

Psychological Capacities for Ethical Adulthood

A Framework for Living After Certainty Collapses

© 2026 Andrea Fiondo. All rights reserved.

Overview

For some of us, at some point—through spiritual insight, philosophical inquiry, psychological work, trauma, burnout, institutional betrayal, illness, political disillusionment, or lived disruption—certainty collapses.

Beliefs that once organized life lose their authority. Moral rules no longer feel sufficient. Narratives that promised meaning, justice, or protection stop working.

This framework is not about restoring certainty.

It is about functioning ethically after it is gone.

The premise of this work is simple and demanding: ethical functioning after certainty depends on capacity, not belief.

Because when certainty collapses, beliefs are no longer sufficiently strong enough to guide us through the most difficult circumstances.

What happens when certainty collapses, and capacity is underperforming?

- nihilism
- rigidity

- spiritualized detachment
- moral paralysis.

Capacities matter.

Spiritual training alone does not address this piece of living; it assumes once one has had certain insights into unity or non-duality, one will magically be at peace and...have certainty again.

This is a myth, I think. Once one has made the requisite non-dual concepts a part of their inner framework of world-seeing, the work of how to behave, to *live* as if non-duality is the core underlying principle, begins.

I am unaware of any spiritual teacher giving explanation as to how this is accomplished.

And psychological counseling is rarely enough, either.

Understanding why we do the things we do, and taking steps to replace those conditioned behaviors with a slightly different set of behaviors, based on a more desirable outcome for the psyche, isn't the goal of adulthood, either.

For example, a person may come to understand—accurately—that their tendency to withdraw during conflict is rooted in early experiences of emotional overwhelm. They may learn to interrupt this pattern, stay present, and respond more openly. This is valuable work. But it does not yet answer the adult question: *How do I act here, now, in a situation where no option is clean, no outcome is guaranteed, and my comfort is not the primary ethical concern?*

Insight may loosen this habit. It does not determine the response.

Ethical adulthood begins when insight runs out—when we must decide how to behave in a live situation that cannot be resolved by self-understanding alone.

Further, it is the certainty that we are mechanical, stable, trait-led beings that therapy should begin to collapse, actually. And once one can see behind the masks that we wear to avoid making direct contact with the world, we are left then, oftentimes, feeling “cured,” even if we don’t live differently.

But in fact, the work once again, has just begun. Once we see how our conditioning is causing us to suffer, with what do we replace our habits? Rarely is a psychologist willing or even able to address how we live ethically, as full fledged adults, in a society that is, dare I say it, immature at nearly all levels of engagement.

The five capacities that follow are skills.

They can be learned, practiced, and strengthened.
They are not traits, identities, or virtues.

Ethical Grounding

A word about where I have grounded the ethics supporting the premise of this work:

This framework is grounded in situational, relational ethics rather than belief-based morality or promised outcomes. Its guiding commitments are practical and impact-oriented:

- harm reduction, including responsibility for downstream effects, not just immediate intent
- preservation of dignity for self and others
- accountability without shame
- recognition of power imbalances, placing greater responsibility for change on those with greater access, safety, and structural leverage
- compassion without rescue
- impact matters more than intention

This framework explicitly rejects myth-making, fantastical or supernatural meaning-construction, and self-soothing narratives when they function to evade responsibility, distort power, or break faith with our shared reality.

Ethical action here is not measured by purity, certainty, or intention, but by capacity and impact—by whether what we do reduces harm, maintains dignity, and remains coherent with the shared reality we inhabit.

Capacity One

How Much Discomfort You Can Tolerate

When certainty collapses, discomfort shows up more often. And it lasts longer.

This first capacity is simple to name:

How much discomfort can you tolerate without getting pulled into a reaction that makes things worse?

Discomfort is not danger.

But your body often treats it like danger.

This capacity isn't about being calm all the time. It's about how loud your internal alarm gets, and what you do when it gets loud.

The volume dial

Imagine you have a dial inside you. It goes from 1 to 10.

- 1–3: mild irritation
- 4–6: stressed, edgy, impatient
- 7–8: “I can’t stand this”
- 9–10: panic, rage, shutdown, impulsive decisions
-

Most of us don't choose where the dial starts.

