

UNITED WISDOM

Accepting an outcome without abandoning resistance

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-02-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Accepting an outcome without abandoning resistance

Epigraph

> *“Be useful to his fellow-men”*

Seneca, *Of Leisure*, III, fragment from the discussion of a person's duty; Aubrey Stewart's English version. Text read.

What this article is about

A proposal has been rejected, a decision made and an earlier possibility closed. A person can acknowledge these circumstances and still consider the decision wrong. Two questions then arise that are easily confused: must we stop demanding a different ending from the past, and must we relinquish further opposition? A Stoic approach to outcomes is often reduced to a demand for resignation. Yet acknowledging a fact does not itself tell us what to do now. We will consider this distinction through selected passages in Epictetus and Seneca, without presenting them as a modern manual for political protest. Hypothetical scenes involving a small shared undertaking will help distinguish an aim from one means, assess the cost of continuing and leave room for refusal. This is moral reasoning, rather than an obligation to endure harm or prove one's worth through endless struggle. A completed event can be accepted without turning it into a rule for the future.

I. The fact of a decision and its assessment

Imagine a group holding classes in a shared room. One participant proposed changing the time so that people with inconvenient schedules could attend. The proposal was discussed and rejected. They can accurately say: the time remains unchanged for this week. This does not yet mean that the selected time is fair or the discussion was sufficient. The first statement describes a decision; the second would require an assessment of it. This separation does not depend on whether the person is pleased with the answer.

In everyday conversation, however, recognising a fact is often heard as endorsement. If the participant stops repeating that the vote should have ended differently, others may assume the whole question is closed for them. The participant may also consider their continued disagreement a sign that they have not accepted defeat. A false choice then appears: either deny the result endlessly or declare it right. Between these positions remains the possibility of acknowledging the event precisely while retaining a separate question about its basis.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The reverse substitution is also possible. A person claims the decision is wrong and therefore speaks as though it does not yet exist. They do not tell participants the actual time, expecting their disagreement to invalidate the old arrangement. In the hypothetical group this could confuse people who were not involved in the dispute. Retaining an assessment does not remove the obligation to communicate existing conditions honestly. Otherwise resistance affects people who now have to untangle contradictory messages as well as an inconvenient schedule.

The first step therefore concerns precise speech. We can communicate which decision actually applies and separately say why it remains disputed. This is not a formality: participants can choose on the basis of real information. Recognising a fact does not require abandoning an assessment, while an assessment does not entitle us to conceal a fact. This distinction does not yet determine a course of further action, but removes one unnecessary difficulty: words no longer need to remake the past in order to discuss the future.

II. The Stoic argument is stronger than an everyday formula

In Enchiridion 8, Epictetus proposes aligning desire with what happens. This is a stronger philosophical argument than simply recording a fact. We do not present his ideal as an observation about every person or a demand to stop feeling loss immediately. Our distinction between an acknowledged outcome and a present act is a limited application of the question, rather than a complete account of Stoic ethics.

It matters that an old text should not be quietly weakened, or its practical application strengthened without explanation. Replace the whole argument with a formula about being realistic, and only what a person already knows remains: the completed event has happened. Transfer the ideal into an instruction to someone else not to feel distressed, and philosophy becomes an assessment of their inner life. Both transitions require their own justification. Here we retain the source as a source of a question about desire, while directing our own reasoning towards available action.

In our scene, the participant can experience disappointment and simultaneously communicate the schedule accurately. They may not yet consider what happened acceptable, while still investigating the next possible way of changing conditions. Having a feeling does not automatically show they have lost the ability to act. Conversely, a calm tone does not itself make their argument correct. A proposal must be assessed by its grounds, rather than only by the confidence or restraint with which it is expressed.

A Stoic reference should therefore not become a competition in inward self-command. We do not know the whole cost of the situation to a person and gain no entitlement to determine it from outside. We can ask what remains their own act after someone else's decision, which

commitments persist and what they cannot secure alone. Answering those questions may be useful without promising imperturbability. It also leaves the possibility of discontinuing the exercise if it distracts from necessary help or safety.

III. Relinquishing one means does not destroy the aim

The participant in our group wanted a more accessible class time. Their first means was a shared schedule change. Rejection of this proposal closed one route, but did not determine every future possibility. Another date, a small additional meeting or a different way of participating could be considered. Each version will require consent and resources. The aim itself may also change after talking to the people for whom the change was proposed: their main difficulty may lie elsewhere.

A change of means is not always a retreat. Sometimes it shows that a person distinguishes a desired improvement from their own initial idea. If all that matters is adoption of their proposal, another reasonable option will look like defeat. If the subject of the question matters, they can investigate an alternative suggested by someone else. This does not make every compromise good. The alternative also needs assessment: whom it includes, what cost it requires and whether it retains the old obstacle under another name.

