

UNITED WISDOM

How to Compare Two Possible Next Steps

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-29-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

How to Compare Two Possible Next Steps

Epigraph

> *We deliberate not about ends but about means.*

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, III.3; checked W. D. Ross translation. A philosophical distinction, not a prohibition on revising ends.

What this article is about

Two available actions rarely differ only in effort. One is faster, another clearer; one provides information, another creates a commitment. Both may depend on consent from people whose conditions remain unknown. This article considers an immediate choice without turning it into a judgment of character or a competition between imagined future lives. Name a shared purpose, permissible limits, and two actual steps before comparing information, costs, reversibility, and effects on participants. Aristotle, Epictetus, and biblical wisdom supply different grounds for reflection; the contemporary application remains original and has no asserted empirical efficacy. The aim is an explainable preference preserving uncertainty and the right to revise when circumstances change. Sometimes the result is an action; sometimes a clearer question, a pause, or rejection of the original pair. Comparison reveals grounds but guarantees no outcome and cannot replace competent assistance where required.

I. Compare the Near Step While Keeping the Distance in View

Sometimes two actions are available, but a person compares two imagined lives instead. Speaking with a manager becomes an image of future courage; clarifying the conditions first becomes an image of permanent caution. These pictures are too large for the immediate decision. A real conversation may be brief and resolve nothing; clarification may reveal a previously unseen possibility. Comparison begins by restoring scale: what will actually be done, by whom, under which known conditions, and what immediate change is expected? In a hypothetical workplace example, you can request a meeting or first send a list of questions. These are different ways to open discussion, not a final choice between an active and an indecisive character. Later consequences matter, but they are not already established properties of a small step not yet taken.

An immediate choice still has a longer purpose. If you want to clarify the possibility of working together, assess both actions against that purpose. If you want to state a limit to participation,

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

the same actions will receive different assessments. A meeting intended for deciding should not be compared with a message intended only for information as though they must produce the same result. Name the shared question first: “Which step could clarify the conditions without promising participation beforehand?” This leaves room for differences. It neither reduces life to calculation nor requires predicting the entire route. It protects the next choice from excessive demands: one action need not prove your maturity, decide a relationship's future, and remove every uncertainty. Identify the transition currently under consideration and the parts of the future that will remain open.

II. A Shared Purpose and the Limits of What Is Permissible

Before comparing, separate the desired outcome from conditions that must not be violated to obtain it. You want a clear answer but cannot disclose somebody else's correspondence; you want to explore collaboration but cannot promise a month of unpaid work. These limits are not another score that an attractive advantage can outweigh. An action requiring deception or a commitment you have no authority to make must be changed or removed from the pair. Comparison is therefore different from ranking every imaginable possibility. It concerns approaches you are entitled to consider. A boundary may be ethical, practical, or established by agreement. Name its grounds directly: “This is not my information to disclose,” “I lack authority over that amount,” or “That time belongs to an existing obligation.”

Yet not every discomfort becomes an absolute prohibition. Awkwardness can accompany a permissible conversation; missing information may call for clarification rather than refusal. Ask what precisely makes the step unacceptable and who has authority to change the condition. Sometimes it can be negotiated: replace a promise to complete a whole project with discussion of a limited, defined contribution. Sometimes it cannot, and comparison ends there. This preserves adult freedom. A person need neither overcome every difficulty nor treat every worry as a final obstacle. They identify the constraints that actually apply. Advantages are then compared within that space instead of justifying crossed boundaries. If no permissible second option remains, the task has changed: find another possibility rather than portray a choice between an allowed and a prohibited action as equal.

III. Both Steps Must Be Available in Reality

An option exists only when more than its name is available. “Reach agreement in person” requires an available interlocutor and consent to meet; “obtain the data” requires knowing which data exist and who may provide them. If one action includes all its difficulties while the other is an attractive promise without conditions, comparison is biased from the outset. Describe both with equal specificity. Name the recipient and requested answer for a message; identify a possible format and the need for consent for a meeting. A detailed execution plan is unnecessary. Check that the action can actually begin without silently deciding for someone else. In a hypothetical family situation, “calmly discuss everything today” is unavailable when the other person has explicitly declined today. Compare requesting another time with communicating your own boundary, rather than an imaginary conversation with an actual pause.

