

UNITED WISDOM

Spinoza: Nature, Necessity, and Understanding

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-18-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Spinoza: Nature, Necessity, and Understanding

Imagine a hypothetical evening. Two people are arguing about lateness. One demands, “You could simply have arrived on time.” The other replies, “That is how circumstances worked out.” The first statement seems to make the person the event’s sole source. The second seems to place them outside what happened. Yet they both participated in the situation and depended on things they did not determine: other people’s decisions, the journey, their own preparation, the information received.

Can we explain an action through its causes without turning explanation into an excuse? Can we discuss responsibility without pretending that a person begins the world anew each time through sheer will? This tension helps us approach Spinoza, a philosopher for whom human life belongs to nature and therefore calls for understanding, rather than evaluation alone.

What This Article Is About

We will consider a small framework of Spinoza’s thought: one substance, necessity, the distinction between activity and passivity, and the significance of understanding. We will then develop our own contemporary questions about causes, the conditions of action, and possibilities for change. Our scenes are not empirical studies, and our practical suggestions are not attributed to Spinoza. His system constructs a philosophical argument; modern evidence does not prove it simply because it uses the word “nature.” What matters here is not a promise of complete tranquillity, but a difficult distinction: the causal determination of an action is not equivalent to its acceptability, and acknowledging conditions does not necessarily eliminate a person’s participation. The article preserves the possibility of disagreeing with Spinoza’s metaphysics while exploring what changes when we try to see a concrete sequence instead of offering general condemnation.

1. Nature Is More Than a Backdrop for Human Beings

In the Ethics, substance is defined as what exists in itself and is conceived through itself; a mode is an affection of something else. Spinoza argues for the uniqueness of substance and places everything that exists in God; God is an immanent cause, rather than an external maker of the world. Spinoza, Ethics, I, Definitions 3, 5; Propositions 14–18. Here, “nature” does not mean only forests, weather, and a pleasant walk.

For our contemporary reading, a hypothetical photograph of someone at a desk is a useful starting point. If we describe only what they want to do, much disappears: the room’s

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

arrangement, the distribution of responsibilities, access to information, tools, agreements. If we describe only those conditions, their own participation disappears: how they understood the task, what they noticed, what they did and failed to do.

We propose considering a person within a situation while retaining both layers. This does not prove that there is one substance. It is an independent way of posing a practical question. A missed deadline, for example, may depend both on an unclear request and on the worker's failure to clarify it. The two causes need not cancel each other.

The word "nature" should not stand in for an explanation either. "That is human nature" often merely repeats an event in grander language. If a hypothetical participant interrupted someone, we so far know that they interrupted. We do not automatically know a universal law, their intention, or an unchanging personal quality. A substantive explanation must add a distinction that can be checked or at least discussed clearly.

Instead of asking generally "Why are people like this?", we can ask what exactly was happening in this conversation: whether the point of disagreement was named, who had the opportunity to finish speaking, what consequences the interruption had. Nature then ceases to be a backdrop or an exculpatory word, becoming an invitation to explore how conditions connect.

That invitation does not require crossing out values. We may still consider an interruption unfair. But evaluation and explanation acquire their own tasks and stop competing for the right to describe the whole event.

2. Necessity and an Unknown Future

Ethics I.29 asserts the necessity of what happens; I.33 distinguishes necessity from our incomplete knowledge of causes. This is a strong metaphysical position, rather than merely advice to consider circumstances. Spinoza, Ethics, I.29, I.33, Scholium 1. Academic commentary separately explains the difference between causal necessity and external compulsion in Spinoza's understanding of freedom. Steven Nadler, "Baruch Spinoza," §2.1.

Our hypothetical scene distinguishes two propositions: "Everything had causes" and "I know what will happen." The second does not follow from the first. Even if we accept a definite causal connection, a participant may lack information about it. Confident prediction requires grounds of its own.

Imagine a journey. Someone knows the meeting time but does not know whether an obstacle will arise on the way. Calling something "necessary" cannot remove this lack of knowledge. They can check the route, allow extra time, or give notice of a delay. Each action will itself

enter the sequence of events. Recognising determination does not make preparation meaningless: preparation itself changes the situation insofar as it can.

A fatalistic conclusion often arises here: “If the outcome is determined, why do anything?” In our reading, it covertly severs action from outcome. The outcome is imagined as fixed independently of participation, whereas the connection between participation and outcome is precisely what needs investigating. In the hypothetical case, giving notice does not remove a delay, but may change its consequences for the other person.

We can reject Spinoza’s metaphysics and still notice the logical inaccuracy of such surrender. If planning is one condition of an outcome, we cannot first remove it from the picture and then declare it unnecessary. The opposite mistake is possible too: we cannot assume that having a plan guarantees an outcome under every circumstance.

