

UNITED WISDOM

Collective Error Despite Individual Competence

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-26-N05 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Collective Error Despite Individual Competence

Epigraph

> *Without counsel purposes are disappointed: but in the multitude of counsellors they are established.*

Proverbs 15:22, consulted King James Version. A religious wisdom saying, not a guarantee of every majority's success.

What this article is about

A team can contain attentive, capable people and still produce an incorrect shared result. Everyone checked their part, but nobody noticed that the parts concerned different conditions. Or an observation was heard without receiving a route to a decision. Asking "who here is incompetent?" can then conceal a more precise question: where did grounded knowledge stop accompanying joint action? This article examines that failure without promising an infallible team or diagnosing its participants. We distinguish local knowledge, shared agreement, handover, checking, and authority to decide. A hypothetical meeting preparation makes these distinctions concrete. Plato's ship, Aristotle's argument about the judgment of many, and biblical counsel remain separate interlocutors with historical and religious limits intact. The closing exercise examines one accessible transition between people rather than instituting total surveillance or a dangerous trial. After an error, both correction for affected people and an honest inquiry into causes matter; neither replaces the other.

I. Good Parts Do Not Yet Make a Good Whole

Imagine a small team preparing a public meeting. One person negotiates well with venues, another explains the content clearly, and a third calculates costs accurately. Each handles a familiar part carefully. Yet the event is announced for a day when the room is unavailable: the programme uses an early email, the calculation concerns another option, and only one participant has the venue's confirmation. This hypothetical scene establishes no frequency of failure. It shows a logical possibility: several individually correct actions can produce an incorrect shared result when they rely on different conditions. Understanding what happened requires more than reassessing everyone's professional strengths.

Competence concerns a particular subject. Knowing how to check a budget does not mean the date has been checked; knowing the programme precisely does not itself provide access to

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

the latest agreed schedule. Saying “we have strong specialists” therefore answers only part of the question. What shared claim does the team consider true, who has seen its grounds, and do the different checks concern the same version of the work? A strong team can make resolution easier, but it does not replace those connections. This distinction does not demean participants. It allows discussion of how joint action is organized without declaring everyone incompetent because of one shared mistake or excusing the mistake by listing their achievements.

Nor should every unwelcome outcome automatically be called a collective error. An external change, an accepted risk, an unforeseen event, or a dispute about the criterion of success may be involved. A venue cancelling an already confirmed meeting differs from using an unconfirmed date. Some guests preferring another format does not necessarily disprove the promised content. Establish first what failed to match the grounds of the decision, an obligation, or an available verifiable condition. Otherwise “error” becomes a general accusation, and the team spends its effort defending its dignity rather than finding what actually needs correction and who can now correct it.

II. Shared Agreement Can Conceal Different Grounds

At a joint meeting, several people may say “we can start” while meaning different things. The first has confirmed that their material is ready; the second considers the date provisional; the third hears the first person’s confidence and assumes the whole undertaking has been checked. Deliberate deception need not be presumed. Identical words nevertheless need not refer to identical agreement. Ask each person to finish the sentence: we can start because this has been checked, provided this condition holds. That makes the gap between local readiness and overall authorization visible. Clarification matters especially before an action creates expectations outside the team, where people cannot readily distinguish the internal shades of “ready.”

Agreement can be checked without turning the conversation into an examination. Name one shared version of the decision and ask participants for their grounds and unresolved conditions. If different dates or different scopes were being discussed, that is not yet a reason to hunt for someone to blame. Return the discussion to one subject first. Nor must every minor detail be clarified indefinitely: focus on conditions on which the chosen action depends. For a meeting, these may include a confirmed venue, an available date, and the agreed scope of the promise; the colour of an internal note rarely matters equally. Proportion depends on the consequences of disagreement, rather than a desire to display maximum thoroughness to colleagues.