But we can learn how to work with it.

A quick self-check

In these situations, where does your “volume” usually land — not at your best, not at your worst, but on a normal day?

- You wake up already tired, with a full day ahead, and realize there is no clear point at which relief is coming.
- Something important to you ends or changes, but there is no single moment where you can say, “That’s when it happened.”
- You realize you have more freedom than you expected — and no clear sense of what to do with it.
- A decision you delayed now has to be made, and there is no option that feels clearly right.
- You notice yourself wanting to make a large change — not because you’ve thought it through, but because you want the discomfort to stop.

There is no right score.

The point is to notice:
Does your system spike fast?
Does it stay elevated?
Do you get pulled into actions you regret?

The ability to sit with discomfort is often described as a moral or emotional virtue, but it is more accurately a nervous system capacity. When uncertainty or conflict arises, most of us do not fail because we lack insight or values; we fail because the intensity of sensation exceeds our regulatory threshold. At that point, we just seek relief, not truth. Developing this space therefore does not mean “tolerating” discomfort through willpower, but learning to modulate the volume of internal signals so that we remain online. The capacity is not to endure indefinitely, but to remain present long enough—sometimes only seconds at a time—for wiser action to remain possible.

This capacity isn’t “how calm can you be.”

It’s how much discomfort you can hold without outsourcing it.

Not numbing it.
Not discharging it onto others.
Not turning it into certainty, blame, ideology, or righteousness.

Just... holding it.
Most people resolve discomfort by:

- Aggression (someone must be guilty)

- Ideological fusion (my side = good, other side = evil)

Capacity looks different. Capacity says:

This hurts. I don't like it. I can stay present anyway.

So when you ask "How much discomfort can you tolerate?" you're really asking:

- How much ambiguity can you live with?
- How much grief can you carry without turning it into a weapon?
- How much injustice can you witness without abandoning your own value system?
- How long can you stand in the heat without hardening or checking out?

People who can tolerate more discomfort need fewer enemies. They don't have to pretend everything is fine, and they don't have to purify the world to feel okay inside.

This is not the same as calmness or detachment. It is the ability to remain present with grief, moral pain, ambiguity, and anger without outsourcing that discomfort through blame, withdrawal, ideological certainty, or righteous aggression.

When harm feels real and avoidable, look for causality and enemies; this is our conditioning. Maturity is not the absence of that impulse, but the ability to notice it without granting it authority. We have all been trained by imperfect trainers, right? Once we see it, we can change it.

This capacity to withstand the feelings that accompany situations where our values or morals feel threatened grows through small, deliberate exposures rather than endurance.

The question is not “Can I stay with this?” but “Can I stay with this for ten seconds without acting?” Over time, the window widens. Ethical action becomes possible not because discomfort disappears, but because it no longer dictates behavior.

Capacity Two

Repairing Harm Without Collapse, Defensiveness, or Self-Erasure

Everyone causes harm.

Not because we are bad people.

But because we have been conditioned to defend what we believe is true and what we fear might be taken from us.

This capacity is not about avoiding harm altogether.
It is about what happens after harm occurs.

Repair means you can stay present and responsible when something you did—or failed to do—had a negative impact on someone else.

Without this capacity, relationships quietly erode, even when no one intends them to.

What repair is not

Repair is not:

- explaining what you meant
- listing your good intentions
- correcting the other person's interpretation
- collapsing into shame
- disappearing to avoid discomfort

Repair is also not:

- "I'm sorry, but this is just how I am," or "I'm not able to do any better than this."
- "If you would stop doing X, I might stop doing Y."

The first pre-justifies future harm and refuses accountability.
The second makes accountability conditional.

Both shift attention away from the impact that already occurred.

What repair actually requires

Repair requires several things at the same time.
Missing any one of them weakens the repair.

1. Staying in contact

You do not flee the conversation.

You do not shut down.

You do not go on the attack.

You remain present long enough for repair to be possible.

2. Acknowledging effects and impact

You can name what landed, even if it was not what you intended.

You can say, "I see how that affected you," without adding a defense.

Impact does not require intent to be real.

3. Taking responsibility for your part

Not all of it.

Not theirs.