Necessity and uncertainty thus concern different questions. The former concerns the structure of what happens within a philosophical system; the latter concerns the limits of information available to us. Practical decisions occur within this incomplete knowledge and should account for it, rather than hide it behind a final pronouncement about fate.

3. Understanding Causes Does Not Mean Approving an Action

Explaining an event does not grant it moral permission. This is our editorial position and a key to an everyday reading of the topic. If we learn that someone broke an agreement because they lacked time, the cause helps explain the course of events. It does not, by itself, answer who suffered harm, what now needs repair, or whether work can continue under the previous terms.

Imagine a shared project. One participant fulfils a promise late and explains the delay through overload. Another replies, “I do not need reasons.” Their position is understandable: they fear that an account of causes will become a way to escape consequences. But without causes it is difficult to distinguish what should change: the deadline, scope, warning procedure, distribution of work, or the agreement itself.

Three questions can be kept separate. What led to the delay? Which obligation was breached? What next arrangement could account for both participants? The first needs information; the second needs clarity about agreements; the third needs choice and renewed consent. None cancels the others.

An explanation need not be kind. It may reveal that someone understood a risk and chose not to report it. Clarifying causes would then strengthen the assessment of the breach, rather than soften it. Alternatively, it may reveal incompatible assignments or missing access. A demand to “Just try harder” would then have no meaningful target.

The risk of coercive understanding deserves attention of its own. Sometimes one person announces another's causes to them: "I know why you did that." If the second person's own account is ignored, causal language becomes a way of depriving them of a voice. The explanatory system becomes more convenient than the living situation and ceases to be tested against it.

In our application, therefore, questions about causes are accompanied by a right of correction. We can propose a hypothesis, name its grounds, hear disagreement, and leave something unknown. This does not concede accuracy. It is a condition of accuracy when discussing another person's action without complete observation.

Imagine, too, a participant who cannot give a coherent explanation. They offer several incompatible versions or say they do not know. It would be a mistake to treat this as permission to invent a cause for them. Uncertainty may remain while the observed consequences are perfectly clear. Revising a deadline need not require establishing the ultimate motive of a past decision; it is enough to see that the previous agreement was not fulfilled and what is needed for the next one.

Conversation without compulsory confession becomes possible. One person may ask about facts relevant to a shared obligation. The other need not present a final theory of their inner life. Accuracy in joint work sometimes requires less personal disclosure than a dispute about "the real reasons" assumes. This is our ethical boundary for application, rather than a conclusion attributed to the historical text.

Understanding is useful when it makes consequences and possibilities more discernible. If it merely renames every action as inevitable and therefore acceptable, it stops explaining practically significant differences.

4. Between Activity and Passivity

Spinoza's distinction concerns causes: we act when we are the adequate cause of what happens, and are acted upon when we are only a partial cause. An affect is connected with a change in the body's power of acting and the idea of that change. Spinoza, Ethics, III, Definitions 1–3. "Passivity" here is broader than ordinary physical inactivity.

For a contemporary illustration, imagine someone who immediately answers every incoming message. Outwardly, they are extremely active. But if the day's purpose disappears behind a stream of other people's requests, the number of movements does not yet show how far their actions connect with their own understanding of the task. This is our example, not a translation of Spinoza's criterion into a measurable indicator.

The reverse scene: a participant pauses and asks what exactly is being proposed. Outwardly, they do less. But the pause may form part of a substantive decision. It may also be a way to evade something; the behaviour's form alone cannot establish this. An action's significance depends on its place within a sequence.

The example allows a question without moral branding: what determines my response now? A clear purpose, an agreement, fear of missing an opportunity, someone else's demand, lack of a suitable alternative? Several causes may participate at once. There is no need to choose one and declare it "the true one" simply for a tidy scheme.

It matters not to turn the ideal of greater activity into an obligation to control everything. A person does not possess all the conditions, and their understanding is limited too. We may knowingly accept another's proposal because trust and cooperation matter. External influence does not automatically mean humiliation or error.

In our interpretation, more substantive autonomy begins with distinguishing how connections work, rather than removing them. Where do I really assent? Where have important terms not been communicated? Where is refusal possible? Where is a constraint real and impossible to remove with a single new thought?

The answers may unpleasantly narrow our choices. But a small real possibility differs from imagined boundlessness. Clarifying a deadline, limiting scope, or asking for missing information is sometimes more available than declaring complete independence from the world and then encountering the same circumstances.

5. The Power to Act and Power Over Others

The phrase "power of acting" can easily be read as a right to get one's way at any cost. We propose another contemporary question: what exactly becomes possible, and for whom? A hypothetical person may gain more control over a conversation by interrupting others, but that does not yet mean shared work has become more rational or viable.