In Of Leisure III, Seneca discusses obstacles to activity and different scales of useful participation. We use this limited argument without making it a modern political instruction. It allows a question to be posed: when an earlier form is unavailable, has every possibility of benefit disappeared? The answer in our scene is sought through actual conditions, rather than deduced automatically from Seneca's authority.

The earlier means may turn out to be genuinely necessary. An additional meeting will not replace an accessible general assembly if that is where important decisions are made. Reshaping an action therefore does not mean declaring any small alternative sufficient in advance. The participant can retain a demand to change the general meeting time while helping people through currently available means. Temporary help differs from a final solution; naming this honestly is better than presenting relief of particular difficulties as elimination of the whole problem.

IV. Resistance needs a subject

Once a proposal has been rejected, resistance may gradually lose its precise subject. A person begins opposing everything the group does because it all recalls the earlier refusal. A class announcement is experienced as proof of disrespect, while a request to clarify the participant list looks like an attempt at subordination. We do not establish that this occurs in a particular real group. The hypothetical scene illustrates why it is necessary to name exactly which condition remains disputed and what could count as change.

A precise subject does not make a conflict simple. We can dispute the accessibility of a time, the way a decision was made or the absence of information about participants. These questions are related, but their answers differ. A new time will not automatically correct the voting process; a fuller discussion does not guarantee a convenient hour for everyone. When demands are combined into one general accusation, people struggle to understand what action could answer it at all. Resistance then risks becoming endless through its very form.

The participant can describe an observable difficulty: some people cannot attend at the existing time, and their opportunities to participate were not investigated. They can then propose a way to check: ask about available options without requiring disclosure of personal circumstances. This is our editorial proposal for an ordinary voluntary group. It does not guarantee agreement or establish rights in a specific organisation. But the subject becomes clear enough to distinguish an answer, an evasion of an answer and new information.

Precision does not require abandoning moral judgment. We can consider people's exclusion a substantial problem and say so directly. The difference is that assessment concerns an intelligible case, rather than extending without examination to participants' entire characters. A person need not prove everyone else bad in order to question the schedule. This leaves room to change a condition of shared work without necessarily defeating another's self-respect. We can also name in advance an answer that would require revision of our position: for example, a new schedule genuinely agreed with those whose participation was obstructed. If no imaginable answer can change the demand, it is worth clarifying whether we are now discussing a different subject. This clarification does not compel acceptance of the first convenient explanation.

V. The cost of continuing cannot be set for others

Resistance often involves time and effort. In an individual undertaking a person can decide about their own participation; in a shared task their decision affects others. If a participant proposes another discussion, it matters to find out who is willing to attend. Supporting an aim does not mean unconditional readiness for every means of achieving it. A person can agree that change is needed and decline another late meeting. This does not establish a lack of seriousness or moral quality.

Suppose several people signed a request to reconsider the schedule. One then says they cannot help prepare the next discussion. The request's author can explain why help matters and ask about another available contribution. But they cannot treat a signature as permission to use someone's time without renewed agreement. The first act was specific; a subsequent commitment needs separate discussion. Otherwise a struggle for accessibility begins creating inaccessible conditions of participation itself.

There are situations in which dependence limits freedom to decline. Formal consent from someone who struggles to object to an organiser does not necessarily show an absence of pressure. It therefore helps to check whether understandable exit conditions exist and whether refusal comes with a threat of exclusion. This check does not tell us another's inward state, but concerns the structure of the proposal itself. An approach can be changed so that a person need not justify every reason they cannot participate.

Continuing therefore requires a measure that cannot be obtained from one's own resolve alone. The moral importance of an aim does not turn participants into an endless resource. If available capacity is exhausted, a step can be reduced, postponed or acknowledged as currently impossible. That decision may be unwelcome, but it need not cancel an assessment of the initial problem. Declining to control others for a good aim is part of responsibility for resistance, rather than proof of insufficient commitment to that aim.

VI. Help and pressure can look alike

In our group, the participant wants to involve people for whom the schedule is inconvenient. They write, suggest a meeting and ask them to confirm the problem. This initiative may be supportive. But if answers are wanted only to reinforce a finished argument, someone else's experience becomes a means of proof. A person may receive help and still not wish to join a dispute. Their decision need not coincide with the form of resistance selected in their name.

Suppose one recipient prefers to miss classes for now without explaining personal circumstances. The proposal's author considers this too weak a position. They can communicate available options and leave the possibility of returning to the question. But

requiring someone to identify as an injured party or speak publicly adds a new choice, made by someone else, to the initial difficulty. In this voluntary scene, care begins with interest in the recipient's actual willingness, rather than a demand that they represent our shared aim correctly.

