

UNITED WISDOM

When to Stop: Persistence and Losing Direction

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A28 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

When to Stop: Persistence and Losing Direction

Epigraph

People cannot always attain their goals

Carsten Wrosch and colleagues, Adaptive Self-Regulation of Unattainable Goals, 2003; a short excerpt. This general statement does not itself establish that any particular goal of yours is unattainable.

What this article is about

A person continues working because the task once had a clear purpose. They complete the next assignments, correct shortcomings and return after breaks. The effort is real. Yet explaining why this particular undertaking deserves another week of life becomes harder. Sometimes ordinary tiredness or a temporary difficulty is responsible. Sometimes circumstances, possibilities or the goal itself have changed. People can persist equally strongly in all these situations, although the decisions differ.

This article considers the point at which persistence needs to be related to direction. We will distinguish pausing, changing the method, relinquishing a particular goal and seeking another meaningful activity. Previous investment remains part of the history, but the main question looks ahead: what can continuing now provide, under what conditions is it worthwhile and who is affected by our decision?

Stopping does not always mean abandoning everything, and continuing does not always mean remaining faithful to a value. Sometimes the value remains but the chosen route no longer fits. Sometimes the result is still possible but no longer serves present reasons. The decision requires consideration rather than automatically following a feeling or an attractive image of a persistent person.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Movement can coexist with losing direction

A small team creates a meeting club for neighbourhood residents. The original idea was simple: people need an accessible place for relaxed conversation. Work gradually concentrates on schedules, room decoration and the number of events. More tasks appear each month. The organisers are tired but continue because they know how to perform these tasks. When asked who currently needs the meetings and what prevents attendance, their answer is less clear.

The effort in this scene is real. The room is prepared and announcements are posted. Activity itself, however, does not establish that the movement serves the original need. The club may be wanted while its time and location are inaccessible. The need may have changed. The organisers may not yet have spoken with the people they intended to serve. These possibilities require different actions; the number of occupied evenings cannot distinguish them.

Losing direction sometimes means being unable to distinguish an essential task from the next task in line. A person answers every request, improves every small detail and loses sight of what would count as progress. The undertaking's value has not necessarily disappeared. The value may remain while the connection between tasks and outcome becomes unclear. The goal and method then need attention before deciding whether to end the whole initiative.

It can help to pause the addition of tasks briefly and state the present intended result. For the club, this might be an accessible meeting for particular people rather than a count of events. This statement does not settle the decision automatically. It provides grounds for examining whether the method works and which information is missing. Interrupting the stream of tasks may preserve direction rather than abandon it.

II. Tiredness, obstacles and lost purpose are different questions

After a difficult week, almost any undertaking can seem pointless. An irreversible decision may then rest on a temporarily narrowed view. Where circumstances permit, restoring available resources and returning to the question at a more suitable time can help. This does not guarantee that rest will make the old goal meaningful again. It avoids confusing a person's state with a final conclusion about the undertaking.

An obstacle may also be temporary. A necessary participant is absent, a venue closed or the task requires knowledge that is currently missing. Continuing may be justified if there is a realistic way to change conditions. That way should be distinguished from a general promise to try harder eventually. What must change, who can take part and when will information become available? Without clarification, a temporary obstacle can indefinitely explain the lack of a result.

Lost purpose raises another question. Even if the obstacle is removed, does the person still want the result, and does it fit accepted commitments? They may discover that the goal serves an old image of themselves. The task may have mattered under different circumstances. This does not require immediately declaring the past mistaken. The earlier goal could have been reasonable then and need reconsideration now.

The distinction matters because the responses are not interchangeable. Rest does not clarify whether people need the result. Changing a schedule does not explain why an organiser is fulfilling someone else's expectation. Relinquishing a goal does not replace assistance with severe exhaustion or health concerns. A state that seriously limits life deserves discussion with a competent professional; this article considers decisions rather than providing a self-assessment of health.

III. A goal's value and the way of pursuing it

The same value can be served through different goals and methods. Making conversation accessible need not require a large club in a particular room. Smaller meetings at another time may suffice. Working with an existing venue may be more useful. People may want an entirely different form of participation. Considering these possibilities clarifies a route without automatically betraying the original purpose.

Changing methods can also conceal reluctance to acknowledge that a particular goal no longer works. Organisers continually revise posters, formats and names without obtaining grounds to believe that the meetings are wanted. Each adjustment feels like a fresh attempt while the important question remains. It helps to state which hypothesis a change examines. If the timing is inconvenient, another meeting examines a different time's accessibility. If the need itself is unknown, a conversation about that need comes first.

