing with a whole group. Olga can clarify the recipient and content, then preserve the chosen scope. If the friend agreed to a short message, the helper gains no right to add details for persuasiveness. Consent is not a single pass for any action that later seems useful to the same goal. Before sending, the friend can change her mind: yesterday's willingness does not oblige her to disclose the letter today. After sending, a new refusal shapes further steps without permitting a promise that all previous copies will vanish.

In the selected context of the second section of the Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, Kant considers a person as an end and the impermissibility of treating them merely as a means. The article draws a limited connection to the friend's participation in the decision. This is no prohibition on cooperation, help, or tools. The question is whether the other remains someone whose reasons and consent matter, or whether her story becomes material for another's plan. We paraphrase a philosophical argument without claiming that it empirically tested our practice.

Respecting consent does not require making someone explain a refusal in detail. The friend may decline to share the letter without saying why. Olga can name the help she can offer with the available content or acknowledge that there is no other option now. Another's refusal does not make the helper's goodwill meaningless. It sets the action's boundary. A relationship can hold differing wishes when help carries no hidden condition that it must be accepted in the form convenient for the organiser.

After information has been shared, consent cannot be retrospectively inferred from a successful result. The friend found a room, but this does not establish that she permitted the earlier circulation of the letter. She may value the help and dislike its method at once. These responses do not contradict one another. Olga needs to hear both without demanding a choice between gratitude and objection. The result enters the next conversation but does not replace the missing choice at the time of action or remove the person's right to name a violation.

IV. Consider Consequences before Acting

The future cannot be seen completely, but this does not mean consequences need no consideration. Olga knows that the letter contains personal details and a new recipient will be able to read them. She may not know whether he will keep the message, repeat its content, or change the friend's relationship with her. Reflection distinguishes an available inference from what is unknown. There is no need to imagine every possible disaster. It is enough to notice significant consequences connected to the chosen means that could change the decision about it.

Consequences concern different people. The friend may gain a housing option and lose control of her personal account. The acquaintance may feel obliged to help after receiving more information than he wanted. Olga may take on further communication and new promises. These differences deserve names rather than a general balance of good for everyone. We do not propose calculating another's dignity and consent in a single sum. Some constraints on means retain independent force even when the helper expects an attractive outcome.

We can consider which information is missing for the next decision. Is an option actually available? Does the friend want to discuss it with this person? What information is needed for the first conversation? These are finite questions connected to action. There is no need for an endless forecast or complete certainty. Proportionate clarification permits a step with a clear subject. It guarantees no absence of error, but distinguishes honest limitation of knowledge from a hurried claim that a good result will necessarily justify everything done to achieve it.

If the situation is urgent, time becomes a condition rather than universal permission. Olga can explain that the opportunity needs an answer today and offer available options. Urgency does not entail silently controlling the letter. This scene does not address emergency rescue or

special legal duties. In an ordinary task, the possibility of quickly clarifying another's wishes matters. If time is insufficient for the desired form of help, that limits the current offer rather than establishing an obligation to accept any means.

V. Distinguish Participants' Judgement from Permissibility

Dubljević, Sattler, and Racine studied ratings of brief stories varying components of the agent, deed, and consequences. The selected discussion addresses these components' influence and the contextual dependence of their weights. The study supports statements about how participants evaluated presented scenarios. It does not establish that majority opinion makes a means permissible or that a positive intention automatically compensates for a violation. Describing judgement and supplying normative grounds for a decision remain different tasks.

The agent component in the model concerns character and intention, rather than a subjective wish to do good alone. Virtue ethics therefore cannot be declared a teaching that a kind motive is sufficient. Nor can every ethical tradition be reduced to three boxes in one contemporary scheme. The model serves research into evaluations; traditions have their own questions and grounds. It reminds this article that judgement has several components, while replacing neither consent, examination of means, nor responsibility for a particular deed.

Two experiments with brief scenarios also have limits of transfer. An actual friend may not share the participants' rating, and a detailed story includes circumstances absent from a short condition. This does not refute the study; it marks its subject's boundary. We do not call a moral diagnostic exercise scientifically proven or promise that three questions produce the single correct decision. A reader may use the distinctions while retaining the freedom to discuss grounds and seek appropriate help where ordinary reflection is insufficient.

A 2018 correction accompanies the publication: visible tracked changes were removed from supporting files, which were replaced. We read the notice and do not use those supplements. It should not be described as a retraction or as a correction that never occurred. Version and reading scope matter for honest paraphrase. Our scene offers no numerical prediction of a particular person's behaviour; an experimental result does not become permission to forward the letter without consent, whatever someone thinks of Olga's kindness.