Sometimes a team knows that its grounds are incomplete and agrees to act with a qualification. That differs from false certainty. Preserve the qualification wherever the next decision will be

made, and do not communicate it outward as a confirmed fact. The programme can be discussed provisionally while the date is explicitly unsettled; this does not automatically make it acceptable to summon people for a definitively announced day. Moving from internal preparation to an external promise changes responsibility. If participants consider the risk acceptable, clarify who may accept it and whether its cost is being transferred to someone who neither joined the discussion nor agreed to wait for correction.

III. Combining Views Requires Real Differences

In Politics III, Part XI, Aristotle considers whether many people together can judge better than individuals. He immediately qualifies the argument’s applicability and distinguishes specialist and user judgment. This ancient political dispute contains social comparisons we cannot endorse; it is no study of a modern team. The useful question here is what different participants actually contribute. Neither adopting the historical restrictions nor promising superiority to every majority follows. Joint consideration is meaningful when a particular perspective can supply missing grounds rather than merely repeat a confident opinion already heard.

If five specialists read the same incomplete summary, five approvals do not become five independent grounds. The summary may be entirely honest while omitting a cancelled condition or the response of the person who will use the result. Increasing the number of votes then leaves the gap intact. Access to another relevant observation or a check of the original condition is needed. Nor is every new perspective automatically better: someone unfamiliar with the task can misjudge details. Preserve the distinction between an additional question and a confirmed answer. A fresh question opens an inquiry; it does not itself prove that the existing decision is wrong.

Return to the meeting. Someone who has seen the room may know that it suits the intended number of guests; the programme editor knows how long the explanation takes; a prospective participant notices that the announced duration conflicts with available transport. These are different subjects, and each can matter. The final decision does not emerge simply by adding preferences. The team must understand whether conditions are compatible, what has actually been promised, and what can change. Including a user does not oblige them to solve the entire task for specialists. It makes a consequence visible that was hidden inside a professional part, after which the decision can be adopted or reconsidered on stated grounds.

IV. Respect for a Person Does Not Replace Checking a Claim

An experienced participant may say that a condition has already been checked, giving the team reasonable grounds to trust their work. Trust does not require repeating that work in full every time. Yet the claim's limits must be understood: which version was checked, when, and with what result. If circumstances changed afterward, asking whether the check remains current does not accuse the person of incompetence. The earlier action can be acknowledged as excellent while found insufficient for today's question. This language preserves respect without making professional reputation a substitute for an available fact. Someone's history helps determine how to cooperate; it does not make every statement they utter true regardless of its subject.

The opposite mistake is dismissing an accurate observation because its speaker has low status. A newcomer may not know the whole programme but notice that the date announcement contradicts the venue's response. The messages themselves can establish that discrepancy. There is no need first to appoint the newcomer as leader or recognize expertise in the entire undertaking. A locally correct observation and general authority over the work have different grounds. This distinction is particularly useful where an objection is experienced as a struggle for position. Return the conversation to its subject: which condition conflicts and which decision it affects, preserving existing roles until separate grounds justify changing them.

In Republic VI, Plato pictures a ship where a struggle for control prevents recognition of the true pilot's art. His sailors lack navigation knowledge, so the parable cannot directly explain a competent team's error. Its philosophical defence of knowledgeable rule also establishes none of our working powers. It permits only a separate question: is subject knowledge being evaluated, or a person's convenience to an influential party? In contemporary cooperation, the answer must rely on specific authority, available checks, and agreed roles, not a claim that one participant embodies the whole truth and is therefore exempt from explaining their grounds to others.

V. A Handover Can Also Transfer an Unnoticed Gap

Someone finishes their part and sends a file to the next participant. It remains unclear what has been completed: the content, the formatting, the approval, or final readiness for use. The recipient may interpret the file's polished appearance as confirmation of all four conditions. The sender, by contrast, regards pending approval as obvious. When this uncertainty goes unnamed, both act from different understandings while conscientiously performing their roles. A handover needs a short account of the result's current state. This concerns the actual work rather than the number of accompanying documents: an important unresolved question must remain visible after responsibility for handling it changes hands.

