

UNITED WISDOM

Two Desires at Once: How Inner Ambiguity Works

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I24 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Two Desires at Once: How Inner Ambiguity Works

Epigraph

“Choice to the means.”

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, III.2, 1111b, a fragment from W. D. Ross's English translation, translated editorially in Russian. It distinguishes a desired end from choosing an action; it does not automatically favor one desire over another.

What this article is about

Imagine a hypothetical invitation: you are offered interesting work in another city. You want to accept and you want to keep living near loved ones. Each desire sounds convincing while you consider it alone. Shifting attention changes the answer, followed by suspicion: if I really want something, why does another part of me not fall silent? Ambiguity begins to look like a character flaw, although the situation may contain two independently significant interests.

Two desires do not necessarily mean two personalities, a hidden illness, or one real goal beneath a false one. They can concern different goods, timeframes, conditions, and consequences. This article helps first identify the conflict: what you want, how the desires interfere, and what can change in the structure of the choice. The decision remains yours. There is no promise of finding a lossless option or reducing a complicated life to a clear formula. Sometimes good understanding does not eliminate ambiguity but lets you stop fighting the fact that it exists.

I. Two statements can be true of one person

“I want to leave” and “I want to stay” look logically incompatible if one date and place are imagined. But they can describe different objects of desire: a new professional opportunity and everyday closeness; a change of environment and retained support; curiosity about the unknown and attachment to the familiar. Actions at a particular moment are incompatible while both goods remain significant. Recognizing this difference means dropping an extra demand: before deciding, a person must stop valuing everything that will not fit the decision. That demand is not a condition of responsible choice.

In a hypothetical scene, you read the working conditions and imagine tasks you have long wanted to do. Later you talk to a parent and notice how much staying nearby matters. Neither

response has to expose the other as false. Each moment makes part of the situation visible. It helps to record both formulations while available instead of choosing a version of yourself by the latest feeling. This is not a scientific test of motivational strength. It preserves content otherwise lost when attention shifts. You can then check whether the question is about leaving in general or the particular conditions offered.

Difficulty arises when desires are described too broadly. “Freedom” and “family” become opposing camps, although freedom may mean choosing tasks and family attending two important events a month. More precise formulations do not guarantee compatibility but allow it to be checked. Perhaps the job permits a flexible schedule. Perhaps daily presence is required and distance matters. Neither answer can be obtained from attractive names for values alone. Until the task is clarified, someone is comparing images rather than actual conditions. The decision then risks answering a conflict that does not exist in the assumed form.

Acknowledging two desires does not give them equal weight. One may matter more now, another feel stronger, and a third circumstance make the choice urgent. Intensity, significance, and urgency do not automatically coincide. You can intensely want rest yet fulfill a brief obligation whose consequences cannot be deferred. You can consider a long-term goal important while dealing with safety today. These distinctions do not establish the correct priority in advance. They provide more accurate words for discussing it without blaming yourself because every part of life makes its own demands.

II. First locate the point of collision

Julia Gorges and Axel Grund's 2017 review distinguishes conflict arising from limited resources from incompatible strategies or end states. It also shows variation in definitions and measurement. This is a research map, not a diagnosis for someone with two desires or proof that the practice below works. Relevant theoretical and methodological sections were read for this article; individual experiments are not presented as a personal forecast.

Consider two original hypothetical examples. You want to prepare for an exam and spend an evening with friends. With little time, the collision occurs in scheduling. Duration, day, or preparation volume might change, although this is not always possible. Another example: you want to disclose someone else's secret completely and keep a promise not to disclose it. An extra hour does not remove the contradiction between actions. Responsibility, the promise's circumstances, and participants' rights must be considered. The same feeling of tension does not mean the problem has the same structure or requires the same solution.

Sometimes the conflict lies only in a habitual means. Someone wants to maintain a friendship but regards a weekly journey as its only form; they also want less travel time. If both

participants are willing to communicate differently, part of the collision might disappear. Yet if meeting in person matters in this particular history, replacement is not necessarily equivalent. Examining the means must preserve the desire's meaning rather than defeat it through formal convenience. The question is specific: which part of friendship does this meeting support, and what could another means do? Without an answer, saving time may lose the very reason contact was maintained.

It helps to complete: “Acting for the first desire interferes with the second here...” In money, time, a commitment, location, another person's consent, consequences? If no point is found, perhaps you are comparing two values that require no immediate choice. If it is found, its structure can be examined. Merely having two important goals does not require a full inventory of internal contradictions. A working distinction concerns one situation and should help action. It loses usefulness if someone suspects conflict in every interest and considers calm possible only after their whole life is perfectly ordered.