Yours.

Repair fails when people either take too little responsibility—or far too much.

4. Not turning the repair into a request for the other person to apologize

You do not ask them to acknowledge your pain in the same moment.

You do not look for symmetry.

You do not convert repair into a mutual clearing of accounts.

When you ask for the other person to apologize during your repair, the repair stops being for them and becomes a repair for you.

Repair has a *direction*.

The person whose action caused the harm does the work *first*.

How to know when repair is your responsibility

This is where many people get stuck.

Some people avoid repair altogether.

Others take responsibility for everything and lose themselves.

Both are failures of this capacity.

You are responsible for repair when your behavior had a negative impact, regardless of intent.

You are not responsible for repairing another person's misinterpretation, projection, or unrelated wound.

To tell the difference, ask yourself these questions—in order:

1. Did I do or fail to do something observable?

Something said, done, omitted, decided, or ignored.

Not a thought you had, or a feeling you experienced.

2. Did that action reasonably affect the other person?

Even if you would not have reacted the same way.

Even if the impact surprises you.

Last, ask yourself, is the impact tied to my action, rather than their history alone? If the harm would not exist without what you did, repair is likely yours. If the reaction is wildly disproportionate and unrelated, it may not be.

If the answer to the two questions is yes, repair is yours.

You do not need certainty about the history or reaction to begin.

What is not yours to repair

You are not responsible for repair when:

- You are being asked to apologize for setting a reasonable boundary.
- You are being held responsible for something you did not do.

If repair would require you to deny your own reality, your needs or your safety, then, in those situations, repair turns into self-erasure.

That is not ethical repair.

Ethical adulthood requires accurate responsibility, not maximal responsibility.

Repair does not require agreement. You can repair without agreeing on why it happened, the interpretation of the scene, or blame.

It is about acknowledging impact that reasonably arose from your action. This keeps repair grounded in shared reality rather than negotiation.

Real-life examples

Repair is often needed when something you did clearly caused harm.

For example:

- You cut someone off and imposed judgement upon them, and they shut down and were unable to continue to contribute to the exchange.
- You make a joke that lands as dismissive or cruel.
- You withdraw when someone needs clarity or follow-through.

These harms involve misattunement, carelessness, or avoidance. They are relatively easy to recognize after the fact.

But repair is also needed in a different, less obvious set of situations. Repair may be required when you acted as though harm or danger had occurred when it had not, and that response caused damage.

For example:

- You accuse someone of harming you in a way that did not actually occur, and the accusation itself causes harm.

- You call someone names, question their character, or describe them as “unsafe” in a moment of emotional intensity.
- You escalate a disagreement into a moral judgment instead of staying with the actual issue.

In these situations, the harm does not come from the original interaction.

It comes from the *response*.

Both kinds of harm are real.

Both require repair.

Feeling threatened and being in danger are not the same thing.

Acting as though they are can cause real harm to relationships.

When harm was intentional

There are also moments when harm was not accidental—when you knew what you were doing, acted anyway, and hoped not to be exposed.

Repair in these cases does not look like reassurance, mitigation, or explanation. It looks like naming the truth plainly, without ornament, and accepting the consequences without bargaining. This kind of repair is rare because it requires giving up innocence entirely.

But when it happens, it restores trust not through persuasion, but through clarity.

Why this matters after certainty collapses

When old moral frameworks fall away, many people lose their sense of how to be “good.”

Repair becomes the anchor.

If you can repair:

- you do not need to be perfect
- you do not need to be innocent
- you do not need to be right all the time

You can stay in relationship even when things go wrong.

One grounding question

Can I stay present long enough to acknowledge the impact I had—without defending myself, collapsing, or asking for something back?

If yes—even briefly—repair is possible.

And relationships can continue.

Capacity Three

Recognizing Power and Taking Responsibility for Its Effects

Power exists whether or not you acknowledge it or feel it.

It exists in roles, resources, bodies, histories, institutions, and relationships.

It exists in who can leave, who can wait, who will be believed, who will recover, and who will take the larger effect.

This capacity is not about feeling guilty for having power.

It is about accurately perceiving where power is operating and adjusting your behavior accordingly.

