

UNITED WISDOM

Kindness toward oneself and keeping a promise

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-13-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Kindness toward oneself and keeping a promise

Epigraph

“a good will” — Immanuel Kant, Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals, Section I, translated by Thomas Kingsmill Abbott. Text. The Russian edition supplies an original editorial translation. The moral term is not equated with a pleasant mood.

What this article is about

A person promised to help a friend move, but by the end of the week realizes their energy is lower than expected. One inner demand says to come at any cost: otherwise you are unreliable. Another suggests explaining nothing because you need to protect yourself. The friend, who is organizing a day and relying on help, disappears between them. How can kindness toward one's own difficulty coexist with preserving a promise?

This article considers a promise a specific connection between words, capacity, and another person's plan. Kindness means nonhumiliating self-treatment; it does not automatically establish either performance or cancellation of an obligation. We compare Kant's moral question, Buddhist goodwill, and a research distinction between intention and a way of acting. Each source retains its own domain. Examples are hypothetical and the practice editorial. No universal solution exists for every obligation: the content promised, consequences, available actions, and another person's right to participate in changing an agreement matter.

I. A promise has a subject, rather than merely a favorable image of its author

In the hypothetical scene, first reconstruct what was promised. Help all day or transport belongings? Arrive at a particular hour or give a time later? Be the only helper or one of several? Accuracy is not needed to find a convenient loophole. It is needed to understand which result the friend actually expects. A general intention to be a good friend specifies neither the scope of help nor the consequences of its absence.

If the wording was vague, acknowledge uncertainty. One person may have meant an hour, the friend an entire day. One's own implication cannot retrospectively be declared the sole agreement. Clarification can reveal where expectations diverged. This need not establish who

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

is guilty of every misunderstanding. It allows movement toward a real plan while time remains to change it without unnecessary haste or hidden transfers of work to others.

An image of reliability can support performance but easily replaces the subject. A person then thinks primarily about avoiding a bad appearance and postpones communicating difficulty. The later the message, the fewer possibilities remain for the friend. Internally, the promise's author worries greatly about responsibility; externally, the other person receives uncertainty. The first question can therefore be directed toward the recipient: what information does this person need now to act?

The promise itself must not expand without new words either. Agreeing to transport boxes does not necessarily mean an obligation to dismantle the whole apartment and cancel the following morning. But if new circumstances make the original scope insufficient, they can be discussed. A boundary protects both parties' accuracy. It grants no right to ignore an evident dependency in shared work, just as another's need does not automatically create an endless obligation for the author.

II. Support concerns the person; performance concerns the action

A phrase about kindness toward oneself answers how to treat one's difficulty. Checking a promise answers what happens to the agreement. These are connected but not interchangeable. Exhaustion can be acknowledged and a feasible part performed. Exhaustion can be acknowledged and a replacement agreed. Speech can be gentle while nothing is done. Tone alone establishes neither the obligation's status nor a change in another person's plan.

In the moving scene, a useful self-statement is: I expected greater resources; fewer are available now; communicating this is unpleasant, but I can make the message accurate. Such support does not declare the friend demanding or unfair. It prepares a conversation about one's capacity. If every expectation of me is immediately judged cruel, kindness becomes a verdict on someone else. Their actual position remains unknown and needs separate consideration.

Calmness need not come first. Someone can feel awkward and still communicate that help is available for only two hours. But a message differs from an agreed new arrangement. The friend may say it is insufficient, propose another option, or express disappointment. Support is also needed to hear a response without demanding immediate comfort for the author. An unpleasant reaction does not necessarily attack dignity or necessarily cancel a limit of capacity.

If someone really cannot fulfill what was promised, humiliation will not create the missing strength. Yet stopping humiliation does not automatically create a solution. Work remains between them: name the limit, learn the consequences, propose what is available, avoid promising on others' behalf. This article concerns that intermediate work. Neither a severe inner command nor a general slogan of care replaces it, because particular situations contain details that the slogan lacks.

III. The moral question differs from avoiding inconvenience

In Section I of the Fundamental Principles, Kant examines a promise made with an intention not to perform it and distinguishes the moral question from cautiously calculating consequences for oneself. This is a philosophical argument about duty, rather than a motivation experiment. We borrow a limited question: am I using promising words so another person believes me now, although I already intend not to act? Changed capacity is considered separately in our scene, rather than declared the same case. [S1]

The distinction prevents convenient substitution. Someone may already know they will not come but write that everything remains agreed simply to avoid hearing disappointment today. That message damages the friend's ability to plan. Compassion toward one's fear of the conversation does not make false information accurate. Fear can be acknowledged while seeking a feasible, honest way to communicate, without requiring an unpleasant task to stop being unpleasant first.

