

UNITED WISDOM

A good life: virtue, duty and care

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P06 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A good life: virtue, duty and care

Epigraph

> *“None of us can stand aside; our feet are mired in the same soil, and our lungs breathe the same air.”*

— Jane Addams, Democracy and Social Ethics, chapter VII, paragraph on shared implication in political corruption. Original English.

What this article is about

A good life can mean comfort, success or worthy treatment of others, and these meanings do not always coincide. How can we discuss its moral quality without demanding perfection or making each action an examination of identity? This article compares three perspectives: virtue asks about the character repeated action sustains, duty about the grounds of obligation, and care about a particular person's situation. We consider them through an invented volunteer centre where requests, promises and limited resources all matter. Aristotle, Kant and Jane Addams stand alongside the discussion without forming one theory. The distinctions reveal the cost of good intentions, limits of assistance, shared conditions and the possibility of repair after an error. The subject is accountable action, rather than a guaranteed formula for a morally correct life.

I. A good life requires clarifying “good”

A life can be called good for different reasons: it is pleasant, successful, rich in relationships, or allows someone to regard their actions as worthy. These answers need not exclude one another, but they are not identical. Someone may live comfortably while recognising that others bear an unfair burden. They may fulfil obligations while relationships contain little attentive presence. They may help constantly yet become unable to keep existing promises. These situations do not deliver a judgement on an entire life. They reveal why one feature is insufficient and why “I do good” still requires an account of what happens to everyone involved.

Three questions stand alongside one another here. What sort of person am I becoming through repeated action? On what grounds is an action permissible or obligatory? What does the particular person connected to me need? The first opens a perspective on virtue, the second on duty, and the third on care. This is an editorial organisation of the discussion, not a complete definition of three major ethical traditions. Historical sources are more complex than these brief formulas. The distinction nevertheless shows how one action can receive different

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

assessments. It also guards against diagnosing every moral difficulty as defective character, blind obedience or insufficient sympathy before the circumstances are understood.

Imagine an invented volunteer centre. A coordinator wants to help a new visitor although the day's allocated resources are almost exhausted. Additional help may appear generous; preserving arrangements promised to others may appear obligatory; the visitor's request may reveal an overlooked need. Selecting one question does not erase the others. A good life here does not mean always giving the same response. It concerns hearing different grounds, acknowledging limitations and making a decision accountable to affected people. The centre is an analytical example, not a study establishing which ethical approach works best.

II. Virtue: action that forms character

Generosity, courage and justice can concern not just a conspicuous act, but a way of acting again. Book II of the Nicomachean Ethics connects moral character with activity and habit. This is a historical philosophical account, not a modern experiment on behaviour formation. For our discussion, repetition matters: which habitual form of participation does today's action sustain? A brave moment demanding continual risks from others differs from accountability for one's own decision. One generous act may display its giver, while less visible participation can better preserve reliability. Circumstances matter more than outward impressiveness.

At the hypothetical centre, a coordinator may cover everyone else's shifts and appear exceptionally responsive. If this hides an impossible rota and prevents colleagues from agreeing on workloads, however, the repetition deserves scrutiny. The character question is not a demand to become less kind. It concerns which stable relationship is created: an open arrangement or dependence on one permanently available person. Generosity is not measured only by tasks accepted. How they are accepted, the treatment of others and the ability to keep promises matter. Declining an extra shift can preserve responsibility if communicated beforehand rather than deployed as a sudden punishment for inadequate gratitude.

Virtue should not become a frozen image of an impeccable person. Such an image easily demands proof of courage through every risk, kindness through every agreement, and patience through an absence of boundaries. Our editorial application concerns discerning a suitable action more than constantly demonstrating an attractive quality. What would repeated use of this method sustain in our lives? The answer is no prediction, but can reveal the direction of a commitment. It leaves room for learning: changing assistance, acknowledging an ill-considered promise and finding a more reliable participation. Character is discussed through available actions and their grounds, rather than a final declaration about identity from one difficult situation.

III. Duty: a reason that does not disappear with desire

Duty reminds us that an action can retain its grounds when we do not want to perform it. I promised to communicate a significant change; I am responsible for handing over entrusted information; someone relied on an agreement. Reluctance alone does not dissolve these relations. “Duty,” however, should not gain authority merely because an insistent person uses it. Where did the obligation arise, to whom does it apply, and where does it end? Otherwise, morality can disguise an arbitrary demand for permanent obedience. Explaining duty differs from pressure through its capacity to name grounds, rather than displaying the force of someone's expectation or the weight of our guilt.

