

UNITED WISDOM

Changed Circumstances and an Honest Revision of an Agreement

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-17-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Changed Circumstances and an Honest Revision of an Agreement

Epigraph

> *moral duty also undergoes a change*

Cicero, De Officiis I.31, short excerpt, Walter Miller translation. The original connects change with justice's grounds rather than any convenience for the person promising.

What this article is about

Dmitry agreed to lead a session in a small hall. Its date, attendance, and purpose were clear, and preparation began. A week later, the venue temporarily closed. The organiser proposes the same session in a courtyard with a different duration, while Dmitry wants to withdraw altogether. This hypothetical scene contains a genuine event after agreement, rather than an initially hidden condition or merely a more attractive opportunity. The event nevertheless does not decide for the parties what is now agreed.

The original arrangement retains a history: people allocated time, prepared material, and perhaps declined other plans. A new option may preserve the purpose, change its meaning, or be unavailable. Honest revision distinguishes these states, names real grounds, and obtains an intelligible answer. We will examine responsibility for an earlier word without literally doing what is impossible or using change to rewrite everything unilaterally. Agreement here means an ordinary human arrangement. The article establishes no legal enforceability, compensation, or venue-closure procedure. It examines the ethical side of open coordination after a genuine change in conditions.

I. Name Exactly What Changed First

Closure differs from preparation feeling dull. It changes the available place, but not necessarily the date, participants, or purpose. Dmitry should not gather everything into a general claim of impossibility. The organiser should not declare closure insignificant simply because a courtyard exists. Acoustics, duration, equipment, or participants' attendance may matter. The scene establishes no technical suitability of the space. Clarify which part of the accepted action really became unavailable.

Preserve the sequence. The hall was confirmed, closure then occurred, and the courtyard was subsequently proposed. If closure was known before agreement, a different question arises:

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

the original description may have been incomplete. If the hall remains open and Dmitry preferred another meeting, that is another case too. Honesty starts with naming the actual history rather than choosing a convenient category. A new circumstance gains ethical weight because it genuinely changed conditions, not merely because the conversation calls it change.

Not every detail needs proof before everyone. An ordinary group may need only reliable notice of unavailability and an understanding of significant consequences. Knowledge nevertheless cannot be replaced with a rumour when cancellation depends on it. Sometimes confirmation from the venue's responsible person is needed; sometimes a clear notice already exists. Checking should be proportionate, rather than investigating the entire event. Separate known change, estimated duration, and unchecked options so that a temporary rumour does not become an established final condition.

Accurate naming permits different responses. If the place changed, discuss the place. If a particular format became impossible too, discussion is broader. Losing a hall accepted as essential has different weight from losing an optional venue. These distinctions name no winner in advance. They let both parties consider the same subject instead of one defending the whole previous session and the other justifying cancellation of the entire relationship when only part actually changed.

II. A Promise's Grounds May Survive Without Its Previous Form

Dmitry promised more than standing inside a hall: he promised an intelligible session for people. That does not automatically make every venue and duration equivalent. Purpose reveals possible continuity; form helps establish limits. A noisy courtyard may change quiet work with texts itself. Another format may remain available for a brief equipment-free conversation. Assessment needs specific content, rather than endlessly preserving an external form or refusing to notice its significance.

In De Officiis I.31–32, Cicero considers changed circumstances through justice's grounds and performance's consequences. This is historical philosophical argument rather than modern contract law. The limited comparison asks whether the earlier action's grounds survive a new form. It does not automatically cancel every inconvenient arrangement or choose for Dmitry. Ancient examples and legal references become no contemporary permissions; the authors' scene needs its own ethical consideration.

Sometimes preserving a purpose needs change while literal fidelity makes an action pointless. Arriving at closed doors at the agreed time may preserve a date but will not conduct the session. Demonstrating consistency does not necessarily fulfil what was accepted for another. A useful alternative result nevertheless cannot be imposed as performance without their

answer. If organiser and participants accept another task, new agreement becomes possible. Otherwise, a facilitator's noble intention alone does not declare the matter solved.