Sometimes, however, a promise was sincere and circumstances really changed. Inability must not automatically be explained through concealed deception. Establish what happened, when it became known, and which options remain. If someone became ill or an unexpected obligation arose, the conversation differs from deliberate avoidance. These examples give no medical assessment; they show why one moral story should not be assigned to every failure of timing and scope.

Nor should a philosophical term become an internal overseer's voice. A promise's seriousness can be recognized while its content is examined critically. Some promises were too broad, obtained under pressure, or require unacceptable action. They cannot be preserved by a single command to remain faithful always. The article does not settle such cases for the reader. It retains the central question of honesty: another person needs actual information about available action, rather than a beautiful appearance of continuing agreement.

IV. Intention needs a place and time

In Peter Gollwitzer's 1999 paper, a goal intention differs from an implementation intention: the latter connects an anticipated situation with a specific response. The abstract and selected definition were read, rather than the entire paper. This research distinction helps formulate a planning question but guarantees neither performance of a particular promise nor its moral worth. The following examples and check are editorial. [S2]

Return to the move. A general intention to help does not say when someone will leave, what they will bring, or whom they will call if delayed. An available sequence can be named: check the time in the morning, bring a trolley at the agreed hour, and immediately communicate a traffic delay. No complex system is needed for every friendly task. The plan merely needs to address a known obstacle rather than depend entirely on a favorable internal state at the last minute.

A specific response needs a real signal. “When I become sufficiently organized” is not observable to another and can be postponed endlessly. “After breakfast, I will send the message” is clearer if breakfast actually occurs that day. But that signal is not magical either. It may not arise, the message may require missing information, attention may shift to another task. The outcome is checked through action, rather than the beauty of a planning phrase.

Sometimes planning reveals that a promise is already impossible. Travel takes longer, the vehicle is unavailable, or two obligations overlap. This is useful information before the event. Kindness toward oneself allows acknowledging the calculation without another accusation over the inaccurate earlier forecast. Responsibility then requires bringing the information into the relationship. If the limit was understood only internally and silence continued, the friend still lives with the earlier picture and bears the cost of late discovery.

V. Goodwill does not eliminate directness

In the Karaniya Metta Sutta, Sn 1.8, wishing well-being to living beings appears alongside uprightness and rejection of deception and contempt. This is Buddhist instruction with its own religious aim. We compare only goodwill that retains honest treatment, rather than equating it with contemporary self-support or Kant's foundation of duty. Thanissaro Bhikkhu's translation is briefly paraphrased without quotation. [S3]

For our scene, this editorial comparison poses a simple question: what does another person receive from my kind words? If they receive a respectful, accurate answer, the words serve communication. If they receive vague reassurance that leaves planning difficult, pleasant tone does not remedy the information gap. One can wish the friend an easy day while clearly stating that staying all day is impossible. Directness need not sound like abandoning goodwill.

Accuracy also concerns the offer of help. “I will think of something” may be sincere but has no confirmed result. “I can bring boxes before nine” contains an action and time. If a third person's help is proposed, their agreement is needed first; nobody can be made part of our repair without discussion. A good aim does not cancel another's independence. A new promise should not be given solely for quick relief because the previous option cannot be performed.

At the same time, directness does not require communicating every personal detail. Sometimes naming available scope and timing suffices without revealing another person's history, diagnosis, or family conflict. Honesty about what matters for the agreement can coexist with privacy. If an explanation is requested, its extent is discussed. An incomplete account of one's inner world does not necessarily mean deception, just as a detailed account does not prove a sincere intention to fulfill the promise.

VI. Partial performance needs a new agreement

Reducing a promise internally is easier than discussing change with its recipient. Someone decides two hours suffice and declares that the new outcome. But if the friend expected a day, their task has changed differently. Partial performance may help or be almost useless at the selected time. A proposal should therefore remain identified as a proposal. Its value depends on the shared plan, rather than only on what extent the author finds pleasant to count as performed.

In the hypothetical scene, one can ask which two hours are most needed. Perhaps morning for heavy items, evening for transport, or the day is already arranged differently. The response can change the available action without increasing total scope. Such a conversation shows that self-support and attention to another need not compete for one resource. Sometimes better coordination is needed, rather than greater self-sacrifice or complete withdrawal.