The goal needs sufficient specificity too. A general intention to do good for people does not identify an appropriate action. Almost any activity can continue indefinitely under a broad value. Conversely, a very narrow statement may bind that value to one method alone. A workable level lies between them: a particular outcome under particular circumstances, with room to consider alternatives.

Reconsideration should preserve what actually matters. A person may end their own project while continuing to help an existing group. They may defer a personal goal to fulfil a more important current commitment. They may recognise that an earlier result is no longer wanted without immediately finding a replacement. Preserving a value does not require filling the freed time with a new large plan that same day.

IV. Unattainability needs consideration, not declaration

Wrosch and colleagues investigate capacities to disengage from unattainable goals and reengage in other meaningful pursuits. The portions read distinguish these capacities. A new activity does not itself mean that the old effort has ended, and relinquishing an old goal does not guarantee a new direction. This distinction is useful here: deciding to stop and deciding how to participate afterwards may require separate attention.

The research includes three cross-sectional samples. It considers associations with subjective well-being rather than proving that abandoning any difficult goal causes improvement. The paper cannot establish that a reader's particular project is unattainable. Nor can an association become a promise that stopping will necessarily bring relief. A decision requires its own grounds; the research helps name possible processes more precisely.

Assessing a current goal requires identifying the significant obstacle. Is the outcome impossible under present conditions, too costly for available resources or simply not yet achieved? These situations differ. Attainability may depend on time, cooperation or skills. An honest statement includes conditions: with available means and the chosen timeframe, we see no suitable route, or the information remains insufficient.

Such language preserves uncertainty without requiring endless continuation. A person may not prove an outcome absolutely impossible yet reasonably decline its next stage because its cost or grounds are unsuitable. They should not call a practical decision under particular conditions scientifically established. This precision distinguishes the limits of knowledge from the right to choose another route.

V. Consider the next stage instead of defending history

Previous investments remain facts. They can indicate acquired skills, remaining resources and commitments created along the way. Time already spent does not itself make the next stage useful. Continuing concerns what will still be required and what outcome can realistically be expected now. This involves losses as well as possibilities for using what was gained differently.

The club team has learned to organise meetings and met several active residents. If the format does not suit the need, these connections and skills may remain useful elsewhere. Ending the lease of a particular venue does not erase everything acquired. Commitments to partners, participants or the venue owner may also remain. An inner decision that the goal has lost purpose does not remove them; appropriate discussion and completion of agreements may be required.

When considering continuation, it helps to ask separately how to identify the next stage's direction. What should it provide? Which resources will it use? What conditions are necessary? What could make continuing unsuitable? This view moves attention away from arguing whether the past was wasted and back to the present task.

The cost of a stage differs between people. One has available time, another carries caregiving responsibilities and a third must agree participation with a team. Someone else's story of perseverance does not prescribe our scale of continuation. We can respect previous work while recognising that the next step does not fit current circumstances. Honesty towards the past does not require promising it the entire future.

VI. Conditions for continuing and returning to the question

Sometimes the most reasonable decision is to continue while making conditions explicit. A team might choose one meeting after talking to prospective participants. It identifies what it wants to learn: whether the format is convenient, people are willing to attend and obstacles remain. This step should not be presented as guaranteed success. It is a limited action whose result supports the next decision.

The point for reconsideration should relate to information rather than only a calendar date. After the meeting, observations and participants' conversations can be considered. If essential information remains missing, that should be acknowledged rather than replaced by an impression. Sometimes there will be grounds to change the method. Sometimes organisers' expectations and people's needs will differ substantially. Sometimes the result will be ambiguous and require a more cautious decision.

Conditions for continuing should also include resources and other people's interests. What labour is available, who agrees to participate and which commitments apply only to this stage? A plan silently depending on someone's unlimited willingness may be unsustainable regardless of its importance. Discussing the workload distributes participation and reveals what must change before another promise is made.

Dewey connects reflection with examining the grounds and consequences of a belief. We use this educational motif to ask about a next stage. This is an editorial practice rather than a universally validated research procedure. It is useful insofar as it clarifies actual grounds for a decision. If consideration becomes endless note-taking with no possibility of choosing, its form can be simplified too.

VII. A pause works better when its purpose is understood

A pause temporarily prevents expanding a commitment but does not itself determine what comes next. It may serve rest, information gathering or discussion with affected people. Naming its purpose gives a clearer next step. Organisers may stop adding events to discuss the need and available labour. This differs from simply ceasing to answer messages while leaving everyone else to guess.