Preparation's history does not disappear with the lost form. Material exists, time was allocated, and part of the action may retain value. Name these parts and ask what they are now suitable for. This does not require using everything to avoid regret. It checks the actual remainder, distinguishing revision from erasing the past. Sometimes little remains; sometimes it preserves the purpose. Neither outcome follows in advance from a general formula about fidelity or change.

III. Communication Need Not Await a Perfect Solution

Dmitry may delay responding until a good new venue is found. The intention is understandable: offer a solution rather than a problem. The organiser and participants meanwhile keep planning around old confirmation. Once significant information is known, silence itself creates consequences. Communicate before the final solution: the hall closed, the format is unconfirmed, options are being checked, and another answer will arrive by a specified time. This truthfully describes a process rather than complete incompetence or a promise that an alternative will certainly appear.

An early message lets the other party participate. The organiser may have a suitable contact or participants may prefer postponement. Their options are missing while Dmitry searches silently. What matters is timely naming of known information, rather than maximal speed at any cost. No unchecked rumour needs broadcasting. Tell the party responsible for the arrangement what matters and agree necessary communication to others. Different recipients preserve clarity without a public competition of anxious accounts.

Explanation should distinguish fact from personal choice. The venue closed names an event; therefore I withdraw entirely names Dmitry's decision needing separate grounds. Options may or may not remain between them. They cannot automatically be joined as though the second arose entirely from the first without agency. Equally, the organiser cannot say a courtyard's existence makes the old promise unchanged. Both must preserve the boundary between a new condition and their chosen response to it.

A response deadline has weight too. Promising to clarify an option by evening creates a new small obligation independently of the search's success. A message that nothing was found can fulfil it. One cannot treat only favourable outcomes as requiring communication and disappear if they fail. Reliability here concerns truthful status rather than controlling every condition. An intelligible report of unfinished searching can preserve more joint work than indefinite confidence that everything will be arranged before the session.

IV. Propose the New Option Rather Than Declare It Accepted

The organiser proposes the courtyard. The proposal is not yet Dmitry's agreement to another format. Saying he will consider it is not confirmation either. Even agreement in principle leaves significant conditions: date, duration, attendance, subject, and what will no longer be performed. Ordinary meetings need no inventory of all technical arrangements. Make precisely the changes and each party's new expectations intelligible. Otherwise, earlier uncertainty simply moves to a new address.

Participants may also have accepted one format and received another. The organiser informs them within her role; Dmitry should not automatically write on her behalf or promise everyone's availability. Their joint agreement does not necessarily confirm each audience member's capacity. Name who will check participation and by when. This is no bureaucracy for its own sake. It preserves voices without which the new option looks agreed only to two people still planning for everyone else.

Sometimes a proposal changes the purpose. An informal meeting replaces a session, or a read message replaces practical work. That can have value but cannot be named the previous performance without explanation. A different task needs different expectations. Dmitry can accept a short conversation without promising it replaces the original experience. The organiser can accept while preserving possible participant dissatisfaction. The new option's value need not be proved by claiming nobody lost anything and everything stayed the same.

Clear new agreement concludes a particular stage. Saturday remains, place and duration change, a block is excluded, and the organiser informs participants. Name an unknown significant point separately instead of calling everything ready. Precision makes the next step checkable. It guarantees neither a successful session nor absence of disappointment. It lets people rely on a common description rather than separate internal versions of what was supposedly decided.

V. Recognise Actual Loss Without Assigning One Universal Culprit

After closure, the organiser lost preparation time, Dmitry some work, and participants the original opportunity. These losses can exist without anyone being responsible for the closure itself. Recognising them does not automatically assign total blame. Absence of blame for the event nevertheless does not remove responsibility for later communication. Knowing for two days and staying silent is a separate action. Concealing an unconfirmed new place is another. Distinguish the change's origin from handling a change already known.

Consequences are not always symmetrical. Dmitry may easily free Saturday while a participant already paid for travel. The article prescribes no compensation or legal rights. Ethical consideration should at least notice the difference instead of describing everyone through nothing serious happened. Someone may consider the loss significant. Dissatisfaction does not prove a duty to perform the impossible, but is not an incorrect reaction merely because the speaker did not cause closure.

