

Manacratee and Belugratron 6000 are having a battle for the ages under the waves of Queen Anne Pool. It also happens to be under the pool covers, such that as long as the covers stay on, the outcome of this grand combat remains uncertain. In fact, **until** the covers are removed, it can be said that the outcome is uncertain on a quantum level, in a state of superposition **until** an observer pulls the covers off and sees the result, making it certain. Does this observer bear a moral responsibility for the outcome of this melee and its aftermath, or is there a strong argument *res ipsa loquitur* that only these two eternal forces of nature are to answer?

One could argue that the observer is just the messenger, and like Shakespeare said, we probably shouldn't shoot them, and that "the thing speaks for itself." However, in that scenario ~~x~~ someone would have to be sending the message ~~x~~ and the information would therefore already exist. Perhaps the outcome does speak for itself, but the observer is translating the speech so that everyone else knows.

Interesting thesis. Explore.

If the information ^{were} not revealed ~~x~~ it would affect nothing. In fact, according to the 18th-century Irish philosopher George Berkeley ~~x~~ the information would not even exist. According to quantum physics ~~x~~ a particle, when not perceived, takes on a different form than it would when perceived. It becomes a wavelength with infinite possibilities. Similar ~~/~~ to that, the information, when no one is aware of it, does not exist. The observer who removes the pool cover is the only reason the outcome of this fight could affect anyone. For example, when Edward Snowden revealed the American people that their government was spying on them ~~x~~ he was responsible not for the information ~~x~~ but for the reactions of the people. However, the wording of the question could save the observer's conscience. The word "until" implies that at some point in time ~~x~~ someone will certainly reveal the outcome. If it HAS to happen, then the person who does it is irrelevant. The information will be released eventually. That brings about the first question: is the information certain to be revealed?

Is information subject to perception? A fascinating quandary for any Modern philosopher!

A great opportunity to include Kant. Thank you for not doing so!

Superb analysis

Let's turn the question around. If the observer knows something but refuses to reveal it, are they morally responsible for the aftermath of the lack of information? For example, if someone observes a murder, but chooses not to report it to the police, and the murderer strikes again, is the observer morally responsible for the second murder? To answer that question ~~x~~ we must ask: does the observer realize the potential outcome and/or the significance of what they've seen. If yes, then the conclusion would be that they are, in fact, at least partially morally responsible for the murder, even if they share the blame with the murderer himself. If no, if the observer happens to see a man walking down the street ~~x~~ and doesn't find it suspicious, then perhaps the observer is not morally responsible in the least, just naïve. That conclusion brings about the second question: is the observer aware of the situation under the pool cover and of the potential outcome of releasing this information?

Essentially, the argument boils down to these two questions. In order to come to a morally correct conclusion, one would need the answers to those questions. The main problem that arises is that those answers could differ depending on the context. The best possible conclusion with the information given is "it depends on the circumstances."

A fascinating, if somewhat comma-heavy, treatment of a complex problem. Sadly, your conclusion backs away precisely where things get the most interesting! You give the observer agency as translator only to shrug at the accidents of this translator's context.

That said, your handling of epistemological dilemmata is keen and revelatory, highlighting facets of the problem I had not anticipated. Fine work, and I look forward to the rest.

70
—
90

-20 No picture?