Make the handover specific: this text has been checked on these grounds, the date remains provisional, and external release requires this confirmation. The next participant then need not infer unresolved matters from "everything is ready." If they cannot perform the remaining check, establish that before the action for which it matters. A handover does not automatically create access, time, or authority to settle a dispute. Another person, a smaller promise, or a delayed release may be needed. Continuing the old route merely because the file has reached the next desk treats movement through a process as grounds for its correctness. No necessary connection exists between the two.

Not every handover gap explains an error that has already occurred. Check the connection rather than announce it after failure. A recipient who knew the condition and deliberately acted without it presents a different history from a condition that disappeared. A sender who could not know a new restriction should not be credited retrospectively with that knowledge. Reconstruct a few important transitions: what was known, what was passed on, and what was treated as confirmed. This does not require surveillance of every employee's every step. Its purpose is to find where grounded knowledge stopped accompanying action and correct that particular transition while preserving precision about individual responsibility.

VI. An Objection Needs a Route to a Decision

Permission to voice a doubt does not yet mean the doubt can affect action. A participant reports a contradiction, receives thanks, and everything continues without an answer to the important question. The team has heard the words but has not incorporated their subject into its decision. Establish who will consider the observation, what grounds are needed, and what happens until an answer is available. With a small uncertainty, reversible preparation may continue. Where a missing condition makes a promise false, the external action itself may need to stop. A pause concerns the affected part of the work; it need not cancel the whole project and should not punish an unwelcome question.

Proverbs 15:22 connects counsel with the establishment of plans. Nearby sayings concern knowledge, answering, and a religious orientation to life. The verse therefore does not promise that many advisers guarantee any success. Here it opens a question about readiness to take counsel seriously. For a particular team, that means both hearing the person and giving a substantive observation an intelligible outcome: a check, an explained rejection, or a revised action. These working alternatives are our practical reasoning, not a procedure extracted from the verse. Their suitability depends on the task and participants' authority; no measured efficacy of the exercise is asserted.

Rejecting an objection intelligibly can be well justified. The observation may concern an old version, another event, or a condition already checked. State those grounds rather than simply invoke busyness and the number of supporters. Nor does the objector acquire an unconditional right to hold up any work indefinitely. If the question does not affect the chosen action or an available confirmation resolves it, work can continue with the explanation retained. But an important unresolved question cannot be closed by a deadline alone: a date arriving does not turn an assumption into a fact. In a difficult case, reducing the promise may be more honest than portraying final agreement while the necessary condition remains unknown.

VII. Deciding and Checking Concern Different Subjects

A leader may have authority to select an option without the knowledge needed to check every condition. A specialist may know how to check a condition without authority to accept a new risk for everyone else. Both situations can coexist consistently. The team needs to connect a technical or substantive finding with the decision of someone entitled to act. The checker states what is established and what remains unknown; the decision maker considers that information within their role. Merging the actions into an unclear "approved" obscures the distinction between fact and choice. Keep them separate even when one person performs both functions: possessing authority does not supply missing information.

For example, confirming a room's capacity does not answer whether the team agreed to increase the number of invitees. An increase may change duties, duration, and people's comfort. Correct information about the room can coexist with an unjustified decision about the format. The reverse is possible too: a reasonably selected small format does not confirm that the room is free on the chosen day. These questions need different answers, neither replacing the other. When discussion stalls, identify which answer is missing. This prevents demanding new moral consent from a specialist instead of a factual check, or asking a decision participant to prove something to which they have no access.

A check can be entrusted to someone else on clear terms. The final decision maker nevertheless remains responsible for understanding the finding's limits where that belongs to their role. A result is not reliable merely because a checker's name appears somewhere.

Understanding the subject, currency, and important limitations is enough; repeating all the specialized work is unnecessary. If the finding is unclear, seek an explanation before the action that depends on it. In areas involving professional requirements, rights, or people's safety, a qualified substantive procedure has its own importance. A general article on joint reasoning cannot replace it and authorizes no dangerous trial to test a team's coordination.