An academic account of Spinoza's ethics connects adequate understanding, human good, and relations with others; it also shows that liberation from passive affects does not mean eliminating all external influence. Nadler, §§2.4–2.5. We do not derive a ready-made model of relationships from this. It gives us grounds only for avoiding a confusion between philosophical power and everyday domination.

Imagine work being allocated in a small team. A leader decides everything alone and obtains a quick result. For a one-off task, this may be convenient. If everyone else stops understanding the conditions and cannot continue without the leader, immediate success sits alongside a new

dependence. Evaluation needs a time horizon: what happened today, and what will become possible tomorrow?

Conversely, every allocation need not be equal. Different knowledge and duties may justify different authority. The problem begins when its reasons, limits, and consequences become unavailable for discussion, rather than with differing roles themselves. Someone acquires a duty without information, or responsibility without an opportunity to influence things.

In our reading, participation has several dimensions: understanding the task, possessing the necessary means, having a right to clarification, and knowing the consequences of one's assent. A lack in one dimension cannot automatically be repaired by increasing another. Extra motivation does not create missing access, and a new tool does not resolve the question of consent.

The question of greater power to act can therefore be directed towards the situation's arrangement. What information is needed? How are the consequences of error distributed? Can a participant refuse additional scope? What depends on shared changes in conditions, rather than one person's effort?

Such a reading promises no harmony. Interests can diverge. But it allows a more precise discussion of disagreement than a dispute between a "strong" and a "weak" person. Sometimes strength lies in setting a boundary, sometimes in cooperation, sometimes in recognising that the previous arrangement does not support the chosen purpose.

6. Why Understanding Does Not Switch Off Experience

Knowing a cause and experiencing a change need not occur simultaneously. In Ethics IV.1, Spinoza considers an image persisting after true knowledge is acquired; IV.3–4 stress the limits of human power in relation to external causes. Spinoza, Ethics, IV.1, Scholium; IV.3–4. Our application of this distinction does not promise an emotional outcome.

In a hypothetical scene, someone knows that a short reply was written while travelling. They no longer regard it as proof of disregard, but the tension does not immediately disappear. This alone does not mean the explanation is useless or that they "have not understood enough." The claim about motive and the current reaction are different aspects of the situation.

Instead of demanding immediate calm, we can look at what actually changed. Did another explanation become available? Did we drop an unnecessary accusation? Was a future expectation clarified? Perhaps the experience remained, but action became less hasty. In this hypothetical case, a concrete change has already occurred, without needing to declare it a completed inner transformation.

There is another possibility: explaining causes increases the burden. Someone discovers that a refusal was deliberate. “Understanding” should then not mean compulsory relief. New information may require revising an agreement, experiencing loss, or relinquishing a previous expectation. Philosophical language should not determine in advance which emotional outcome counts as correct.

Distinguishing explanation, justification, accepting a fact, and choosing an action helps here. We can understand why something happened without agreeing to repeat it. We can acknowledge that it has happened without calling it just. We can choose a boundary without complete clarity about every cause.

These are our contemporary distinctions. Their purpose is not to weaken Spinoza’s demand for understanding, but to avoid turning it into another accusation: “If you were more rational, you would not feel this.” Such a sentence both makes a contested claim about someone and obstructs discovering what they are experiencing.

Understanding takes a respectful form when it lets us notice changes and remaining constraints. It may expand the next choice, but need not act as a switch for human experience.

7. Where the System Remains Contested

A dispute about necessity cannot be replaced by an appeal to ordinary causation. That some events have known causes does not mean Spinoza’s entire metaphysics is proven. Accepting one explanatory principle does not mean accepting every proposition of the system, its understanding of God, and its ideal of freedom.

Our first objection thus concerns overly swift contemporary assent: “Science says the same thing today.” Without a specific study and a precise thesis, the phrase establishes nothing. The philosophical question of the world’s necessity and investigation of a particular process have different scope. This article contains no empirical evidence confirming the system as a whole.

The second objection concerns responsibility. If we should understand people through causes, does room for change remain? Our contemporary discussion shows a logical possibility of such room: new information, agreements, and consequences can also enter a causal picture. But this is not yet a complete answer to every moral question. Who is entitled to judge, which consequences are fair, and where coercion begins are independent subjects.

The third objection concerns access to understanding. Might someone with less time and fewer resources automatically become “less free,” and then be blamed for that too? Careless practical transfer creates such a risk. This is why our article considers constraints part of a situation, rather than personal guilt for lacking ideal knowledge.

Finally, there is a temptation to combine Spinoza with any teaching that speaks of unity. The word alone does not justify this. One substance, causal necessity, and a particular concept of an adequate idea compose a specific system. A resemblance in general tone to another tradition does not establish identical arguments, purposes, or understandings of human beings.