Distinguish a step from its hoped-for success. You can send a clear proposal; you cannot independently perform another person's agreement. Agreement is a possible outcome, not an action entirely in your hands. In The Enchiridion, section 29, Epictetus asks people to consider what precedes and follows an undertaking. The contemporary bridge is limited to checking conditions: the ancient text guarantees no accurate forecast and does not bring another person's answer under your authority. Describing both options as actual actions removes some false superiority. Compare two ways of participating, each with possibilities and limits, rather than one option's success with another's effort. If beginning requires an unknown fact, obtaining that fact may be the immediate step. The original pair can remain a later question instead of a decision that must be forced now.

IV. Criteria Should Keep Their Meaning Throughout Comparison

A criterion identifies the respect in which one step is preferable. In the workplace example, it might concern clarity of the answer, time required, and avoiding a premature commitment. A few intelligible criteria are better than a long list of appealing words that mean something different for each option. Assessing a message by how quickly it can be sent and a meeting by the completeness of the final decision uses unequal grounds. Consider speed of beginning separately from the prospect of obtaining needed clarity; that prospect remains a judgment without a measured percentage. Ask the same questions of both: what is known, what has grounds for expectation, and what remains unknown? Comparison becomes transparent without numbers. Another person can understand the preference and notice an omitted circumstance rather than merely trust your overall confidence.

Numbers help when they signify something real: a known cost, available hours, or an agreed date. “Conversation quality: eight” does not become a measurement because it appears

beside a seven. Explain a subjective scale's meaning and limits if using one; ordinary words often suffice. One action requires more time; another leaves more uncertainty. These differences are real but do not yet establish a winner. Ask how much each difference matters to the purpose at hand. An ethical decision should not hide behind arithmetic: willingness to hear someone is not always comparable with saving fifteen minutes. Criteria reveal the grounds of choice. They do not remove responsibility for deciding which ground matters most or make incomparable things equal for the convenience of a final table.

V. A Step May Provide Knowledge Rather Than Completion

When comparing two immediate actions, ask what each could make known. A message might clarify which question the recipient considers central; a meeting might reveal whether participants can agree on the subject of discussion. These differ. A step that reduces a particular uncertainty can sometimes be more useful despite appearing less decisive. Information has value relative to a question, however. Collecting ten more opinions about a project does not necessarily reveal whether a resource is available or a key participant consents. State the unknown literally: “I do not know whether the team has authority to change the deadline.” Assess which action could answer it and why. Information then has a place in the decision rather than serving as a general stockpile of confidence. Actions repeating what is already known can be distinguished from those changing the grounds of choice.

Learning also has costs and boundaries. A meeting need not become an interrogation, and an interlocutor need not reveal everything that would ease your decision. Possible refusal and an unavailable answer belong in the description beforehand. If clarification requires private information you may not access, compare permissible alternatives or decide without it. Ask about the next transition too: would that answer enable a choice, or merely introduce another uncertainty without a clear purpose? Not every question must be settled before action. Some uncertainty will remain. Information therefore does not become a universally superior criterion displacing time, safety, and obligations. It serves a particular purpose: grounding the next choice sufficiently within what is available, rather than seeking impossible completeness before allowing yourself to live.

VI. Clarify Reversibility Through Consequences

“This can be undone” often concerns only your part of an action. You can withdraw an invitation, but somebody else's time may already be reserved; you can revise a tentative promise, but another person may have relied on it. Assess reversibility through consequences for all affected participants. In a hypothetical project, discussing possible involvement without committing differs from announcing a launch date. The latter is not equally easy to undo if a public announcement creates expectations, expenses, or responsibilities. This does not mean public promises should never be made. Their cost must be visible in comparison. Changing your intention does not automatically restore the previous situation. Money may be returnable while trust in your word is not; a schedule may be corrected while a missed opportunity remains lost.

