

UNITED WISDOM

The Missed Alternative That Imagination Makes Ideal

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-07-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Missed Alternative That Imagination Makes Ideal

Epigraph

> *“Alternatives to past events”.*

Kai Epstude and Neal Roese, 2008, abstract, first sentence: a short part of the definition of counterfactual thoughts. This concerns a thought rather than an observed other life. The Russian fragment was translated for this article. Primary context.

What this article is about

After a choice, the unchosen option can become remarkably complete. It contains satisfying work, easy encounters, and time for what is missing now. Our own life is known together with fatigue, queues, and the need to negotiate; the other is represented mainly by desirable scenes. This does not establish that the rejected opportunity was worse. But its perfection is not established either: the comparison uses information of different completeness, rather than two observed lives.

This article examines an invented decision not to relocate. We will distinguish known conditions, desires, assumptions, and unknown details, then consider which present decision actually depends on the comparison. A theoretical paper about counterfactual thinking helps name the imagined alternative and the limits of its accuracy. It does not diagnose someone who regrets a choice or prove that staying was right. The closing practice is an authorial suggestion without tested effectiveness. A missed opportunity can retain its value without being expanded into guaranteed happiness, and the present life need not win a competition against a faultless picture.

I. The two pictures are constructed differently

Lena could have moved to another city, where she was offered a job. She declined because she wanted to finish a local project, was not ready for relocation expenses, and preferred staying near familiar people. A year later, the project ends with difficulties, and an acquaintance in that city sends photographs of evening walks. Lena imagines a life in which she has already found a suitable flat, joined the new team easily, and regularly spends time by the sea. This is a hypothetical scene. It does not describe a real person's psychological state or suggest that every decision against relocation produces this comparison.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Lena knows her present city in detail. There are journeys, work, shopping, dull days, successful conversations, and the consequences of her commitments. The imagined city is represented differently: by a photograph, the conditions of an earlier offer, and a few desired episodes. The difference concerns the information's composition. It does not prove the photograph false or joy by the sea impossible. The acquaintance may genuinely have had a good evening. But her evening does not provide a complete account of what Lena's week after moving would have been, including work, expenses, relationships, and her own decisions.

It helps to notice which question is being asked. Do I want more time outdoors? Was the job suitable then? Would the entire move have been better than the life I stayed for? The first concerns a present desire, the second permits checking particular conditions, and the third involves many unexperienced events. Answering them all with one attractive picture creates a sense of certainty exceeding the available material. The wish for walks can be taken seriously without declaring the whole alternative year known. Precision does not devalue the opportunity; it restores an appropriate scope to each claim.

The opposite picture can be just as selective. Lena could imagine the other city only through expensive rent, loneliness, and a difficult first day. That version conveniently defends her refusal, but it does not become an observation either. We are not proposing a compulsory gloomy fantasy to replace a happy one. Both have the same boundary: invented details fill an unknown future. The desired option may matter and difficulties may be plausible in an ordinary sense, but a complete assessment of an unexperienced life is not established by one collection of scenes, whatever its emotional direction.

II. A desire does not have to prove the whole scenario

Lena notices three appealing parts of the relocation picture: work in another team, freer evenings, and proximity to the sea. These desires can be examined separately. She does not first have to prove that the entire other life would have been better. Perhaps the work genuinely interested her, while the sea became the central image this year. Other combinations are possible. The extent of a desire differs from the extent of a predicted outcome. A person can honestly state what they want while keeping uncertainty about how far relocation would have provided it and at what cost.

A desire also need not specify one compulsory form. Being near the sea requires particular geography, but more time outdoors can sometimes be possible in several ways. Interest in work may concern its content, the team, or the terms of participation. We cannot decide for Lena in advance that a walk in her present city would be enough. That could replace a substantial dream with convenient advice. We can clarify the subject: which element cannot be substituted, which permits other forms, and which remains linked to an image whose details have not yet been established?

If living in that other city is itself irreplaceable, that is a serious answer. It does not make the previous offer a current opportunity. The job may have closed, rental conditions changed, or the acquaintance moved elsewhere. Today's relocation question therefore needs today's information. A desire should not automatically be called too late because one door has closed; nor should the old door be presented as still open. The value of a direction differs from the availability of a particular option. That distinction allows a new route to be considered without fictitiously restoring the earlier date.