This does not mean that every refusal to participate makes the problem nonexistent. A person may decline for reasons unrelated to its assessment. An absent public response does not prove the schedule convenient. Information should therefore be described precisely: so many people expressed this difficulty; others did not communicate a position. Silence cannot be filled with either agreement with us or agreement with the existing arrangement. Missing information remains missing, even when certainty would make a presentation more persuasive.

Distinguishing help from pressure can change the action itself. Instead of inviting someone into a struggle already declared, we can ask about the form of participation they need. Perhaps they want a recording of the class; perhaps changing the general meeting matters to them; perhaps they do not want to continue the conversation. These options do not amount to a complete solution, but each has its own meaning. Resistance retains its ethical ground when it does not erase the independence of those for whose sake it considers itself necessary.

VII. Not every continuation repeats the earlier act

After a refusal, a person sometimes sees only two options: repeat the proposal in its earlier form or leave forever. Between them there may be work that was previously unnoticed. The participant can gather available information, check the clarity of an announcement, help someone explain a difficulty or preserve a record of the discussion. These actions do not guarantee revision of a decision. But they may prepare a more precise question if they accord with participants' consent and do not substitute for their voices.

A changed action needs an honest name. If a person has stopped seeking an immediate schedule change and begun providing particular help, they should not say the initial aim has already been achieved. They can say another contribution is currently available while the general question remains open. Conversely, temporary help does not oblige them to retain an earlier demand endlessly if new information has genuinely changed its grounds. Responsibility includes the possibility of acknowledging that an initial view was incomplete or mistaken.

Sometimes continuing involves refusing to support a disputed arrangement. A person may stop fulfilling a voluntary role if they consider it incompatible with their position. But leaving also affects promises to others: what was accepted, whom to inform and what cannot be abandoned without explanation need to be established. The article does not create a universal

rule for exiting commitments. Agreements, dependencies and professional requirements differ between cases; a philosophical formula does not remove the need to check them.

Resistance is therefore not defined by one outward gesture. Repetition can be stubbornness or a justified return to an unanswered question; stopping can be evasion or a responsible exit from unacceptable participation. Distinguishing them requires more than a visible ending. In our limited scene, it is more useful to ask what action is actually available now, how it relates to the aim and what commitments it creates. This description does not automate a moral choice, but reduces the temptation to judge only the impressive appearance of an act.

VIII. An error in our argument does not justify the whole decision

Suppose the participant discovers they used incorrect information about people's availability. Some of those they cited could attend; others had a different difficulty. They can correct their argument without automatically declaring the entire earlier decision right. An error in one argument and assessment of a whole arrangement are different questions. Conversely, an inaccurate message cannot be retained merely because it supports an important aim. Truth about a case does not become expendable material for resistance.

Correction can be specific: name which information was not confirmed, who received inaccurate information and what is now known. If an error affected someone's reputation, a purely internal correction may be insufficient. Communication to those affected needs consideration, retaining the limits of available information. This promises neither complete repair of consequences nor forgiveness. There is a specific subject of responsibility: stop spreading what is now known to be wrong and explain one's own change.

This step may change relations with opponents, but does not guarantee their trust. They may accept the correction and continue disputing; they may use the error to reject the whole question. Their response is not entirely within our power. But that is no reason to abandon an accurate account. Recognising our mistake has meaning even when it provides no advantage. Otherwise honesty becomes a conditional service we provide only when a favourable answer is promised.

Here acceptance of an outcome also concerns our own image. Past correctness cannot be preserved by denying a known error. The seriousness of a task can be retained by refining its grounds and acknowledging the actual limits of our position. This transition does not devalue the whole earlier effort or make another's argument an unconditional winner. It allows reasoning to continue with the information available now, rather than defending a formula that has lost its basis. Sometimes this will be the most difficult form of further participation.

IX. The right to stop need not be earned through complete victory

A person may decide they cannot currently continue a dispute. Perhaps they lack time; perhaps the available means has become dangerous; perhaps the question requires different expertise. The fact of stopping does not automatically reveal the reason. Ending one's participation does not mean the problem is solved or that everyone else must stop too. A boundary to personal contribution can be communicated honestly without determining a shared ending for the whole group.

Our hypothetical participant can say: I no longer organise additional discussions, but retain my assessment of the schedule. This message may require practical clarification: which materials others can use, what was promised and what participation remains agreed. The boundary itself is not an obligation to provide endless explanations. However, if a person has already accepted a specific commitment, changing it needs to be distinguished from simply declining a new proposal. This examination concerns an agreement, rather than a test of character.

In threat, violence or coercion, the task primarily concerns safety and appropriate support. The article does not suggest testing oneself through continued dangerous action or establish current legal means of protection. These depend on place and circumstances. Philosophical reasoning may help name a value, but cannot replace qualified advice and real assistance. Retaining disagreement need not take a form that exposes a person or people dependent on them to risk.