A reversible step is not always better. Delay can close an opportunity, and a definite commitment may be necessary for cooperation. This criterion clarifies what revision would entail rather than seeking to keep every door open forever. Identify which consequences can be corrected, which remain, and who bears their cost. An unknown answer is a separate uncertainty that may change the choice. A limited trial helps only when participants understand its boundaries. “Let's try” does not erase obligations that actually arise. This article determines no legal consequences of such wording; consequential contractual questions require competent review of the conditions. Everyday comparison can simply avoid concealing another person's costs behind your freedom to change your mind. Reversibility then becomes a substantive property rather than an attractive label attached indiscriminately to both options.

VII. Compare Means Without Making the End Untouchable

In Nicomachean Ethics, III.3, Aristotle distinguishes ends from means in deliberation. This helps explain why two steps need a shared purpose: otherwise one is assessed for proximity, another for speed, leaving the choice without a common subject. The ancient formulation does not oblige a contemporary reader never to revise an end. Comparing means may reveal that an initial intention is unavailable or has an unacceptable cost. In a hypothetical work situation, you wanted immediate final agreement, but either available action can only clarify conditions. The immediate purpose changes: determine whether discussion has grounds rather than conclude an agreement. This is not deliberation's defeat. It has exposed the gap between a wish and what an available action can actually accomplish.

Keep two levels separate. First compare approaches against a chosen purpose. Then ask whether that purpose remains meaningful under the discovered conditions. Mixing them can turn an inconvenient means into an accusation against the end, or an attractive end into justification for any means. You can want an honest conversation while acknowledging that

today's format does not suit it. Change the format while preserving the intention, or revise the intention after learning something new. Neither transition follows automatically from the ancient text. This is an original contemporary use of its distinction, retaining responsibility for both means and ends. Comparison therefore need not conclude with mechanically selecting the more convenient route. It can clarify which question should be addressed before continuing to compare actions aimed at a subject that has already changed.

VIII. Include the People Affected by the Choice

Two steps can look similar for you and differ greatly for others. A message transfers clarification work to its recipient; a meeting requires shared time; an immediate decision changes the workload of someone not yet invited into discussion. These effects are easy to overlook because your own costs are directly felt while others' costs must be discovered. Do not assign ready-made feelings to people. State what is known and ask about consequential unknowns. “This option requires your time; is it available?” is more precise than assuming someone will be pleased to help. Participants may assess the same action on different grounds. Speed matters to one, clear authority to another, and preserving an existing commitment to a third. Such differences need not imply incompatible characters or absent goodwill.

Proverbs 18:13 gives a moral judgment of answering before listening. In this comparison, the motif preserves space for another person's answer without establishing universal collective voting. Participants do not always have equal authority, and not every action requires everyone's consent. Avoid claiming authority you lack or presenting your estimate of another person's workload as their agreement. Even when a decision is yours, you can explain its consequences and hear a material objection. When the decision is shared, your preference does not complete discussion. The next step may therefore be presenting two options to participants rather than implementing one. That is a separate action with its own purpose, preserving the distinction between choosing how to approach someone and reaching an agreement that does not yet exist.

IX. Compare Under the Conditions and Capacity You Actually Have

Choice is often distorted by an image of an ideal performer: someone who can conduct a difficult conversation without fatigue, gather documents quickly, and calmly tolerate an uncertain answer. You will perform the action under today's conditions. If an option requires sleeplessness or cancelling an important obligation, include that in its description. Capacity neither excuses every refusal nor measures a person's worth. It describes conditions for action. In a hypothetical situation, a detailed message is possible today while a substantive meeting requires unavailable time. This does not establish that messaging is generally better. It may make it more reasonable for the immediate transition. Tomorrow the comparison may change. Avoid concealing this temporary preference by turning today's choice into a permanent principle or a final verdict on your abilities.