In The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Kant considers personal perfection and others' happiness as ends connected with duty, distinguishing moral self-obligation from external constraint. Duty therefore does not reduce to carrying out someone else's orders; its grounds require moral consideration. His argument is no instruction for a volunteer rota. Our contemporary application is editorial: before calling a rule obligatory, ask which relation it protects and how it applies to participants. This does not cancel professional or legal obligations, which belong in their appropriate domains. It helps avoid dignifying every personal demand with a morally authoritative word.

A distribution rule at the centre may protect people already promised resources. A coordinator should not abandon it solely because a new request is moving. Yet a rule may have overlooked an actual need and require revision through an available procedure. Breaking a convenient restriction, breaching a substantial commitment and changing a mistaken arrangement are different actions. Duty sustains grounds without relieving us of understanding them. If fulfilment requires unavailable resources or conflicts with another obligation, clarification and agreement are needed. A good life includes recognising an obligation without giving that name to every habit, fear of disapproval or request from an influential participant.

IV. Care: seeing the person within the rule

Care begins with attention to a particular person's situation but does not end with warm intentions. What are they asking for? What is available? How do they understand the offer? Which participation preserves their ability to act? At the hypothetical centre, a visitor receives a standard package while needing something different. A worker may conscientiously follow procedure yet fail to notice that the action misses the request. This does not prove general rules unnecessary. It shows that rules need contact with circumstances and may need clarification. Care brings back the person for whom help exists, rather than treating them as evidence of our responsiveness or the organisation's correctness.

In Democracy and Social Ethics, Jane Addams connects moral consideration with diverse human experience and shared social life. Her 1902 text should not be presented as a complete account of contemporary care ethics. It offers a historical comparison: benevolent intentions cannot replace acquaintance with other lives. The centre is our invented scene, not a retelling of an Addams case. Nor do we infer empirically that direct contact always secures a correct decision. Contact can be incomplete and require clarification. Its limited importance here is that, without the affected person's voice, we can easily call an action suitable when it principally suits its proposer.

Attention to needs gives no right to control a life completely. We can offer help and hear a refusal, learn something important without publicising it for a persuasive fundraiser, or acknowledge need while stating limitations honestly. Care therefore involves consent, privacy and distribution of available effort. Sometimes the attentive action is accurate information about another resource rather than promising to solve everything personally. This is neither a universal recipe nor an invitation to withdraw from a difficult request. It distinguishes presence alongside someone from trying to become the sole answer to their life. Good intentions gain substance through attention to need, the recipient's independence and the helper's ability to deliver.

V. Three questions about one action

Return to the coordinator lacking allocated resources for a new request. A virtue perspective asks what repeated participation sustains: consistent attentiveness or impressive exceptions that disregard others. Duty recalls promises and the arrangement's legitimacy. Care returns to a request that may not fit the original scheme. Retaining only one question makes part of the situation disappear. The three questions need not produce three different answers: they may support one action for different reasons. They may instead reveal genuine tension that cannot be removed by calling the selected action kind, correct and caring all at once.

The coordinator can clarify urgency, alternatives and the possibility of an agreed redistribution. They can state limits, offer particular participation and avoid promising on absent colleagues' behalf. This option does not emerge automatically from the questions: information and time are required. In another situation, urgency may prevent extended discussion; acting within one's competence and later explaining the grounds remain necessary. We are not creating a universal emergency algorithm. The scene illustrates a simpler distinction: attention to grounds reveals which aspect needs scrutiny instead of attempting to prove someone's complete moral perfection through one response.

The perspectives should not become a vote in which two automatically defeat the third. A substantial constraint does not become insignificant through numerous attractive descriptions. If an action breaches privacy, praise of generosity and care does not remove that fact. If a rule

systematically makes some people invisible, invoking discipline does not conclude discussion. Each ground needs its own language and examination against the circumstances. A particular person or authorised group still decides. Responsibility does not disappear into a philosophical table; it concerns explaining what was known, what remained uncertain and why the method appeared permissible under these constraints.

VI. Good intentions do not cancel the method

We can sincerely want to help while selecting a method that removes another person's participation in their own life. In an invented scene, an acquaintance publicises someone else's difficulty to gather support quickly. They explain it as care, but the person wanted privacy. The method, consent and possibility of repair matter alongside the desired result. This does not prove all care false, any more than a worthy purpose supplies sufficient justification. A good life requires attention to the relation between ends and actions: how assistance occurs is already part of the moral relationship, rather than a technical detail to postpone until something useful has been achieved.

The three perspectives retain different parts of the scrutiny. Virtue asks which manner of relating becomes habitual. Duty concerns a substantial commitment, such as a promise of confidentiality. Care concerns actual need and the person's voice. Together they can reveal an error without making examination an accusation against every intention of the helper. Someone can recognise a good purpose and an unsuitable action simultaneously. Repair does not first require proving they have always been a bad person. It requires ending the available violation, discussing consequences with the affected participant and avoiding calling them ungrateful for declining the proposed method. This precision preserves responsibility without moral theatre.