III. Wanting an outcome and choosing an action are different steps

In Nicomachean Ethics III.2, Aristotle distinguishes wish from choice and discusses the relation of ends to means. This is normative philosophy of action, not a modern model of motivation. We use the distinction to avoid treating every strong desire as a completed decision. The range of wanting is wider than the range of acting; applying this thesis today remains our comparison.

In a hypothetical example, you can want interesting work while declining to move under the offered conditions. Rejecting a particular offer does not prove rejection of professional interest altogether. You can seek another role, await another opportunity, or revise requirements. Another outcome is possible: the offer matters enough to choose it while retaining regret about distance. In both cases, action is more specific than desire: it has a timeframe, conditions, and consequences. “I choose this option under these conditions” says more than a demand to prove that only one correct aspiration remains inside.

Not every imagined means is available. Remote work may be absent, travel unaffordable, the response deadline short. Discussing means must not create an appearance of limitless freedom. First learn the conditions, then distinguish actual options from desired ones. “I wish the offer were different” is a permissible thought too, but it does not yet change the contract. If negotiation is possible, its subject can be named. If not, the conflict becomes a choice among existing consequences. Better description of the inner situation does not eliminate it, and that does not make description useless.

Separating desire from decision also protects against premature promises. Interest can be acknowledged without immediately accepting a commitment. “I like the idea; I need to check the conditions” leaves room for information. Conversely, continuing uncertainty should not be presented as consent already given. If others plan actions around your response, its timing and certainty matter. Honesty concerns not only your experience but what participants have been told. Retaining two desires does not authorize promising incompatible actions to different people and then explaining the consequences solely through inner complexity.

IV. Sometimes different timeframes are arguing

“I want to rest” and “I want to finish the project” can concern different periods. One desire concerns this evening, another an outcome next month. Comparing them as identical proposals loses important conditions. Establish how long each action takes, when consequences appear, and what happens if it is postponed. Sometimes a sequence becomes possible: brief rest today and specific work tomorrow. Sometimes deadlines really collide. Distinguishing time creates no additional hours, but avoids attributing an internal prohibition against activity where more honest scheduling is needed.

A hypothetical scene: someone wants to learn a language but prefers a film in the evening. That can be an ordinary choice of rest at day's end rather than proof that the learning goal is false. If studying is always scheduled when only residual energy is available, the organization deserves examination. Is another time possible, a smaller amount, a real deadline? Sometimes someone instead discovers they like the image of knowing the language without choosing its process. That information can also be used without humiliation. Neither scheduling nor interest should be declared the sole explanation in advance; the specific history of action is worth examining.

Another temporal conflict concerns keeping options open. You want freedom to change plans and you want others to rely on you. Constantly leaving decisions open suits the first desire while potentially interfering with the second. The cost of delay enters the choice itself. You can agree on a response deadline, indicate provisional willingness, or limit a commitment. You cannot guarantee that every relationship will tolerate uncertainty as long as you need. Your freedom's significance does not erase another person's time. Agreement makes waiting limits visible rather than forcing one participant continually to carry all the other's uncertainty.

A temporary decision can be complete in its own right. You might choose a particular arrangement for three months and then evaluate conditions. The actual timeframe, exit possibilities, and effects on others matter. If a contract is irreversible or revision expensive, calling it a “trial” does not make it safe experimentation. An experiment must be distinguished from a commitment whose alteration has a high cost. This applies to inner promises too: “I choose this for now” can reduce unnecessary finality without canceling facts. A good

temporary decision does not hide its cost behind “temporary” or require declaring the arrangement your identity forever.

V. Sometimes desire argues with an image of the right kind of person

Inner ambiguity can intensify when each goal carries a moral portrait. Someone who stays is faithful; someone who leaves is brave. The decision must then establish who you are altogether. Yet a particular action rarely gives the entire answer about someone. You can leave and maintain care, or stay and choose a life from your own interest. Opposite histories are also possible. Words about fidelity and courage do not replace examining actions. Ask which responsibilities, relationships, and risks actually exist instead of comparing two promotional images of character.

In a hypothetical example, relatives say a good daughter must stay close, while friends say an adult must always choose herself. Both phrases can conceal specific questions: is help needed, how often, who else can provide it, what does development mean to the woman herself? Clarification complicates the moral drama but reveals action more clearly. It cannot be decided from afar that care is always imposed or independence always noble. Someone can value relationships and their plans simultaneously. Responsibility begins with real conditions, not the victory of the most attractive slogan in an imagined argument.

If another person's judgment is most frightening, that also needs precise naming. What do you expect: disappointment, punishment, lost support, public condemnation? Real consequences differ from an unpleasant conversation. Vulnerability can restrict opportunities to discuss a choice openly. An invitation simply to tell the truth is then insufficient. Information, support, financial stability, or safe timing might be needed first. This is an authored distinction between conditions, not advice for every dangerous environment. Where violence is a risk, appropriate local help and safety assessment are needed; an attractive exercise in sincerity cannot replace them.