VI. Do Not Turn a Good Outcome into Permission

Suppose Olga has already forwarded the letter, the acquaintance offered a room, and the friend gained a useful option. That result can be recognised without declaring the approach right. Help had a consequence, while sharing information had its own boundary. A successful outcome does not change the consent available at the time of action. Olga can say she is glad about the option and separately willing to discuss the letter's circulation. Such clarity preserves the result's value without requiring silence about the unpleasant part of the experience.

The opposite outcome does not automatically reveal the entire moral evaluation either. Olga asked permission and sent an agreed short message, but no room was available. Failure to achieve the desired benefit does not make the means a violation or care a deception. We can check whether promises were accurate and whether unverified information was conveyed. Yet the result also depends on circumstances and others' choices. Responsibility for our action differs from guaranteeing the entire future outcome and does not require declaring ourselves guilty of every unsuccessful attempt.

In Analects IV.5, in the read Legge translation, the discussion concerns declining a desired acquisition if it is not obtained through the proper way. This offers a historical perspective on constraints on means. It is not a contemporary consent procedure and does not make all cultural norms interchangeable. We do not transfer historical hierarchy into the friends' relationship. A narrower connection is appropriate: an acquisition's attractiveness does not exhaust the question of how it was obtained and which choice a person made on the way to it.

Good and bad consequences both need new attention. We may need to correct inaccurate information, clarify expectations, or acknowledge another's inconvenience. These actions should not become endless scrutiny of personality. Olga considers one particular message and its subsequent handling. She can name what she controls now, what she asks the recipient to do, and which promise she can fulfil. The rest remains unknown or depends on others. Accurate responsibility is more useful than total justification or total accusation.

VII. Repair What Is Available

If the letter was shared without consent, the first step is to name what happened without minimising it. Olga can tell her friend whom she sent it to and which text was sent, then listen to what matters to her. There is no need to hide behind the intention to help or demand gratitude for the room. Acknowledgement concerns the deed rather than a declaration that the person is forever bad. It keeps concrete repair possible: stop further circulation, ask the recipient to delete the message, and clarify what information remains in subsequent communication.

Asking for deletion does not guarantee that the letter was not saved elsewhere. Promising full restoration of control would be another exaggeration. Olga can honestly state what she has done and the answer received, rather than declare the problem entirely gone once a request has been sent. Some consequences are irreversible; some can be limited. This distinction does not make repair meaningless. It helps select an available action without adding a new promise that cannot be verified or fulfilled to the earlier violation.

The friend is not obliged to forgive immediately, explain every feeling, or continue searching together. She can set a boundary on help and conversation time. Olga may have her own feelings and seek support, without making her friend responsible for relieving her guilt. Repair is not a way to obtain a desired emotional reaction. It concerns a concrete deed and consequences. The relationship may change, and one persuasive sentence or a statement of good intention cannot guarantee its restoration.

If the violation has not happened, repair need not be staged in advance. Olga can pause, clarify consent, and choose another message. This is an ordinary correction of a decision rather than proof that the person is morally dangerous. Reflection before action has a different subject from reflection after the result. First we choose a means with limited knowledge; later we recognise what was done and decide what is available next. Distinguishing stages avoids accusing someone of an imagined event or treating a real consequence as merely a possibility.

VIII. End with a Choice rather than a Grade

The three questions of intention, means, and consequences are not an arithmetic formula. Two positives and one negative cannot automatically permit a deed. Consent, promises, and substantial harm may have grounds that do not disappear within an attractive overall score. In our scene, Olga can choose an agreed short message or give the contact to her friend directly. The choice's grounds are clear without a morality number. She preserves help by changing the particular means without promising a guaranteed result.

Not every reflection requires equal detail. A simple agreed message may need only clarification of content and recipient. Sharing personal details needs greater attention to boundaries. Where legal questions, danger, or dependency arise, an ordinary article does not replace appropriate help. Proportionality means seeing the subject rather than turning every everyday step into a moral hearing. A person can finish analysis after a sufficient decision, retaining the possibility of returning if a new significant circumstance appears.

In the Groundwork's first section, Kant distinguishes good will from evaluation by success and from a pleasant wish alone. His argument concerns duty and does not coincide with an everyday feeling of being kind. It cautions this article against the simple formula that meaning well justifies everything. Aristotle, Confucius, and contemporary research have different

grounds. We preserve these differences, using them as perspectives on attention rather than confirmation of one universal technique for a morally correct decision.