Without this capacity, people default to fairness language in situations that are not fair, symmetry in situations that are not symmetrical, and neutrality in situations where neutrality itself causes harm.

People also default sometimes to cruelty.

What power is (in this framework)

Power is not primarily about domination or intent.
It is about leverage and consequence.

Power shows up as:

- having more options
- having more safety
- having more credibility
- having more insulation from consequences
- having the ability to leave without cost

Often, the person with more power feels less emotional intensity, not more.

That lack of intensity is not neutrality.

It is insulation.

What power is not

Power is not having strong feelings, a loud voice, being articulate, being wounded, or sounding morally convincing.

Suffering, insight and good intentions do not erase power.

Power is contextual, not moral.

Why power distorts repair if it is not named

Repair assumes that responsibility follows impact.

But when power differences are present, impact is amplified downward and absorbed upward.

This means:

- the person with less power often bears more consequence.
- the person with more power often feels less urgency

When power is ignored:

- the powerful ask for mutual repair when asymmetry exists
- the less powerful are asked to “meet halfway”
- harm is reframed as misunderstanding
- repair becomes negotiation instead of responsibility

A core principle of ethical adulthood

Those with greater power carry greater responsibility for restraint, clarity, and repair.

Not because they are worse.

Because they have more room to move without breaking.

This applies whether the power comes from:

- wealth
- professional status
- institutional backing
- emotional detachment

If you can absorb more without being harmed, you are responsible for absorbing more.

How to tell when power is operating

Ask yourself:

- Who has more options here?
- Who would suffer more if this relationship ended?
- Who would be believed if there were a conflict?
- Who has institutional or social backing?
- Who can afford to be misunderstood?

If the answers are not evenly distributed, power is present.
You do not need certainty.
You need orientation.

Common mistakes people make about power

1. Confusing emotional pain with powerlessness
You can be deeply hurt and still hold more power in the situation.
2. Assuming equality because intentions are equal
Equal intent does not produce equal impact.
3. Using fairness language to avoid responsibility
“We both did things” can be true and still obscure power.
4. Waiting for the less powerful person to initiate repair
This often places additional burden where it least belongs.

What ethical use of power looks like

Ethical power use is not self-effacing or theatrical.

It looks like:

- pausing before acting
- initiating repair without being asked
- absorbing discomfort rather than exporting it
- not insisting on being understood first
- not weaponizing logic, calmness, or status

It often feels unfair to the person with power.

That feeling is not evidence of injustice.

It is evidence of the indication that we may have a need for adjustment.

A necessary clarification

Ethical responsibility does not mean:

- tolerating abuse
- accepting false accusations
- surrendering boundaries
- erasing yourself

Power-awareness does not require self-sacrifice.

It requires *accuracy*.

Why this capacity matters after certainty collapses

When belief systems fall away, people often reach for a place where they can take a neutral stance, or what-about-ism. They default to “everyone’s perspective matters equally.”

But power asymmetry does not disappear when certainty does.

Ethical adulthood requires the ability to say:

“Even if I am confused, uncertain, or wounded, I still have more power here — and that changes what is mine to do.”

One grounding question

If I act exactly as I want to right now, who absorbs the cost — and who is protected from it?

If the answer is not “me,” power is operating.

And responsibility follows.

On Capacity, Limits, and Responsibility; Capacity Is Not a Moral Ideal

I do not wish for this framework to become a way for us to feel as if we once again must reach some sort of “end of the assignment” in order to maintain our dignity.

This framework does not assume equal capacity in all human beings. It does not wish treat capacity as a measure of moral worth. Capacities are unevenly distributed, context-sensitive, and shaped by history, health, trauma, and circumstance.

In the moment, we are all doing the best we can, with the resources we have available to us in the moment. That’s true whether we are five years old, an alcoholic, grief-stricken, mentally impaired, culturally out of place, traumatized, or a thousand other circumstances and conditions in which we become entangled.

Further, capacity is not who someone *is*; it is what is available in a given moment, context, and system.

This framework does not ask or require that everyone do the best they can with all the resources available *to the highest functioning, most resilient, most supported, and emotionally and cognitively intelligent among us*.

Ethical adulthood does not require that everyone meet the same standard; it requires that responsibility be calibrated accurately.