Separating your self-image from a particular decision does not abandon values. Instead, a value becomes examinable through action. If care matters, what exactly are you prepared to do? If independence matters, which commitments do you accept voluntarily and how will you fulfill them? Clarification may confirm the original choice or change it. It does not guarantee everyone's approval. But it allows the decision to be assessed through its connection to actual life. Someone stops choosing a title and starts choosing an action whose grounds, limits, and responsibility toward affected people can be named.

VI. Compromise is not useful for every conflict

When desires compete for time, allocation sometimes helps. Part of an evening can go to work and part to meeting someone. But dividing equally has no special moral advantage. If a task requires continuity, two short periods do not equal one long period. If a meeting matters only on a particular day, postponement changes its content. Compromise is assessed through whether it preserves what is essential in both tasks and whether its cost is acceptable. It can be successful, imperfect, or pointless. The word itself does not prove the interests were actually considered.

In some conflicts, the middle position violates the purpose of choosing. You cannot half keep a secret by revealing its essential content and regard the promise as fulfilled. Unacceptable risk cannot be reduced by verbal balancing between an outcome and safety. Where medical, legal, or professional assessment is required, two columns of advantages cannot replace it. Permissible actions and actual consequences must be established. Having two desires does not make every option equally legitimate. Others' rights, consent, and limits on means enter the decision even when one desire is very strong.

Sometimes changing both desires' forms becomes suitable. Someone wants intensive study and free evenings. Instead of the full program, they choose a slower course, openly acknowledging a later result. This can be a good decision if the new pace actually fits. It cannot be called equivalent to the original without checking: perhaps the deadline is critical. An integrating option must be assessed under its own conditions. Its appeal often rests on a promise of losing nothing; that promise deserves particularly careful examination. A third possibility does not become successful merely because it removes the uncomfortable word “choice.”

VII. Loss after choosing does not prove a mistake

A choice can leave regret about what was not realized. If both desires matter, that is understandable logically: one action does not realize everything valuable. This article does not establish that every regret is useful or will pass unaided. It communicates loss without being the sole criterion of the decision. Someone can miss home after moving and value the work; they can stay and regret the opportunity. Conditions, consequences, and new information deserve assessment. Demanding never to regret often makes responsible choice impossible by excluding in advance the right to continue valuing the unchosen path.

In a hypothetical scene a month after declining the offer, you see photographs of the new team and feel sadness. That response does not automatically change the circumstances underlying the decision. Perhaps you remain unprepared for distance. Perhaps previously absent conditions have appeared. Ask what is new here: information or a reminder of the lost

opportunity's significance? New information can prompt reconsideration. A reminder allows regret without an immediate canceling action. This does not prohibit changing your mind. It distinguishes grounds for revision from an attempt to eliminate every unpleasant experience.

Responsibility remains. Recognizing loss does not mean constantly presenting it to others as a debt: “I stayed for you; now you must make me happy.” If the decision was your own within actual constraints, its price is worth discussing without turning another person into a lifelong debtor. Coercion or rights violations require different consideration; not every action should be declared free choice. In an ordinary arrangement, needs and revised conditions can be discussed. Regret then becomes part of an honest conversation rather than a weapon for recovering a price that cannot fully be returned.

VIII. Ambiguity can be held until a sufficiently clear step is possible

Sometimes no decision is needed today. You can gather conditions, establish the deadline, talk to participants, and retain both formulations of desire. This is substantial work if it supplies information. Repeated reflection does not always add something new, however. Distinguish the next unknown fact from repetition of the same argument. If conditions are already known and every new table merely changes the latest feeling, perhaps consideration needs a timeframe. Such a boundary is an authored organizational proposal, not a universal psychological technique. It fits only where timing and consequences actually allow its use.

Sufficient clarity differs from absolute certainty. You can understand the main grounds, costs, and unknowns without knowing the future experience. A decision then includes honest uncertainty: “Given these conditions, I choose this; here is what I still do not know.” If the unknown is critical, action is postponed or clarified. If it cannot be removed, the acceptability of risk must be assessed. An article cannot make that assessment for you. Professional information, rights, safety, and affected people may matter. Inner ambiguity sometimes remains after information has been gathered conscientiously; it is not automatic evidence of poor preparation.

With the opening invitation, you may ultimately choose the work, retain your existing life, or negotiate altered conditions. A good distinction predicts no answer. It shows that development and closeness were real interests, while the particular conflict arose in a specific offer's structure. The chosen action then gains its proper scale. It need not destroy the second desire or establish a final hierarchy of values for your whole life. You can accept a commitment, attend to consequences, and alter subsequent plans as new circumstances arise. A person remains more complex than one decision.