Ecclesiastes 3:1–8 places life among different times for actions, while selected 3:9–15 retains work and limited understanding before God. The limited comparison recalls changing conditions of life. It neither justifies every change nor derives revision procedures from the list of times. Difficult images become no permission for contemporary harm. The religious context remains independent, while acknowledging particular losses in this scene remains the authors' argument.

Rather than searching for total blame, identify particular correction: notifying people before travel, supplying agreed material, returning what is unused, or declining an unconfirmed result. No action is obligatory or available in every case. Offer it accurately and hear the response rather than promise to compensate the world because of discomfort. Remaining losses can be acknowledged. Revision gains human precision without requiring everyone to be unharmed before a conversation can count as having occurred.

VI. Honesty Needs No Stronger Oath

Under unstable conditions, Dmitry may promise that everything will definitely happen this time and pledge his reputation. Such speech may seek to restore trust. Greater solemnity nevertheless supplies no venue or confirmed attendance. Connect reliability to what is known: what was checked, accepted, and when another answer will arrive. Strong language can conceal residual uncertainty when substituted for information. An attempt to repair the relationship then creates another promise whose fulfilment is not fully within one's control.

James 5:12 joins prohibition of oaths with truthful affirmative and negative speech in a religious context. The limited comparison concerns intelligible speech rather than a contemporary agreement procedure. It does not automatically condemn every habitual phrase or authorise never promising anything. The community, religious grounds, and warning remain; the editorial inference is narrower: certainty should match actual confirmation rather than the strength of wanting an unpleasant wait to end.

Conditional information can be clear. A definite format if the venue is confirmed by evening, otherwise notice of cancellation, differs from saying everything is probably as before. A condition matters when both understand it and it conceals no known impossibility. Closure cannot be called merely possible when confirmed. An available option cannot be called

definitively cancelled solely because searching is unpleasant. Truthful language preserves the extent of knowledge, including confirmation's difference from assumption.

After new agreement, participants need not stay permanently uncertain. Confirmed conditions can be stated directly and accepted performance carried out. Caution should not empty every promise through reservations cancelling any outcome. It serves accurate correspondence between word and action. Clarity here means saying yes to a confirmed format, no to an unsuitable one, and not passing off searching as a finished decision. These different responses respect other people's planning.

VII. Revision May End in Termination

The session cannot always survive. The courtyard is unsuitable, no other venue exists, and postponement is declined. An honest result may be ending this arrangement. Termination differs from the group's complete ethical failure and from secret cancellation followed by claiming everyone understood. Name the task ending, actions remaining, and who informs participants. Without common consent to termination, do not call it a joint decision; preserve disagreement and separately identify personal withdrawal or impossibility.

Ending an arrangement does not automatically end a relationship. Dmitry and the organiser may discuss a future meeting without needing to promise one to soften present loss. An indefinite assurance of making up everything someday can leave people waiting again. State that no new date exists if true. Agreed material can be provided when that contribution is actually accepted. It cannot be called a conducted session. A more modest, clear result distinguishes completed, cancelled, and possible future work without consoling substitution.

Expenses or significant contractual disputes need appropriate resolution outside the article. Ethical acknowledgment does not replace legal assessment, and an ancient author's words create no contemporary release. Even ordinary cases benefit from not granting oneself authority to dismiss every claim through saying conditions changed. Explain grounds, state a limit, and hear a particular question. The other party can find the explanation incomplete without acquiring unlimited authority to demand the impossible.

An accurate ending lets people move on. The organiser seeks another facilitator or ends preparation; Dmitry stops holding the date conditionally; participants hear before travelling. These are possible actions, not guaranteed happy resolution. They show why ending needs as much clarity as new agreement. When nothing further can be promised, honestly having no promise is better than an endless process maintained only for the appearance of a joint project whose available subject is gone.

VIII. Change Must Not Erase History or Learning for the Future

Afterwards, one can say the hall closed and nothing could be done. Sometimes that is true about the venue. It describes neither how parties learned, what was discussed or agreed, nor who was informed. History matters to future promises. Promising another venue without confirmation is one lesson. Clearly coordinating but still finding the result impossible needs no invented guilt to explain regret. Keep the event, subsequent action, and actual outcome as different subjects.