A desire can remain without an immediate task. Lena values the idea of another place but does not currently want to investigate moving. This does not prove that her intention is weak. Private reflection need not turn every attractive possibility into a plan. The important distinction is between two positions: I am not choosing an action yet; I know that the entire missed life was ideal. The first can be an accurate present decision. The second still lacks complete evidence. A desire retains its dignity when it is not required to establish more than it actually tells us.

III. Put an ordinary day back into the imagined week

An imagined life often consists of a few high points. To examine the comparison, Lena could place an ordinary working Tuesday beside them. She would need to get to work, complete tasks, buy food, resolve a housing matter, and reply to people. We do not claim these activities would be burdensome or destroy enjoyment. Their inclusion serves another purpose: the alternative also occupies time and requires conditions. A seaside walk can remain wonderful, but it no longer describes the entire week if the whole week is the subject of comparison.

The details of everyday life should not be invented as certainty. Previous rent may have been known; relationships with future colleagues were not. The former can be recorded as a fact and the latter left open. Confidently imagining daily quarrels or guaranteed friendship would not restore symmetry. An ordinary week raises questions about necessary parts of life; it does not manufacture a new proof against moving. Work requires time, housing conditions, and shared participation consent. Exactly what these would have been for Lena is partly unknown. That uncertainty applies to appealing and difficult versions alike.

Some costs may be definite. The offered job had a schedule, relocation required moving belongings, and the old flat needed a decision about its continued use. If this information survives, it can be included without dramatisation. It does not make the option bad: someone may accept costs for something important. But the choice becomes more substantive when both the desired and necessary are visible. Stakes should not vanish merely because the opportunity has passed and no longer requires immediate payment. Unexperienced expenses remain conditions of the version being compared, although they were not actually incurred.

A more honest, but still incomplete picture emerges. There might have been seaside walks, and the job had a particular schedule; some relationships remain unknown; moving could have opened some opportunities and closed others. No complete total of happiness needs calculating. One clarification may be enough for the present question: I was comparing my whole year with a few attractive evenings. This does not say which city is better. It shows the earlier comparison's limit and allows a specific desire to be investigated, without requiring the life actually lived to have no ordinary inconvenience whatsoever.

IV. The imagined alternative in its primary research context

Kai Epstude and Neal Roese's paper examines counterfactual thinking as imagining alternatives to what happened. The authors propose a functional theoretical model and discuss research. In the selected section on accuracy, they explain why the plausibility of these constructions needs separate consideration; they do not claim an established overall average accuracy for all imagined alternatives. This is a review and theoretical paper, not an experiment involving our hypothetical relocation scene.

It does not establish that every thought about another city is useful, useless, or necessarily mistaken. We do not extend particular mechanisms discussed in the paper to every reader, use a neural explanation, or promise less regret. An imagined alternative can take part in planning, but its existence does not verify its details. Here, the source helps preserve the difference between what happened and what is imagined. Checking housing costs, voluntary relationships, and current job availability is the authors' application of questions to an invented example, rather than a universally established everyday method from the research paper.

This limitation matters in conversation. If Lena describes wanting to leave, naming a psychological phenomenon does not close her question. She may be accurately recognising unsuitable conditions at her current job. She may genuinely have information about a better offer. She may be speaking about something valuable that she has postponed for a long time. Naming the imagined alternative excludes none of these positions. It invites clarification: which part is known, which desired, and which mentally supplied? A person retains the right to investigate their option within that boundary.

Nor must the research theory become an account of every personal cause. The example does not establish why Lena is thinking about relocation now. The photograph is a stipulated opening to the conversation, not a proven causal mechanism. The article needs only the accessible logical difference between the two sets of material being compared. That difference can be considered without explaining an entire biography. This keeps the scientific source within its own subject and frees a person from accepting a ready-made story about the hidden structure of their desire before naming a real present question.

V. What can actually be learned about the missed option

Some earlier conditions can be checked. Lena may find the offer letter, schedule, description of duties, and her reply. These materials belong to a particular date. They can confirm what was offered, but not every consequence of acceptance. Payment terms in the letter are information about the offer; an acquaintance describing her salary a year later is a different report. The latter cannot automatically be inserted into Lena's earlier contract. The same job title does not establish the same path, workload, or relationships.