IX. Two interests can support each other in another form

Focusing on collision can make us overlook relations between goals that support both. Interesting work may increase the ability to support loved ones; close relationships may provide conditions for learning; rest may free time otherwise taken up by constant overload's consequences. These are possible links in a particular life, not a universal law of mutual benefit. They should not be used to persuade someone to accept any option. Examine instead which part of the first desire supports the second and which really interferes. Conflict then stops occupying the entire picture and acquires boundaries that can be discussed without promising complete reconciliation.

In a hypothetical example, the goals are “make music” and “be with my child.” At particular times, rehearsal really excludes shared time. Sometimes music can instead be a shared activity if both enjoy it and it fits the child's age. This possibility does not replace the parent's personal creative work or oblige the child to like the same thing. It shows only that goals relate differently through different actions. A separate rehearsal and separate caring time can be retained while adding a small shared part. In another case, no shared part emerges. Examination must allow that answer; otherwise the child's participation becomes a means of removing the adult's uncomfortable feeling.

Mutual support can also be hidden in refusing excessive scale. Reducing a project to a feasible size may allow someone to retain both interest in work and relationships. Reduction has a cost: income, timing, or quality may change. The smaller project cannot be declared the same simply because the new option feels better. Name what is preserved and postponed. Sometimes that decision fits the present life period more accurately. It does not require proving that the larger goal was wrong. Its place may change later with different resources and agreements, or it may not.

This view is especially useful before finally describing yourself as someone who must always choose between two worlds. “Always” and “never” can exceed the evidence. Today's offer has particular conditions; the next might be organized differently. At the same time, some constraints endure and cannot be removed by new wording. Good inquiry retains both facts: life can offer other forms, and the current choice may still involve real loss. Asking about mutual support therefore supplements assessment of the conflict without canceling it or promising a reward for sufficiently creative thinking.

What this means in practice

For one situation, voluntarily record the two desires separately. Give each its own complete sentence without “what I really want.” Add the good behind each and the particular action you already imagine. Do not label one desire weakness and the other maturity. If you want to leave for interesting work and stay for everyday contact, both formulations can be retained. The practice does not require a perfect objective picture; it lets you see your account's content and correct it if inaccurate.

Name the point of collision. Which date, amount, responsibility, incompatible action, or lack of consent prevents combining them? Mark separately what can still be learned. If working conditions are unknown, request them next instead of again comparing freedom and care. If timing is the collision, consider changes to it. If rights and promises are involved, consider permissible actions. For significant risks, use suitable professional support; a simple note cannot replace assessment of safety, health, or legal consequences.

You can now examine one possible option, including its cost for both desires and other participants. Do not call a third possibility lossless before considering its conditions. If a choice is needed, state its grounds, timeframe, and what you will not attain now. If the decision is deferred, state which information is required and how long waiting is possible. You can also stop the exercise if it increases self-blame without clarifying the task. Refusing the practice does not refuse responsibility.

After action, return to consequences rather than asking whether the second desire vanished. Are agreed conditions being met? Has new information appeared? What needs support next? Regret is allowed, as is revision, but neither must occur on schedule. The purpose is a sufficiently clear next step in which both interests are named and the cost is visible. It does not promise inner unanimity. Sometimes a mature formulation is simple: “I want both; for now I choose this, understanding that the other mattered too.”

Key quotation

> *“Resource vs. inherent conflict.”*

Julia Gorges and Axel Grund, 2017, abstract of Aiming at a Moving Target. The Russian version gives a short editorial rendering of the distinction. These terms identify a distinction in the review; the Russian fragment conveys its meaning rather than naming a diagnosis.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question and boundary
Review of goal conflicts ↔ everyday competing desires	Locating the obstacle's structure is useful; scientific definitions and measurements vary.
Aristotle ↔ desire and decision	Wanting an end and choosing a means differ; ethical theory is not a psychological test.
Planning ↔ moral responsibility	Scheduling helps with limited time without authorizing violations of a promise or right.
Recognizing loss ↔ revision	Regret communicates the abandoned path's significance; conditions and new information also matter for revision.

This is an authored comparative map, not a universal law across traditions or proof of a therapeutic effect.

Sources

1. Gorges J., Grund A. Aiming at a Moving Target, 2017. Frontiers in Psychology 8:2011, DOI 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02011. The abstract, theoretical distinctions, and relevant methodological limits were read. CC BY; authors and original publication credited. The review does not establish our practice's effectiveness.

2. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, Book III, translated by W. D. Ross. Passages from III.1–2 on voluntariness and choice were read; the narrow end/means distinction is used. Historical moral judgments are not imposed on the reader as contemporary legal standards.

Tags

two desires, ambiguity, goal conflict, decision, choice, resources, time, means, ends, responsibility, promises, consent, priorities, Aristotle, philosophy of action, motivational psychology, compromise, loss, regret, revision, conditions, uncertainty, closeness, development, voluntary practice.

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.