Assess conditions without self-diagnosis or heroic promises. “I can spare half an hour now” says more than “I must pull myself together”; “The needed information arrives tomorrow” is more accurate than “I always procrastinate.” Present capacity does not automatically cancel existing commitments. If they cannot be fulfilled, another task arises: communicate the difficulty, negotiate a change, or obtain suitable help. Comparing two steps grants no right to silently transfer consequences to somebody else. It reveals which action is available and which transition needs agreement. For decisions with substantial financial, legal, or medical consequences, this article does not establish that personal assessment is sufficient. Relevant facts and expertise are needed. In everyday situations, retain an honest scale: a real participant chooses under real conditions, rather than an imagined self allowed to have no limits.

X. The Order of Actions Can Change the Original Pair

Two options are sometimes mistakenly treated as mutually exclusive. Sending a question first and meeting after the reply may create a third arrangement. Do not add a sequence merely because it appears to preserve everything you want. It has its own costs: waiting, repeated participation, and possible delay of clarity. Assess it against the same purpose as the original steps. If brief clarification makes a meeting substantially more definite, the sequence has grounds. If the actions duplicate one another, it only adds burden. A new possibility does not create a duty to keep searching. Two actual options can suffice for a reasonable choice. A third helps when a particular limitation of the pair has emerged, rather than when someone postpones deciding until an impeccable approach requires no sacrifice.

Distinguish an action enabling choice from one following choice. Clarifying a recipient's authority may precede comparison of a meeting and a message; preparing materials for an

already selected meeting belongs to execution. This article concerns the earlier transition: seeing the grounds of two possibilities. Its result is no mandatory schedule or reporting plan. Further work must fit the situation. You can already name what blocks the decision, however. If it is an unknown fact, find a permissible way to learn it. If values conflict, more information alone will not resolve them. If a participant is unavailable, clarify participation conditions. Distinguishing obstacles gives a sequence meaning. It does not promise that every difficult choice can be divided into convenient small actions, removing all ethical, emotional, or practical difficulty.

XI. Equal Advantages Do Not Mean No Decision Is Possible

An honest comparison does not always make one option better on every ground. A meeting offers room for clarification; a message preserves a clear record. One requires shared time; the other permits a later reply. These differences may not yield a single ranking without another decision about priority. Comparison has not malfunctioned; it has exposed the structure of choice. Explain why one criterion matters more today. If preserving the precise question matters most, a message gains an advantage. If disagreement requires joint clarification, a meeting may be preferable. The justification remains conditional. A different purpose or new conditions can change the preference. You need not invent a hidden objective victory to take responsibility for your assessment. State the grounds and what the choice does not promise.

If the difference is immaterial, choose an available option without dramatizing it. If it matters but its grounds are unclear, a pause or appropriate help with clarification may be permissible. Assess a pause through consequences too: it can preserve freedom or increase others' costs. Waiting is not automatically neutral. Both actions may also be unsuitable because each crosses an important boundary or misses the real question. The comparison then warrants abandoning the original pair. Give grounds rather than blame yourself for indecision. Comparison helps even without naming a winner. It can reveal equality, incomparability, missing information, or a misplaced question. Distinguishing these outcomes allows a next move without pretending certainty or endlessly repeating earlier arguments in the hope that repetition will make them final.

XII. A Preference Keeps Its History

Express the result briefly: “Under these conditions I choose this step because this ground matters most now; the other option retains this advantage.” The statement neither devalues the rejected possibility nor promises infallibility. It preserves the choice's history: purpose, permissible limits, material difference, and remaining uncertainty. Changed circumstances will reveal which part needs revision. A meeting may become available sooner, a needed document may arrive, or the recipient may explain that written discussion is inconvenient. Revising the preference does not make the earlier choice meaningless; it concerned earlier conditions. Avoid rewriting history as if the new fact had always been known. Responsibility is clearer when the change of grounds and the people who need to hear about it remain visible.