We deliberately avoid assembling a parade of agreeing voices for this topic. Difference is sometimes more substantive than resemblance. Readers may reject the thesis of one substance and still become interested in why a familiar evaluation of an action so rarely reveals the sequence that brought it about.

We can object to the explanatory scale itself, too: does a detailed map turn a simple mistake into too large a project? Sometimes it does. For a minor delay, adjusting the time and continuing is enough. Detailed inquiry is needed when repetition, consequences, or differing understandings make it useful. We do not propose analysing every movement down to its ultimate cause.

The measure of understanding relates to the task. Returning a forgotten object does not require discovering nature’s entire order. If shared work repeatedly fails under the same conditions, looking deeper is worthwhile. Even then, a small checkable distinction is preferable to a complete story that can neither be clarified nor refuted. Philosophical scope can enlarge a question; it need not extend everyday checking to infinity.

Disagreement need not end a conversation when its subject is named. We can dispute necessity while acknowledging limits of knowledge; dispute an ideal of freedom while continuing to distinguish explanation from excuse; dispute the entire system while reading it accurately.

8. What This Means in Practice

If a causal perspective is useful to you, choose one small recurring episode you would like to understand. A hypothetical conversation about a deadline, for example, always ends in an argument. There is no need to call it “your pattern” in advance, establish a diagnosis, or seek one deep cause. Reconstructing one sequence is enough.

What was known before the conversation? What message was communicated? What could the participants have clarified? What response followed? What became available or unavailable afterwards? If the information rests on your memory, it remains your account. That is an acceptable basis for reflection, but not an independent record of all the other person’s intentions.

You can then separate conditions you can influence from those you must, for now, take into account. This is no universal division of the world into controllable and uncontrollable. Influence is often partial. You can change when you send your own message, but cannot guarantee a reply. You can request a clear task, but the other person may decline your way of working.

If a small available alternative emerges, a voluntary experiment is possible. Before discussing a deadline, for instance, clarify the scope and the condition for warning about delay. The experiment's purpose is to see whether a particular course of work changes. Its result neither proves an entire philosophical system nor determines the participants' essence.

Naming an observation in advance helps: did what was promised become clearer; did a warning arrive; what happened when an obstacle arose? A different result is new information, rather than obligatory proof of your insufficient rationality. Perhaps the selected cause was incomplete, the action insufficient, or the conditions substantially different.

Where boundaries are seriously violated, understanding someone completely need not come first. A decision may rest on behaviour and its consequences. Our question about causes does not cancel the right to stop a conversation, refuse a new commitment, or change one's participation.

Practical understanding thus acquires a modest measure: it helps us notice one transition and choose one action. It includes no obligation to attain a state in which external circumstances never affect us again.

9. Being Conditioned as a Starting Point for Conversation

The two responses in the opening scene were too large. "You could simply have arrived on time" said nothing about the obstacle. "That is how circumstances worked out" said nothing about participation. Clarification might reveal that the delay was unforeseen, but giving notice was possible. Perhaps the deadline was impossible from the start. Perhaps the agreement was understood differently.

Each outcome changes the next conversation. In one case, the warning procedure matters; in another, revised conditions; in a third, a clear record of assent. This is no universal path to reconciliation. Sometimes, after a clear examination, participants will decide not to continue working together. Understanding need not preserve every connection.

What matters is that a question about causes no longer serves as an automatic excuse. It shows what exactly needs discussing and changing. Responsibility also becomes more concrete: for which promise, with what information, with which available actions and

consequences? Such clarification can be stricter than general condemnation because it does not hide behind an assessment of personality.

Spinoza's invitation to consider human beings within nature remains a radical philosophical proposal. It requires more than ordinary acknowledgement of circumstances. We have preserved this distance so that a contemporary reading does not replace the original argument or appropriate results we have not checked here.

A voluntary possibility remains for the reader: sometimes replace "What is wrong with this person?" with "What sequence led to this, and what does it leave available now?" The answer may be incomplete. It may bring no calm. But it can make the situation less obscure.

We belong to what happens and act within it. Recognising this does not yet mean agreeing with everything that happens. In our reading, a space for understanding emerges here: seeing connections, retaining evaluation of consequences, and seeking participation where it is actually possible.

Sources

1. Benedict de Spinoza. *Ethics*, translated by R. H. M. Elwes: I, Definitions 3, 5; I.14–18, 29, 33; III, Definitions 1–3; IV.1, 3–4. Project Gutenberg.

2. Steven Nadler. *Baruch Spinoza*: §§2.1, 2.4–2.5, the system of causation, activity, affects, and understanding. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.