Not every pause needs a fixed deadline. External circumstances may prevent selecting an exact date. Nevertheless, what is known, what remains unknown and when an agreement can be updated can be communicated. This clarity does not promise beyond the person's capacity. It distinguishes a temporary limitation from an unspoken refusal, especially when others rely on participation.

A pause need not preserve the goal at any cost. A person may decide not to return afterwards. That can be a legitimate outcome of considering circumstances and commitments. There is no need to promise that everything will restart after rest. Such a promise can remove the very possibility of reconsideration and turn the pause into another postponement of a needed acknowledgement.

When the decision is unclear, a small element can be retained without creating substantial new obligations. A club can share available contacts or announce a break. A person with a study goal can save notes and clarify whether returning later is possible. This is an organisational measure, not proof that continuing is right. It preserves choice without making others pay for uncertainty through silence.

VIII. Relinquishing a goal and reengaging need not coincide

Someone who ends important work may immediately be offered a new undertaking. Sometimes this helps. Sometimes the offer sounds like a condition without which stopping would mean emptiness and failure. Ending one effort and choosing another activity are different tasks. Time between them can allow consequences to be completed, resources restored and present significance understood.

Wrosch and colleagues' distinction between disengagement and reengagement makes this difference visible. It does not prescribe a compulsory sequence for every reader. Well-being need not be demonstrated by counting new plans. A new goal also requires resources, and immediately filling every freed hour can recreate overload. The meaning of participation matters more than the appearance of uninterrupted occupation.

Another pursuit may be smaller than the previous one. A person who relinquishes a large project may temporarily join an existing initiative without organising it. They may devote more

attention to relationships or restore ordinary tasks that were set aside. These options need not be assessed solely through status and scale. If they fit current circumstances and free choice, their value does not have to compete with the earlier plan.

An earlier value may not yet have found another expression. The search can then be acknowledged as unfinished. This is not automatically evidence of a mistaken refusal. Conversation and exploration can continue without manufacturing certainty. If a sense of loss or the person's state severely affects life, appropriate professional support matters independently; selecting another project should not be its compulsory replacement.

IX. Steadfastness within a tradition and a changed life

In the selected Bhagavad-Gita passages, steadfastness, reflection and duty appear within Krishna and Arjuna's religious dialogue. This is not a contemporary project-management theory. We do not use it to demand continuation of every chosen path. Asking what effort is devoted to is useful here, while the religious assumptions and narrative remain distinct.

William James's Psychology: Briefer Course describes different forms of decision within historical psychological reasoning. These are not contemporary clinical types that establish a reader's character. They remind us here that an inner transition to a decision need not always happen alike: grounds may develop gradually, conflict may remain and clarity need not look like sudden confidence.

Dewey raises questions about examining grounds; Wrosch and colleagues distinguish disengagement and reengagement in contemporary research. Religious teaching about duty, historical descriptions of decision, educational philosophy and observed psychological associations have different statuses. They are not combined into a single proven system. Their comparison considers meaning, choice, information and subsequent participation from several perspectives.

For a particular person, the question remains open: what has changed in life, and on what grounds will the next stage be chosen? Answering in their own words matters, alongside responsibility towards affected people. No tradition should become a convenient label automatically making stopping a vice or continuing a virtue. Consideration respects both the undertaking's value and the person's present circumstances.

X. Complete consequences and preserve direction

Once stopping is chosen, practical work remains. Identify which activities are ending, whom to notify, which materials to transfer and which agreements to reconsider. In shared projects, ending personal activity does not immediately clarify the situation for others. This final organisational stage may itself require persistence: explain the decision calmly and fulfil manageable commitments without making another large promise.

A conversation can acknowledge the earlier purpose and describe changed grounds. Declining further participation does not require declaring the project bad. Nor is it necessary to persuade everyone that the decision is uniquely correct. State which part will no longer be undertaken, what can be completed and what still needs discussion. Contractual or other specialised obligations may require competent advice.

After stopping, identify what remains: skills, relationships, understanding of conditions, completed materials or a meaningful value needing another expression. This does not automatically justify every past cost. It avoids turning a refusal into the claim that the entire history was empty. What remains can be used when a suitable opportunity appears, without immediately converting it into another success.

Persistence then becomes the capacity to maintain a meaningful direction rather than merely continue acting. Sometimes it means working towards the same goal. Sometimes it involves changing the method, taking a temporary pause or ending participation. Circumstances and the next stage's grounds distinguish these options. Stopping can be attentive and responsible while preserving the capacity to devote effort to what matters.