Olga can end reflection this way: she wants to help, does not forward the whole letter, clarifies the agreed scope, and promises a result only within what she can provide. If the message has already been sent, she acknowledges the action and chooses finite repair steps. This is no final certificate of a good person. It is a clear decision in a particular situation. The good intention remains significant, the means receives separate consideration, and consequences enter responsibility without a demand to control the whole future or a right to decide what another must regard as help.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary helping action, planned or already taken. Name the intention simply without a general evaluation of yourself. Then describe the means: what exactly will happen, involving whose information, time, or choice, and addressed to whom? Distinguish a wish for a useful outcome from the chosen deed. If calm consideration is unavailable now, you can pause the action and return to the specific question later without making the pause a conclusion about character.

Clarify consent and promises. Who may decide the scope of involvement, and is the existing permission sufficient for this recipient and content? Consider another available approach that preserves the goal without unnecessary intrusion. Name significant foreseeable consequences and what is unknown without inventing a complete forecast. A good expected result grants no automatic permission; absence of a guarantee does not remove responsibility for available choice.

After action, record the result separately from what was known before. Do not replace evaluation of the means with success or failure. Name possible repair, its limits, and the other person's right to decline further involvement. Do not promise to reverse every consequence if you can only request their limitation. Distinguish your own next step, another's response, and circumstances you do not control.

End with a concrete choice and boundary: what you will do, what you promise not to add without new consent, and when the present question is sufficiently settled. The practice assigns no grade to a moral personality and guarantees no decision's correctness. It keeps intention, means, and consequences within one attention while preserving their differences. The wish to help can then become a more precise action in which another remains involved in choice and responsibility becomes neither justification through every good result nor guilt for every unknown.

Key quotation

> *the situation is judged as being more acceptable*

Dubljević, Sattler, and Racine, 2018, discussion of results. In the original sentence, this refers to a combination of positive agent, deed, and consequence components in experimental scenarios. The fragment describes participants' evaluation rather than proving that a particular letter may be shared. The sentence's conditions matter: it cannot become a rule that any successful help justifies its means.

Connections between traditions

Aristotle helps distinguish wishing from choosing means; the selected Analects chapter attends to the way of obtaining a desired acquisition. Kant considers good will and humanity as an end on his own philosophical grounds. The contemporary ADC model studies relationships between scenario components and participants' evaluations. These subjects differ. An experiment does not confirm entire historical ethics, and philosophical texts do not constitute trials of our practice.

The article's shared authorial task is to retain several questions without assigning a single grade to a person. Consent, accurate promises, and finite repair steps operate here as independent ethical conditions. We do not declare intention the sole content of virtue, duty a prohibition on cooperation, or consequences sufficient permission. Differences between perspectives help us choose a particular action more carefully while preserving people's autonomy and the limits of available knowledge.

Sources

• Veljko Dubljević, Sebastian Sattler, Eric Racine. Deciphering moral intuition: How agents, deeds, and consequences influence moral judgment, 2018. Metadata, abstract, model, selected design, results and discussion of two experiments, conclusion, and CC BY rights read. Descriptive scenario evaluations, neither normative permission nor a test of the exercise. Two brief excerpts, with United Wisdom Russian translation. The 2018 correction was read in full; supporting files containing tracked changes were replaced, and those supplements are not used here.

• Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, Book III, W. D. Ross translation. III.2–3, II.1–4, and selected II.6 read. Wishing, choice, and means belong to a historical virtue system. Precise print edition unidentified; paraphrase only, no quotations or import.

• Confucius. The Analects, James Legge translation, Project Gutenberg 3330. Selected II, IV, and XV passages with context read; this article uses IV.5. Public domain in the USA, without a

worldwide rights claim. A historical perspective on the proper way; hierarchical roles do not become demands on the reader. Paraphrase only, no quotation or import.

• Immanuel Kant. Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation, Project Gutenberg 5682. Selected continuous First Section contexts on good will and duty, and Second Section contexts on humanity as an end and promises, read. Neither the Third Section nor the whole book is claimed read. Public domain in the USA; paraphrase only, no quotation, import, or worldwide licence claim.

Tags

intention, means, consequences, help, consent, autonomy, responsibility, choice, promise, boundary, goodwill, character, deed, result, uncertainty, repair, moral judgement, permissibility, privacy, letter, relationships, practice, virtue, duty, ADC, Dubljević, Sattler, Racine, Aristotle, Kant

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside 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.