Current working arrangements at the organisation can be investigated if the question genuinely relates to a new decision. But a conversation needs an appropriate subject and voluntary participation. The former recruiter does not have to reconstruct Lena's entire unexperienced history or confirm that she lost her best chance. Someone may answer only a particular question, decline the conversation, or lack the information. Their answer becomes new material of its own scope. It provides no guarantee about what would have happened a year earlier, even if it sounds confident and kindly meant.

The comparison's times should be separated. What was offered then? What is possible now? What would have happened following another choice? The first two questions are partly accessible through facts. The third may involve verifiable conditions, but its entire sequence of outcomes remains unexperienced. The inability to answer completely should not be transferred to every question at once. The whole alternative life cannot be known, yet the subject of a current contract can be established. An honest limit does not require abandoning research. It helps avoid spending effort on a promised result that the chosen reports cannot provide in principle.

Some information will change the assessment. Lena discovers that the previous schedule left fewer free evenings than she remembered. Or she learns that work near the sea was a concrete opportunity rather than merely an image. Both findings are permissible. We do not select a convenient answer in advance to reconcile her to refusal. New information might strengthen the wish to relocate, reduce the appeal of that particular job, or leave the main questions open. A check's quality depends on how the source fits the question, rather than whether the conversation ends with a favourable assessment of the present life.

VI. Do not treat different versions of yourself as identical conditions

Sometimes the imagined Lena receives not only a new city but new abilities. She makes friends easily, quickly establishes a home, never postpones walks, and maintains calm working evenings. Such changes may be possible, but they cannot automatically be recorded as the results of relocation itself. Moving changes conditions; it does not by definition provide every desired habit. A particular picture needs questions about the actions assumed and the grounds for expecting them. We are not asserting that people never change. We simply do not turn assumed development into an accomplished fact of the alternative history.

At the same time, present life may contain consequences of the earlier choice that genuinely impeded development. Lena should not be required to demonstrate the ability here before being allowed to choose another city. Such advice could keep her in unsuitable conditions. The more useful distinction is: what is difficult now, and what specifically would change there? A new schedule may provide time, but using that time remains a separate action. Geographic proximity may make a walk easier without determining every week. Real advantages can be examined without promising an automatically new personality.

It also helps not to assign the current Lena all the fatigue of the lived year while giving the alternative Lena only initial enthusiasm. If a year is being compared, conditions of that same period matter. Yet the exact alternative state is unavailable. It can be acknowledged as unknown instead of confidently imposing obligatory equal fatigue. Not every move is difficult, and not every decision to stay preserves energy. We are not establishing equality between two lives. We are noticing that one person is known through lived material, while the other is a desired version that still needs distinguishing from information.

A wish for change can thereby become more specific. Lena wants work that leaves time, clear housing conditions, and more opportunities to be by the sea. These subjects can be checked in a new offer. She no longer has to guarantee that she would have been a different person in every respect. A present choice can concern one condition. It need not prove that last year's refusal was right or compensate for the entire unexperienced year. Reducing the question's scope does not diminish the dream's dignity; it connects it with actions available under present circumstances.

VII. Keep the loss without inventing complete knowledge

Some opportunities have genuinely closed. The previous position is filled, a particular team has dispersed, or the housing option available then has disappeared. These can be regretted specifically. The loss need not be denied merely because the full subsequent outcome is unknown. Losing a particular opportunity differs in scope from claiming a guaranteed better life. The first may be supported by facts. The second requires an unknown sequence. Someone may value the vanished offer without proving that it would have delivered every desired result and removed each current difficulty.

Acknowledging loss should not become an obligation to derive benefit immediately. Lena may need time before wanting to search for another job. She may not want to repeat the earlier form. This article establishes neither a correct duration for the feeling nor a compulsory next step. A present obligation, if there is one, needs separate consideration. But regret about a closed door does not make a person indebted to every door still open. Freedom to choose a new action remains without first declaring the old loss a useful lesson to earn the right to move forward.