A future arrangement may contain one clear backup option or confirmation deadline. This requires no foresight of every change. Avoid turning an event into an enormous system that makes ordinary meetings impossible. A proportionate lesson concerns observations: secure necessary venue confirmation before a final announcement, or define who communicates changes from facilitator to participants. Limited decisions preserve clarity without guaranteeing success merely because experience has been considered.

Revision does not alter the past retrospectively. Initial agreement arose under actual previous conditions. A new agreement does not prove the old one lacked weight. Termination does not prove trust was pointless. Preserve both facts: the promise had grounds, then conditions changed. This requires a transition rather than declaring all speech meaningless. Trust remains a relationship to particular actions rather than a demand to control the whole future or never change any form.

Honest revision holds real change, prior reliance, present capacities, and affected voices together. It may lead to a new task or clear termination; each needs truthful naming. The next step here is to report confirmed closure, assess the courtyard proposal, and obtain a response to definite conditions. The promise's ethical weight survives through responsibility for the transition. It requires neither literally doing the impossible nor claiming to speak for another about an already changed agreement before they can respond.

What this means in practice

Choose an ordinary agreement after a real new event. Record its original task, acceptance date, and what changed later. Distinguish change from an initially unclarified condition or altered preference alone. Name confirmed, assumed, and unknown information. In legal, professional, technical, or dangerous cases, this practice replaces no appropriate competent decision.

Separate unavailable parts from what remains possible. Check whether an option preserves the purpose and significant conditions or offers another result. Communicate important information before finding a perfect solution if the other party still plans around old

confirmation. Name the next response deadline and communicate even without a successful alternative.

Propose the new task as a proposal: place, time, extent, omissions, and agreement required. Promise no others' participation for them. Before confirmation, do not call an option ready; after agreement, preserve a shared description. Recognise particular losses and your part in communication's consequences separately. Demand neither gratitude for revision nor a universal culprit for the event.

If preservation fails, name termination and remaining actions. A new future date is unnecessary for consolation; unknowns can remain unknown. Record one proportionate lesson after closure. The author-designed practice carries no research efficacy claim and is no contractual procedure. It makes responsibility for transition visible so that change does not erase a promise's history and fidelity does not merely prove outward sameness at the real task's expense.

Key quotation

> *let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay*

James 5:12, short excerpt, King James Version. Prohibition of oaths and the religious warning remain in the explanation; the phrase does not replace discussing particular changed conditions.

Connections between traditions

Source	Context	Limited comparison	Difference retained
Cicero, I.31–32	Justice's grounds under change	Performance is assessed in new conditions	No contemporary contractual release
Cicero, I.33	Deceptive interpretation	Formal wording must not conceal action	Historical cases supply no legal instructions
Ecclesiastes 3:1–15	Times for actions and understanding before God	Change belongs to human life	The list authorises no arbitrary act
James 5:7–12	Patience, oaths, and truthful speech	Certainty matches confirmation	The independent religious context remains
United Wisdom	Hypothetical venue closure	Communication, proposal, consent, or termination	The authors' sequence is not attributed to sources

Sources

• Cicero. De Officiis, Walter Miller, Project Gutenberg 47001. Walter Miller English translation, William Heinemann/The Macmillan Co., 1913; metadata confirmed. Continuous selected English I.30–33 was read, web lines 300–320; I.31–33 is used. The epigraph is a short I.31 excerpt. Latin and English are distinguished; the whole treatise is not claimed read.

• Ecclesiastes, King James Version, Wikisource. Continuous selected 3:1–15 was read, web lines 216–241; times and limited understanding are used. No permission to harm is derived from its images; no literal quotation is given.

• James, King James Version, Wikisource. Displayed continuous 5:7–12 was read, web lines 305–314; the key quotation is a brief 5:12 excerpt. Religious grounds remain. Edition rights are not declared established worldwide; full sources are not imported.

Tags

agreement, circumstances, change, revision, promise, fidelity, responsibility, communication, confirmation, condition, task, place, time, extent, proposal, consent, termination, loss, history, trust, clarity, uncertainty, word, boundary, participants, Cicero, Ecclesiastes, James

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

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 coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.