VIII. After a Mistake, Distinguish Correction from Explanation

If the wrong date has already been published, the first available step concerns the people relying on it. Establish the meeting's exact status, communicate corrected information through an appropriate channel, and promise only what is confirmed. Discussing causes can proceed separately and take time. Waiting for that discussion does not always justify leaving the old inaccurate message in circulation. Yet a hurried new date without confirmation repeats the error's structure. Correction should restore grounds for recipients' own decisions: travel, await clarification, or decline participation. The team cannot assume that its internal distress has compensated others' inconvenience, and it should not hide an important change behind the neutral word "update."

Establish causes from available history rather than blaming whoever stood closest to the final result. The person publishing the message may have been entitled to expect final confirmation from someone else; alternatively, they may have changed the date against an explicit condition. Those possibilities call for different conclusions. Do not choose a team's preferred account merely because it closes an uncomfortable conversation quickly. Preserve what remains unknown. Acknowledging uncertainty does not prevent correction, but it limits accusation. One can state that the message is wrong and is being corrected without claiming that intention, blame, and the entire mechanism have already been established.

An inquiry is not useless if it finds no single principal culprit. Everyone may have performed their parts while no check covered the decisive condition. That transition then needs changing. Yet "the system was to blame" can also evade responsibility: particular people may have had access, authority, and accepted obligations they did not use. Examine both levels without selecting an excuse in advance. Improving the arrangement and acknowledging one's decision are compatible. Neither requires defining a person permanently by the mistake. The point is to understand the grounds of responsibility and the next available action while keeping the consequences for affected people in view.

IX. A New Arrangement Should Address the Gap Found

After a shared mistake, it is tempting to require everyone to check everything. This can appear serious while merely obscuring responsibility for the final check. If everyone expects others to discover a discrepancy, the decisive subject can again go unanswered. A more proportionate response connects the identified gap to a definite action: before announcing a date, check the particular confirmation, and a changed date returns the question to that check. This arrangement is no universal guarantee. It addresses the discrepancy actually established. A different cause requires a different change. Promising complete infallibility conceals the limits of any arrangement and may hinder recognition of a new kind of problem.

Adding a step does not make it feasible. The assigned person needs access to confirmation, an understood criterion, and a way to report an unresolved condition. Without these, a name in the arrangement merely provides a convenient target for future blame. Check whether the action is possible under ordinary circumstances rather than exceptional heroic effort. For example, the latest email must be accessible to the date checker, and changed conditions must reach them in time. This feasibility check need not promise that people and circumstances will remain unchanged. It makes explicit what the improvement currently relies on and which change would require reconsideration.

Not every improvement requires permanent oversight from above. Some tasks need only a clear handover state and one confirmation before external action. Others have special rules that a convenient general scheme cannot abolish. The choice depends on the subject, the cost of error, and actual authority. A time-consuming arrangement gives grounds to discuss proportion, but does not automatically prove the check unnecessary. A very simple arrangement does not prove sufficiency either. Ask more specifically whether the step addresses the identified gap and whether an important condition still has no responsible recipient. This allows cooperation to improve without making every mistake a reason for endless expansion of rules.

X. A Team Learns by Preserving an Accurate History

A sound conclusion need not say “we have improved.” A more verifiable conclusion states what has been established, corrected, and left open. For example, the team found that the announced date had not been checked against venue confirmation; the message was corrected; an accessible check was assigned before the next announcement; participants’ expenses remain under discussion. These are distinguishable states. Such a record neither treats a new rule as proven reliability nor equates closing an internal conversation with resolving all consequences. An accurate history can be brief. Its value is that the next decision can rely on established facts rather than a legend of complete repair.

Preserving history does not mean keeping someone permanently ashamed. A mistake can be acknowledged, a corrective obligation fulfilled, and cooperation continued where grounds and consent support it. One cannot demand that others erase an uncomfortable event in exchange for one’s readiness to work again. Someone whose warning went unanswered may need clarity about the new route for observations. A person affected by an external promise may decline the next offer. Such decisions need not express hostility. They reflect their own grounds for trust and limits on participation. A team also learns by recognizing that restoring relationships is not controlled by a leader’s single internal decision.