A new place cannot be required to replace the old opportunity literally. The next team will be different even if the work is interesting. Another trip is not the move that never occurred. It can have its own meaning. When a present offer must restore the entire lost scenario, its real merits may go unnoticed. We do not claim that something new will necessarily be enough. A particular participation can be irreplaceable. But that is a separate relationship to loss, rather than proof that every option available now is automatically meaningless.

In our scene, Lena can say: there was a job that interested me then; I declined; its complete possible outcome is unknown; certain conditions still matter to me now. These positions are compatible. They neither justify refusal automatically nor condemn it completely. They preserve its real subject and time. A past offer need not become a perfect life to be regretted. A current path need not defeat that life in imagination to deserve attentive consideration in relation to its own actual conditions.

VIII. Find the present decision within the larger comparison

Lena notices that the discussion of the past actually contains today's question about work. She wants to know whether her schedule can change or whether to look elsewhere. That subject permits action. Actual conditions, an available timeframe, and commitments need examination. The current job cannot simply be declared bad on the basis of an attractive alternative scene. But neither must everything remain unchanged until the complete other life is proven. Changing a particular condition may require particular evidence about present workload and an available offer, rather than a general verdict on last year.

Another present question concerns place. Lena wants to check whether relocation is possible now. A limited search then makes sense: an actual offer, expenses, exit conditions, and necessary agreements. An old letter can help clarify her interest but cannot replace new information. Regret need not be removed before investigating the direction. Nor should relocation be promised to remove it. The new decision responds to the present task. Its quality cannot be measured in advance by how neatly it will conclude a story about a once-missed opportunity.

Sometimes there is no present decision. Lena remembers an attractive offer but does not intend to change work or location yet. Reflection may remain a private acknowledgement of value. Investigation need not be continually sustained to feel productive. The comparison can end while retaining one question for a suitable future time. This does not promise never to return to it. New conditions will change the subject if they arise. But the absence of action today does not make the past alternative more accurate, just as action does not establish that every imagined element would have occurred.

To determine the scope, ask which answer would affect the action. If the decision concerns a work schedule, every former relationship in another city need not be investigated. If housing availability needs clarification, someone else's holiday photographs do not answer that question. The subject can be narrow and still substantial. This order guarantees no quick result. It only prevents a logical expansion of the task: one real present choice need not reconstruct every unexperienced branch completely in order to have sufficient grounds.

IX. Other people are not details in a convenient scenario

The imagined life includes colleagues, neighbours, friends, and possible relationships. Lena's decision alone does not determine their participation. A job may have been specifically offered; future friendship was not. Closeness can be hoped for without being stated as a guaranteed consequence of relocation. Each person has their own circumstances and right to respond. This boundary matters ethically and for the comparison's accuracy. If an alternative year contains only desired reactions from others, we are considering a scenario with preassigned participants rather than a known path of living relationships.

A present conversation also needs to be voluntary. Lena can ask the acquaintance about ordinary life in the city if appropriate. But the acquaintance does not have to disclose every inconvenience to equalise the comparison. Her photograph was a message about an evening, not a promise of a complete account. She should not be accused of constructing a false picture merely because she shared joy. Missing information should be treated as missing rather than automatically as deliberately concealed. Another person retains the freedom to speak about their life within a scope they choose.

When Lena receives an answer, its author and subject must be retained. The acquaintance likes the neighbourhood; that does not guarantee Lena would have liked it. A colleague describes a demanding schedule; that does not establish identical demands in the earlier offer. A personal account may be useful material, but it cannot completely replace a contract or one's own assessment. It need neither be dismissed as subjective nor appropriated as universal. For each conclusion, we must understand what the source can actually confirm and what remains a question.

Relationships thus return from imagined scenery to a space of separate voices. One can want a meeting without knowing its result, value an account without demanding that it determine one's fate, and choose new contact without promising to restore a vanished year. Where threats or coercion are present, an ordinary shared exercise is not proposed; appropriate protection and help are needed. In the other hypothetical scenes, preserving consent promises no harmony, but prevents a private comparison from directing someone else's participation to secure a pleasing conclusion to one's own story.