Attending to methods does not require ideal knowledge before any action. Information may be limited while assistance is needed now. Uncertainty can be stated openly, with action confined to available consent and no unsupported expansion of participation. If a prior conversation is impossible, subsequent explanation becomes particularly important. This is no general permission to choose for others: urgency must be actual rather than a convenient name for impatience. The article replaces no professional rules on assistance or safety. Its limited question is whether we can explain why a method was chosen, what it affected, and how it will change if previously unrecognised harm emerges.

VII. A good action does not require a rescuer role

Attention to people can gradually become a belief that I must answer every request. Every limitation then feels like abandonment of a good life, although personal resources remain finite. At our hypothetical centre, the coordinator cannot work for everyone, fund every need and preserve all earlier commitments. Recognising limits does not decide whom to help, but makes discussion more honest. Relinquishing the sole-rescuer role reveals other participants, joint decisions and organisational tasks. This is an editorial distinction, not a psychological explanation of a helper's identity. We infer no concealed motive from heavy workloads and do not require kindness to be labelled a pathological habit.

Need, available assistance and promised participation can be distinguished. A need can remain substantial even when I cannot meet it completely. Assistance can be partial when its limits are clear. A promise commits to the stated scope rather than every future request. This also protects the recipient, who can assess whether the offer is sufficient and where additional support might be found. “I am always here” may sound warmer but reveal little about tomorrow. “I can help with this at this time” sometimes contains greater reliability despite sounding less magnificent. The available meaning of words matters more than their emotional height.

Boundaries should not excuse harm already done or unexplained disappearance when someone reasonably relied on assistance. If promised participation proves impossible, communicate accurately and discuss an available transition. Sometimes a competent professional or authorised service is needed rather than proof of personal moral endurance. A good life does not consist in appropriating every task in the world. It can include being one accountable participant among others: doing what is available, avoiding unknown promises, recognising others' contributions and keeping the recipient involved in the decision. This form is less grand than a rescuer image but leaves more room for reciprocity and independence.

VIII. Character lives within relationships and conditions

When moral discussion concentrates solely on personality, it can overlook how shared work is arranged. The centre explains resource shortages through insufficient generosity, an impossible rota through inadequate patience, and missing information through inattentive visitors. These explanations can conveniently preserve an arrangement that needs changing. The invented scene exposes a risk: one participant's good character cannot replace fair distribution of effort and intelligible rules. Personal responsibility does not disappear into a system. It includes recognising where an individual concession temporarily helps and where its constant repetition conceals a problem, transferring costs to those least able to refuse.

We can care for a visitor while proposing a changed booking process so similar needs do not remain invisible. We can keep a necessary promise while noting that the next commitment requires resources. We can act patiently while naming an unacceptable workload. These combinations do not require choosing between personal kindness and the organisation of shared life; they reveal different levels of responsibility. A proposal is not correct merely because it is called systemic. Change requires information, agreement and scrutiny of consequences too. A reform helping some can impede others' access, so attention to the person remains essential after a rule changes.

A good life neither ends at pure intentions nor dissolves into a demand to repair every social condition alone. Each person has a particular sphere of participation and limited competence. They can report a problem, propose an available change, support shared work or decline to endorse an impossible promise. These methods require different resources. Their value does not depend on the volume of a moral declaration, but on what happens to the shared task and affected people. This gives the three perspectives a living context: character appears in relationships, commitments exist under particular conditions, and care attends not only to one request but to how access to assistance is organised.

IX. Error and the possibility of repairing a relationship

If a good life means never making mistakes, acknowledging an unsuccessful action threatens the whole self-image. Someone defends intentions, disputes consequences and asks the affected participant first to confirm their kindness. An error need not become a final diagnosis of identity. We can acknowledge an ill-considered promise, a rule applied without necessary information, or assistance offered without consent. Each description concerns an action and opens a particular route for repair. It is more precise than “I am terrible,” which often leaves another with the original consequences and an additional task of consolation. Responsibility attends to circumstances rather than only the distress of judging oneself morally.

At the invented centre, the coordinator promised an unavailable resource. They can state the fact, acknowledge their part, clarify alternatives and avoid demanding gratitude for the initial intention. The recipient need not immediately restore trust. Repair can take time and may not recover a lost opportunity completely. An attractive explanation cannot remove this unwelcome limit. Acknowledging consequences nevertheless allows changed participation: checking stock before promising, explaining timescales and passing essential information to colleagues. These actions guarantee no reconciliation. They describe available responsibility after an error, when the original situation cannot be rewritten and what actually happened must be addressed.