What this means in practice

Choose an undertaking whose continuation has actually become a question. The practice considers an ordinary decision; it is not a medical assessment, legal conclusion or guide to a risky financial choice. Specialised obligations or serious consequences call for appropriate competent assistance.

1. **Name the current outcome.** What should the undertaking provide now, and for whom? Separate the result from occupied hours and completed assignments. If the goal cannot be stated, clarify it before promising more activity.

2. **Distinguish your state from the grounds.** Is tiredness, a temporary obstacle or changed purpose involved? They can coexist. Do not turn a brief note into self-diagnosis; state only what is actually known.

3. **Consider the next stage.** What does it require, what can it provide and which essential information is missing? Past investments remain history and resources but do not automatically justify this stage.

4. **Separate the options.** Pausing, changing the method, continuing with conditions and relinquishing a particular goal have different consequences. A new project need not immediately replace the old one. Record appropriate possibilities without demanding a heroic choice.

5. **Account for others' participation.** Who relies on you? Which agreements need discussion, tasks need transfer and resources are genuinely available? Do not assume that others' willingness is unlimited.

6. **If continuing, define the question to examine.** Which limited action supplies necessary information, and under what conditions will you reconsider? Do not promise to continue regardless of its result.

7. **If stopping, complete the consequences.** Notify affected people, discuss commitments and retain useful materials. No new large goal is needed merely to make the refusal convincing.

The club team may discover that the original need remains but the evening time is unsuitable for prospective participants. It chooses one meeting in another format with a bounded workload. This changes the method; it does not prove that the entire project will succeed. If new information reveals a mismatch between the need and the team's capacity, ending its own club and collaborating with another venue may be another justified option.

A person pursuing a study goal may face different circumstances: the result remains important, but resources are presently insufficient because of caregiving. They clarify the possibility of pausing and conditions for returning instead of promising the previous pace every day. This does not declare the goal absolutely unattainable. It recognises current conditions and organises the next decision.

The practice can end once a clear immediate option and its consequences have been identified. It does not require doubting everything hourly or seeking an absolute guarantee. Changed grounds can justify returning to the question. If the decision is limited by incomplete information, acknowledge that honestly. Direction is preserved through relating effort to real purpose rather than promising never to stop.

Key quotation

> *other pursuits of value*

Wrosch and colleagues, Adaptive Self-Regulation of Unattainable Goals, 2003, the introductory discussion of sustaining purpose after an unattainable goal; a brief noun phrase. A new pursuit's value needs consideration in personal circumstances. The excerpt does not promise that any replacement will improve well-being.

Connections between traditions

Contemporary psychological research. Wrosch and colleagues distinguish disengagement from unattainable goals and engagement in other pursuits. Cross-sectional associations do not establish causal outcomes or settle the attainability of a reader's goal.

Historical psychology of decision. James describes different forms of decision. This is historical reasoning, not contemporary clinical classification or a character test.

Educational philosophy. Dewey directs attention to a belief's grounds and consequences. Here the motif supports consideration of a next stage without promising a universal algorithm.

A religious tradition of duty. The Bhagavad-Gita places steadfastness within duty, knowledge and devotion. This context does not require continuing every modern plan. The connections raise different questions while preserving their different statuses.

Sources

1. Carsten Wrosch et al. — Adaptive Self-Regulation of Unattainable Goals, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29(12), 2003, 1494–1508, DOI 10.1177/0146167203256921. Abstract, introduction, selected methods/results, general discussion and limitations read. Three cross-sectional samples; causality and a personal goal's unattainability are not established.

2. William James — Psychology: Briefer Course. Preface and selected Chapter XXVI passages on decision read. Historical abridgement of Principles; no clinical typology is proposed.

3. John Dewey — How We Think, 1910. Chapter I read. Examining grounds is a philosophical motif; historical prejudices are excluded.

4. Bhagavad-Gita, The Song Celestial, Edwin Arnold. Selected XVIII passages read. Religious context preserved; no universal requirement to continue plans is inferred.

Tags

persistence, direction, goal, reconsideration, pause, ending participation, choice, purpose, resources, responsibility, commitments, tiredness, conditions for continuing, goal disengagement, reengagement, attainability, uncertainty, grounds, support, decision, Wrosch, James, Dewey, Bhagavad-Gita, past costs, next stage, agreement, alternatives, value, boundaries

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, connections between 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.