X. The alternative remains a possibility, not a proven life

After examining the matter, Lena need not conclude that staying was right. She may still judge her refusal poorly if specific reasons support that assessment. She may retain uncertainty or see a mixed result. What matters is that the assessment now concerns particular information and conditions rather than a wholly favourable imagined year. Giving up perfection does not require giving up value. The job, city, or a particular involvement could have mattered even if other aspects of the path are unestablished. A partial answer can be more honest than a final contest between two entire lives.

Present life should not be made ideal to defend the earlier choice either. It may contain real difficulties that need changing. Some relationships and activities matter; some conditions do not fit. They can be examined separately. We do not prescribe gratitude as an obligatory way to cancel the comparison. A person may recognise a shortcoming and seek another option. That search needs current information. An existing difficulty does not prove every merit of the past offer, but provides an independent subject for today's decision.

Some unknowns will remain permanently. The same past year cannot be lived again with another choice and both results observed from the same position. No number of questions has to overcome that boundary. More information about conditions can be obtained, a desire named, a vanished opportunity acknowledged, and the current examination ended. Regret may remain. The proposed distinction is not a method of removing it. It simply prevents an image's force from automatically becoming the completeness of knowledge that actual history and available sources do not provide.

The conclusion may be simple: a particular part of the alternative is appealing; some conditions are known, others assumed; there is no complete outcome. The next step belongs to the present: learn the schedule, check a new offer, choose a trip, or change nothing yet. No action has to compensate for the entire missed scenario. A person remains free to investigate what they want without proving another life's perfection, and to live their own without immediately declaring it the best of every possibility. Precision leaves room for both values and gives each piece of knowledge its boundary.

What this means in practice

Take one ordinary missed opportunity suitable for voluntary private reflection. Briefly describe the appealing picture and separate it into four parts: known conditions, your own desire, assumed consequences, and the unknown. This is not a tested method of working with regret. You may leave it unwritten, stop, or choose another form. Serious harm and specialised decisions require appropriate information and help that a general example cannot replace.

If you are comparing whole weeks, include an ordinary day in both pictures. Do not invent compulsory misfortunes for the alternative or assign it guaranteed development. Clarify only necessary conditions: working hours, housing, expenses, agreements, and actions. Distinguish surviving evidence from present memory. Someone else's account has its own subject; it cannot become a complete record of your unexperienced life. A desire retains significance where the outcome remains unknown.

Then ask whether there is a present decision. Which particular information would change it? One enquiry about a real offer may suffice, or the question may stay open. Other people need not supply an account, offer comfort, or confirm your assessment of the past. A vanished opportunity can be a real loss without proving an entire perfect life. Naming more precisely what matters, what is unknown, and what is available now may be a sufficient result, even without a final judgement of the earlier refusal and while the feeling remains.

This concerns a safe activity chosen voluntarily. You may stop the exercise if there is a threat or coercion; answering these questions does not require disclosing private material.

Key quotation

> *“Some are accurate and useful; some are not”.*

Epstude and Roese, Accuracy, author manuscript p.14, the section's concluding paragraph. This complete short sentence concerns differences in the accuracy of counterfactual thoughts. It neither assesses a particular reader nor denies the value of their desire. The Russian companion uses a translation made for this article. Context.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Possible connection	Boundary
Counterfactual theory ↔ the image of another year	The imagined differs from the observed.	This is neither a diagnosis nor proof that every alternative is mistaken.
An opportunity's value ↔ its unknown result	Desire can be serious without complete knowledge of the outcome.	Present life need not be declared better.
Authorial comparison ↔ a present choice	A particular question can be linked to available information.	The practice is untested; others' participation remains voluntary.

Sources

• Epstude, K.; Roese, N.J. The Functional Theory of Counterfactual Thinking, 2008, DOI10.1177/1088868308316091. The opening, selected Theoretical Clarifications/Accuracy, and adjacent author-manuscript contexts were read; not all38pages or all discussed studies. Public access is not a general licence. Russian quotation fragments were translated for this article; the complete source is not reproduced here.

Tags

alternative, choice, missed opportunity, imagination, counterfactual thought, comparison, information completeness, desire, value, loss, regret, uncertainty, past, present, relocation, work, schedule, housing, expenses, ordinary day, conditions, assumption, fact, source, consent, relationships, decision, Epstude, Roese, accuracy

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside 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.