A record does not replace participation. Choices affecting an agreement require coordination within actual authority. For actions belonging to you, beginning need not depend on everyone's approval of your reasoning. Sound comparison guarantees no outcome. It makes grounds examinable while distinguishing your action from another person's response. The step produces new experience that may change later choice. Neither make the first preference an oath never to retreat nor abandon it at every inconvenience without new grounds. Between stubbornness and endless revision lies ordinary work: retain what remains known, revise what depends on a new fact, and remember the transition's purpose. Two small actions can then become an intelligible choice while leaving room for responsibility, uncertainty, and living participants.

What this means in practice

Begin with one sentence stating the purpose: “I want to clarify participation conditions without committing beforehand.” Identify limits that advantages cannot outweigh: another person's private information, absent authority, safety, or an existing commitment. If an option crosses a boundary, change or remove it first. Speed does not make it permissible.

Describe two immediate actions with equal specificity. State the subject, recipient or participant, and condition required to begin. Separate the action from the hoped-for answer: you can request a meeting yourself, but cannot perform another person's consent. Check that both options exist under today's circumstances. A detailed execution plan is not yet necessary.

Choose a few substantive criteria. Ask the same questions of each step: what might become known, which resources are needed, what commitment arises, what can be corrected after revision, and who bears remaining effects? Use numbers only where their meaning is known. Record unknowns as unknowns and do not present subjective assessments as measurements or calculated probabilities.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Consider affected people and your actual conditions. Include any required consent or decision belonging to someone else. If a material fact is needed first, make it a separate question. Check whether the actions form a useful sequence and assess that sequence's own cost. A third option need not appear merely for completeness.

State the result: one step is preferable on identified grounds, the difference is immaterial, information is insufficient, or the pair misses the task. Assess the consequences of a pause. When choosing, preserve a brief history of conditions and the decisive criterion, then coordinate what actually requires coordination. This reflective approach promises no correct outcome. It separates clear grounds from appealing stories and keeps responsibility for your action from being transferred to a table, an ancient text, or an imagined requirement for everyone's approval.

Key quotation

> *In every affair consider what precedes and follows, and then undertake it.*

Epictetus, The Enchiridion, section 29; checked Elizabeth Carter translation. This historical counsel guarantees no prediction of consequences.

Connections between traditions

1. **Purpose and conditions:** Aristotle (III.3) distinguishes ends and means; Epictetus (section 29) considers what precedes and follows. Both help bound a choice's subject, while Aristotelian deliberation and Stoic discipline retain different philosophical grounds.

2. **Choice and another person's answer:** Epictetus (section 1) distinguishes our own affairs from what is beyond control; Proverbs 18:13 preserves listening. The contemporary bridge avoids treating consent as your action. A Stoic boundary of control differs from a religious judgment of premature answering.

3. **Deliberation and participation:** Aristotle (III.3) acknowledges consulting others on important matters; Proverbs 18:13 warns against answering before hearing. Both concern missing grounds, but prescribe neither universal voting nor equal authority for every participant.

4. **Consequences and reversibility:** Epictetus (section 29) considers the cost of an undertaking; Aristotle (III.1–3) examines action and decision. This article's distinction between correctable and remaining consequences is contemporary, not an ancient project-management procedure.

5. **Grounds and present choice:** All three sources can interrupt premature confidence through different routes. Comparing criteria is our independent application. It neither merges traditions into a validated algorithm nor promises a correct result.

Primary sources

1. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, III.1–3 — primary philosophical text in W. D. Ross's translation; selected chapters actually read. Means, decision, and action conditions; no Greek collation.

2. Epictetus. Enchiridion, sections 1, 29 — Stoic counsel in Elizabeth Carter's translation; these sections actually read. No contemporary absolute guarantees inferred.

3. Proverbs 18:12–17, KJV — primary biblical text on listening and answering; modern commentary excluded, with no Hebrew collation.

Tags

choice, next step, comparison, end, means, purpose, criterion, boundary, consent, action, outcome, information, unknown, resource, time, reversibility, consequence, commitment, authority, participation, sequence, preference, pause, responsibility, decision history, Aristotle, Epictetus, Proverbs, philosophy, practical reflection

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.