Stopping sometimes means leaving an open question open. This is difficult because we want a complete account: either we secured change or proved any further work impossible. But the absence of such an ending does not invalidate a personal boundary. We can acknowledge that specific participation ends now while further possibilities are unknown. This answer does not guarantee peace; it merely avoids demanding that everything be declared good or meaningless before we are entitled to discontinue an action.

X. The next step begins with present conditions

An accepted outcome is not the final argument about the future. It becomes one of its premises. In our group the time remains unchanged for this week. We now know which answers were given, which information is absent and who is willing to continue the discussion. The next proposal needs to start from this position, rather than the fantasy that the first vote can be held again without any changed conditions. Another discussion is sometimes possible, but it too needs agreement.

It helps to ask how the next action connects with the subject of resistance. If we want accessibility, how does the step change opportunities to participate? If we want honest discussion, how does it improve information or procedure? The answer may be modest and incomplete. But an action merely reproducing earlier anger without addressing the task cannot be justified by loyalty to the aim alone. A feeling can accompany an act; it does not replace an account of what exactly is proposed.

Present conditions include other people's freedom. Opponents may disagree, recipients of help may decline, and fellow participants may choose a different route. This does not make all positions equally persuasive. It means that resistance itself remains action among other people, rather than control over their wills. We can therefore retain a strong assessment while avoiding promises in the names of those who made none. Accurate description also concerns our own side of a conflict.

Acknowledging an outcome and opposing an arrangement thus cease to exclude each other. Acknowledgment means not concealing the actual position or demanding another history from an event already completed. Continuing means choosing an available moral act, considering its means, cost, consent and possibility of stopping. This limited conclusion does not exhaust Stoic philosophy. It suggests considering the next step without two automatic answers: that defeat justifies what happens, or that disagreement necessarily demands endless repetition of an earlier act.

What this means in practice

If this experiment suits you, choose a small completed situation whose outcome you dispute: a rejected proposal, changed agreement or unsuccessful shared plan. Do not use the exercise for threat, violence, coercion or a decision requiring specialist assessment. You may decline, stop or return later. The exercise does not test endurance or require you to stop feeling regret.

Record a fact and an assessment separately. The fact answers what actually happened; the assessment concerns what you consider disputed and why. Then check whether the description includes unknown motives attributed to others. For example, instead of claiming everyone wanted to exclude you, state the existing time and the absence of an answer to a specific question. If information has not been checked, retain that limitation rather than filling a gap with a convenient account.

Choose one available next step, if there is one. Name its subject, the agreement it requires and its cost to you and others. Separately identify a condition for stopping: an expressed refusal, a lack of necessary expertise, a new threat or a predetermined limit to your involvement. If no step is available, you can end the record by acknowledging that boundary. You need not invent an action to prove your disagreement serious.

Later, at a time you choose, check just one thing: did the description help distinguish a completed event from a current choice? A possible narrow result is a more precise formulation of the subject for further discussion or for honestly ending participation. Successful change, disappearance of difficult feelings and others' agreement are not promised. If the record intensifies repeated self-accusation or obstructs seeking needed support, stop the experiment without requiring yourself to finish it.

Key quotation

> *"The general interests of mankind"*

Seneca, *Of Leisure*, III, fragment from the paragraph about helping others; Aubrey Stewart's English version. This is part of an argument about usefulness, rather than a promised outcome for each individual action. Text read.

Connections between traditions

Question	Sources read	Connection	Boundary
Outcome and desire	Epictetus, Enchiridion8; Seneca, Of LeisureIII	Failure of one external means raises a question about one's further action.	This comparison is within the Stoic sphere, rather than a unanimous modern psychology of acceptance.
Useful participation after an obstacle	Seneca, Of LeisureIII–IV; our hypothetical shared task	An aim can be distinguished from the available scale of participation.	A modern voluntary group is not an ancient republic; legal and political rules are not transferred.

No external interreligious identity or historical influence is asserted here. Comparisons are confined to sources actually read.

Sources

1. **Seneca. Of Leisure / De Otio, I–IV.** Aubrey Stewart, *Minor Dialogues*, London: George Bell and Sons,1889; Wikisource English transmission. Selected sections I–IV were read, rather than the whole collection. Quotations belong to Seneca's own prose in III, rather than embedded sayings by other authors. Text.

2. **Epictetus. Enchiridion,1–2,8–10,24–25.** Internet Classics Archive English version, identified as Elizabeth Carter's translation. The limited passage8 about desire and outcome is used;

complete reading of the text is not asserted. Its philosophical ideal is not presented as a measured effect for the reader. Text.

Tags

Stoicism, acceptance, outcome, resistance, Seneca, Epictetus, leisure, Enchiridion, fact, assessment, desire, action, responsibility, means, aim, disagreement, participation, consent, boundary, stopping, error, correction, help, pressure, accessibility, schedule, shared undertaking, moral choice, uncertainty, dignity

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.