Collective competence involves both the richness of individual abilities and the ability to connect them to one subject of action. This is our concluding argument, not a formula unifying ancient teachings and modern research. Keep several distinctions in view: agreement and knowledge, checking and deciding, transferring a file and transferring its state, correcting a result and explaining its cause. They promise no elimination of error. They provide language for noticing an important gap earlier and acting more precisely afterward. A strong team need not demonstrate strength through an absence of questions. It can preserve participants’ dignity by answering questions substantively and changing action proportionately where its former grounds no longer hold.

What this means in practice

Choose one small transition in joint work where one person’s result becomes grounds for another person’s action. This might be handing over a programme, agreeing a date, or reporting that material is ready. Do not choose a dangerous trial, another person’s confidential material, or a situation where your participation gives no authority to intervene. Where specialized professional requirements apply, use the appropriate checking procedure; this exercise does not replace it.

First write down one action the recipient intends to take after handover. Name the important condition they will rely on. Distinguish established, provisional, and unknown matters. If the condition has been checked, identify the version to which the answer applies and whether confirmation is available to the person acting. There is no need to recount the sender’s entire labour or gather information about every minute of it.

In an agreed conversation, clarify the state of the part being handed over. Use a specific statement: the content is prepared, the date is unconfirmed, and an announcement requires the venue’s response. Invite the recipient to describe in their own words what they consider ready. If the answers diverge, return them first to one subject. Do not turn divergence into proof of dishonesty or weakness; intention cannot be inferred from differing formulations alone.

Name a route for an important observation: its recipient, the answer needed, and what can continue meanwhile. Reversible preparation and an external promise may require different decisions. If a necessary condition remains unknown, choose an available action: obtain confirmation, reduce the promise, or stop the affected step. A deadline arriving is not confirmation. Do not accept a new risk for someone who has not given that authority.

If an error has already affected others, formulate the correction for them separately. Inquiry into causes can continue; report only what is established. Then record one change to the transition that addresses the gap found, and check feasibility: access, an understood criterion, and a way to report an unresolved condition. The outcome is concrete clarity about the next action rather than a feeling that the team is now protected from every mistake. Keep unknown matters and unresolved consequences visible. The exercise’s benefit has not been measured here; consider only whether the selected handover became clearer within a task you may legitimately undertake.

Key quotation

> *for some understand one part, and some another, and among them they understand the whole.*

Aristotle, Politics III.XI, Benjamin Jowett. The passage qualifies its argument; universal group superiority is not asserted.

Connections between traditions

Interlocutor	Subject	Comparison limit
Plato, VI	Recognition of subject knowledge	The sailors lack navigation training; no competent-team study
Aristotle, III.XI	Qualified shared judgment	Ancient political reasoning guarantees no majority’s correctness
Proverbs 15:22	Readiness to receive counsel	Religious saying, not a procedure or efficacy measurement
United Wisdom	Connecting a checked condition to joint action	Original practical reasoning and hypothetical scenes

Primary sources

1. Plato, Republic, VI, 488a–489d. Jowett; PG 55201, largely 1888 text with 1908 markers. Ship parable and immediate interpretation read, displayed lines 6112–6138; no Greek collation.

2. Aristotle, Politics, complete III.XI, displayed lines 135–153. Jowett; interface does not identify a print edition. Historical hierarchies not adopted.

3. Proverbs 15, 14–23, especially 22; displayed lines 73–89. Displayed KJV; commentary not used as grounds for the argument.

The contemporary handover and checking discussion is original editorial reasoning. Worldwide website-layout rights are not established; raw ingestion and vectorization are not authorized.

Tags

collective error, competence, cooperation, shared decision, joint work, knowledge, agreement, checking, responsibility, authority, handover, conditions, version, clarification, objection, counsel, trust, respect, result, correction, causes, history, consequences, Plato, Aristotle, Proverbs, philosophy, ethics, action, team

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.