The perspectives preserve the meaning of change. Virtue concerns which action will be repeated next. Duty recalls unfinished obligations. Care returns to the affected person's

situation, which differs from the helper's wish to end an uncomfortable conversation. Repair does not require accepting every subsequent complaint or surrendering boundaries. Accountable responsibility, available compensation and unsupported demands need distinguishing. Questions concerning law, health or safety require appropriate competent assistance. A philosophical essay can clarify discussion's grounds, but determines no legal culpability, treats no distress and replaces no professional decision about a particular case's consequences.

X. A good life without a demand for perfection

A good life cannot be obtained by attaching three approving labels to every act. Virtue, duty and care matter when they reveal what might otherwise be missed: a habitual relationship, an obligation that survives reluctance, or a person's voice within an arrangement. Endless assessment of moral purity can distract from available action. At the centre, resources, promises and responsibility for decisions still need explaining. Philosophical language is useful while returning us to these relationships and grounds, rather than constructing another stage for demonstrating superiority.

Several demands can coexist without an instant answer. This need not mean moral emptiness. A fact may need checking, a participant consulting or conflicting commitments acknowledging. Uncertainty does not remove responsibility for what is already available: honesty about resources, respect for privacy and avoidance of knowingly false promises. A good life here involves action under incomplete knowledge without pretending knowledge is complete. It also allows pleasure, rest and personal interests. These do not become suspicious merely because someone else has a need. The question concerns relationships and accepted responsibility, rather than a requirement that every minute prove usefulness to everyone.

Reflection may therefore produce a small change: promising more precisely, asking more attentively, noticing a repeated method and recognising others' participation. It creates no finished exemplar, but connects discussion of a good life with what can actually be performed. Virtue recalls the direction of repetition, duty the weight of grounds, and care the particularity of a person. They remain distinct perspectives capable of substantial disagreement. Their proximity matters through expanded attention rather than a final reconciliation of every theory. Life acquires a clearer moral form when someone can explain an action, hear its cost for others and change a method where a good intention has not yet become a suitable relationship.

What this means in practice

For voluntary reflection, select a small action you regard as good but about which a doubt remains. First describe the action without evaluating identity: what was done, to whom it was offered, what was promised and which result is known. You need not start with the most painful error. If important information is missing, record its absence rather than replace it with a confident guess about another's feelings or a concealed motive.

Then ask three separate questions. Which relationship would repeated action sustain? What obligation actually exists, and where did it arise? What is known about the affected person's need, consent and independence? Answers can coincide or reveal tension. Do not turn them into a vote or demand immediate proof of kindness. If a promise supports the action, check its scope. If a need supports it, check whose voice describes that need. If a character quality supports it, return to the particular participation.

Finally, choose one available clarification: asking about preferences, stating resource limits, checking a fact or correcting an inaccurate promise. You may only need to recognise insufficient information for now. The exercise is no proven technique, moral-maturity test or replacement for professional assistance. It requires no continued participation in danger and determines no legal responsibility. Its purpose is to make a small next step more precise while preserving distinctions between good intentions, permissible methods and another person's actual circumstances.

Key quotation

> *“Thus, in one word, states of character arise out of like activities.”*

— Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, II.1. English translation by W. D. Ross.

Connections between traditions

Perspective	Connection	Limit
Character and action	Aristotle connects character with repetition; Addams considers shared social life.	Individual formation and social consideration differ.
Duty and virtue	Kant connects moral ends with duty; Aristotle discusses habitual activity.	Their foundations are not identical.
Care and circumstances	Addams attends to varied experience; our example asks about a recipient's voice.	The historical text is not a complete contemporary care ethics.
Promises and assistance	Kant's duty question is compared with attention to need at the centre.	This is editorial application, not Kant's resource-distribution rule.
A good life and arrangements	All three perspectives allow different questions about action.	Related questions erase neither philosophical differences nor conflicts.

Primary sources

1. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, II.1–2. W. D. Ross translation: character, repetition and circumstances.

2. Immanuel Kant. The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Introduction I–II and IV. Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation: grounds of duty.

3. Jane Addams. Democracy and Social Ethics (1902), chapters I and VII. Social experience and responsibility; the chapter VII quotation concerns political corruption.

Only the passages identified in the research notes were read. Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations from W. D. Ross’s English translation of Aristotle and Addams’s original English text. Kant is read in Thomas Kingsmill Abbott’s English translation; the Greek and German originals were not collated. All contemporary scenes are hypothetical editorial examples.

Tags

good life, virtue, duty, care, morality, ethics, character, habit, action, relationships, consent, privacy, responsibility, promise, assistance, boundaries, resources, intention, consequences, error, repair, social ethics, Aristotle, Kant, Jane Addams, independence, cooperation, commitments, circumstances, philosophy of life

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.