When capacity is genuinely limited, ethical responsibility does

not disappear—it changes shape. It may be time-deferred, reduced, or redistributed. Others in relationship with this person may need to carry more. Systems they rely upon may need to compensate. Expectations may need to be lowered without denying reality or excusing harm.

This cannot and does not always happen. Our systems are a reflection of the average person's capacities, and they are usually immature. This can't be helped immediately to change. This truth requires us to step up in the ways we can to mitigate the harm this truth inevitably will cause if unchecked by we who are intimately involved in the systems.

What this framework resists is not incapacity, but *distortion*: knowing the capacity is there to improve and refusing to do the work, or stating the capacity exists when it does not, or denying responsibility where impact is real and ours to own.

Ethics after certainty collapse is not about innocence or blame, but about accurate accounting—of power, impact, and what is realistically possible in a given moment.

Failure here is not measured by falling short of an ideal, but by refusing to adjust when limits are visible.
Everyone is acting within their capacity.

Ethics begins when we stop pretending capacity is either infinite or irrelevant.

Capacity Four

How You Grieve Loss Without Freezing, Collapsing, or Making Meaning Too Fast

After certainty collapses, loss is no longer abstract.

You lose:

- identities you once inhabited
- futures you assumed were coming
- relationships that cannot be repaired
- faith in institutions, people, or narratives
- versions of yourself that will not return

This capacity is not about feeling better.

It is about being able to stay present to loss without distorting reality or hardening against it.

Without this capacity, grief leaks sideways—into anger, blame, withdrawal, fantasy, or spiritual bypassing.

What grief is (in this framework)

Grief is not an emotion to process and move past.

It is a condition you learn to carry without letting it run your behavior.

Grief becomes ethical when it is allowed to exist. It isn't weaponized with restraining orders. It's not abandoned in favor of personal meaning-making. It is never used to excuse rupture in relationships.

Grief does not require resolution, it requires honesty and containment.

What grief is not

Grief is not a problem to fix, a lesson to learn, a badge of courage, proof of virtue, or evidence of spiritual advancement.

Grief is also not endless rumination, collapsing into helplessness, or outsourcing responsibility to fate or God.

Meaning-making that arrives too quickly is often a defense against terrible discomfort.

The central ethical risk of grief

Unintegrated grief distorts perception.

When grief is not tolerated, people often inflate threats to their personal safety, assign blame prematurely or unfairly, mythologize events, look for villains or saviors, and attach meaning to random or cruel outcomes.

These actions do not make us weak. It is the human condition under unbearable pressure.

But ethical adulthood requires the ability to say:

“This hurts, and I do not yet know what it means—if it means anything at all.”

Grief after certainty collapses

Before certainty collapses, grief is often buffered by beliefs we have collected over the years. Beliefs that are common:

- everything happens for a reason

- this is part of a plan
- suffering leads somewhere better
- it will all make sense once I get over it

After certainty collapses, those buffers are gone.
What remains is raw loss.

This is where many people reach for God, closure, a redemptive story arc, or some sort of justice, be it symbolic or part of the actual story. Not because they are living in an illusion—but because pain without scaffolding can be *terrifying*.

This framework does not offer replacement myths.
It asks for a different capacity.

What ethical grieving actually requires

Ethical grieving requires:

1. Allowing loss to be real

- Not minimizing it.
- Not comparing it.
- Not rushing past it.

2. Resisting forced meaning

- You do not need to believe the loss “happened for a reason.”
- You do not need to redeem it.
- You do not need to turn it into wisdom immediately.

3. Separating grief from action

- You feel grief.
- You do not let grief decide your behavior toward others.

4. Letting grief change you without letting it hollow you out.

- You may become quieter.
- More careful.
- Less certain.
- More compassionate.

But you do not disappear.

A critical distinction

There is a difference between being changed irrevocably by grief, and being governed by it.

Ethical adulthood requires we change. It resists being the final word on how we adapt to the change.

When grief turns unethical

Grief becomes ethically dangerous when it is used to:

- justify cruelty
- excuse irresponsibility
- demand special exemption
- rewrite reality
- silence others' experiences

Pain explains behavior, but it does not take the responsibility for our actions.

Grief that cannot be repaired

Some losses do not resolve.

Some harms are irreversible.

Some relationships end without closure.

Some deaths do not make sense.

This framework does not promise peace.

It asks:

Can you live honestly in a world where some losses remain open?
That question is not spiritual, it's not philosophical, and it's not negotiable. It is adult.

One grounding question

Can I tell the truth about what I've lost without turning that loss into a story that *distorts how I treat others or the world*?
If yes—even imperfectly—this capacity is present.

Capacity Five

Acting Without Guarantees, Innocence, or Certainty

After certainty collapses, after repair becomes necessary, after power becomes visible, and after grief is no longer avoidable, one question remains:

How do you act?

Not what you believe about the world.

Not what you hope will happen to the world.

Not what outcome you can promise if you win.

What you *do*.

This capacity is not about confidence, it's about functioning ethically in a world that offers no guarantees.

What action looks like after certainty

Before certainty collapses, action is often scaffolded by the belief that God will reward us, justice will prevail, growth will occur after suffering, and things will work out just fine if I am perfect.

After certainty collapses, those assurances are gone.

Action becomes quieter, provisional, deliberate.

You act without knowing whether your action will help, if it will be sustainable, if it will be properly recognized, or if it will even matter in the long run.

You act anyway.

What this capacity is not

Acting without guarantees is not resigning yourself to what is, nihilism, withdrawal to a cave, or the belief that morals are relative.

Ethical action here is often small, repeatable, and unspectacular.

The ethical standard shifts

When certainty falls away, intention can no longer carry the moral weight it once did, and neither can the outcome of what we do.

The ethical standard becomes how does what I do affect the relationship, and my own internal coherence? How repeatable is the action, and is it *mine to do*?

You do what reduces harm.

You do what preserves dignity.

You do what you can stand behind even if it fails.

Not because it will work.

But because it is *yours to do*.

Acting without innocence

One of the hardest losses after certainty collapses is innocence.

You can no longer tell yourself:

- “I didn’t know.”

- “I meant well.”
- “I was just following the rules.”
- “Everyone does it.”

Action now requires ownership.

You act knowing:

- you may be wrong
- you may need to repair
- you may need to stop

Ethical adulthood is not clean.

It is *iterative*.

Why restraint matters more than righteousness

Without guarantees, righteousness becomes dangerous.

People who believe they are on the “right side” are more likely to escalate fear, justify harm, override other’s rights and ignore valuable feedback.

This framework favors restraint over certainty.

Restraint looks like:

- acting locally rather than universally
- refusing to export pain
- stopping when impact worsens
- remaining corrigible by the felt reality of your stances

Restraint is not weakness, it is the discipline of the power associated with ethical adulthood.

Acting in the presence of grief and power

After grief, action must respect loss without trying to redeem it.

After power, action must account for asymmetry without

dramatizing it.

This means:

- you do not demand closure
- you do not insist on hope
- you do not require gratitude
- you do not force reconciliation

You act in ways that remain ethical even if nothing improves.

That is the new bar for us.

The kind of hope this framework allows

Not optimism.

Not faith.

Fidelity.

You stay faithful to the current reality as it unfolds; to your responsibility within it; to the limits of your reach, and to the dignity of others.

You keep showing up—not because it will be rewarded, but because abandoning your internal coherence would cost more.

What this looks like in practice

It often looks like:

- continuing to tell the truth without certainty it will land
- repairing again and again without being assured it will stick
- using power carefully even when you could get away with not doing so
- carrying grief without letting it harden you
- choosing actions you would recognize as ethical even if no one ever knew

No applause.

No arc.

No guarantee.

One grounding question

If nothing improves, and no one thanks me, can I still stand behind this action?

If yes—even tentatively—this capacity is present.

A final closing statement for this framework.

These five capacities do not make life safe; they make it livable without the illusions which have ceased to be recognized as reality.

This is not a map to tell you how to get to the top of a mountain called Ethical Adulthood with a Regulated Nervous System.

It is a way of moving without a map.

And that is what our lives can look like, once the certainty scaffolding is gone.

Copyright © 2026 Andrea Fiondo
All rights reserved.