If the new option is rejected, there are no grounds for recording that the promise was preserved. An honest record can say: offered two hours, the friend finds that insufficient, a solution remains unfound. This status is unpleasant but useful. It preserves the task as open where it really is open. Internal relief over good wording must not close an external question; absence of relief does not invalidate an already agreed option either.

Sometimes another kind of help remains: paying for an available service, preparing materials, warning others, or finishing a stage beforehand. These are examples rather than mandatory means of compensation. They require resources and the affected people's agreement. A beautiful gesture cannot arbitrarily be chosen and every loss declared compensated. The question remains specific: does the proposed action solve part of the task for which the original promise was needed?

The conversation also needs a time at which both understand the current plan. If the decision remains open, naming when a response is expected and what happens without it helps. This is no ultimatum to obtain convenient agreement. It prevents keeping another's day uncertain. Waiting rules must nevertheless suit the relationship and task; the promise's author gains no right unilaterally to declare any silence consent. Without a response, honestly retaining open status is better than inventing an agreement for two.

VII. A promise to oneself has a particular structure

Personal promises also deserve accuracy: read daily, finish learning, go walking. But there is no second person relying on those words in precisely the same sense. That does not make the promise unimportant; it changes revision's structure. Goals and means can be refined without mandatory external agreement when nobody else is affected. Ask what intention remains behind the original form and whether that form suits current circumstances.

If someone promised an hour of reading but twenty minutes are now available, they can examine what they hoped to support: knowledge, enjoyment, regularity, preparation for discussion. Different aims permit different changes. Twenty minutes may be insufficient for tomorrow's examination, but appropriate for free reading. Kindness does not prescribe reduction in advance. It permits examining a task without proving character through the maximum amount of time spent.

The promise must not become a constant source of new internal sanctions. If every walk produces another obligation to improve route, speed, and well-being, the aim may have silently changed. Examine what outcome previously counted as sufficient. New demands may be useful and deliberate. Or the old task may now carry an obligation to prove discipline. These explanations are examined rather than selected according to which sounds psychologically more convincing.

When an action is not performed, look at the actual day: was there time, were conditions suitable, was material accessible, was the next step clear? Not every failure should be assumed a lack of willpower. But not every difficulty requires canceling the aim either. A small revision may preserve it better than a new severe contract with oneself. Record what changed and why so kindness does not become the name for the gradual disappearance of what still matters.

VIII. A counterexample: keeping a promise at any cost can harm it

Sometimes a person comes to help although already knowing they cannot perform a particular action safely or well. They want to preserve an image of faithful friendship and conceal the limit. Outwardly, the promise seems fulfilled: the person is present. But the result can worsen for the shared work. This article gives no technical safety assessment of moving; the example shows that physical presence and appropriate performance are not identical signs.

It helps to clarify which quality the promised help requires. If the task needs something currently unavailable, communicate the limit and find another option. Coming at any cost can transfer that cost to everyone else, who must also care for the helper. Nonhumiliating self-treatment permits earlier acknowledgment. Yet refusal or change must not be decided secretly as a moral victory; the friend needs inclusion in the actual picture.

Another boundary concerns an unacceptable promise. Someone might agree to conceal substantial information, violate another's boundary, or participate in an action they do not regard as right. Fidelity to words is not a universal reason to continue. Name the conflict and seek an honest way to discontinue or change participation. The article gives no legal judgment or assurance of a consequence-free refusal. It simply does not make keeping a promise an automatic justification of its content.

This counterexample prevents kindness from becoming additional severity. Sometimes the most responsible step is to communicate something unpleasant beforehand and acknowledge that the earlier promise was mistaken. Sometimes it is to make more effort and perform it. A single inner feeling cannot choose these decisions. Content, consequences, and actual capacity are needed. Compassion helps bear examination; it supplies no ready answer for every moral conflict.

Sometimes the mismatch becomes known only after beginning. Then communicate new information immediately while the order can still change. Early acknowledgment does not make the original promise correct, but may reduce further uncertainty. If the other party has already borne a cost, retain it in the examination. Correcting a process and acknowledging an earlier consequence are separate tasks. The past cannot be declared repaired simply because the right earlier action and the desired next action are now understood.

IX. Repair after a violation needs no new limitless promise

If help has already failed to occur, another task begins. Acknowledge the particular violation, learn its consequences, and consider available repair. Wanting to restore a good relationship immediately can produce a promise broader than the previous one: now I will always help and never let you down again. Such words briefly reduce tension but create future reliance without clear conditions. Better to offer a definite step that can actually be agreed and checked.

In the hypothetical scene, the friend paid for transport independently. The author of the broken promise can learn which help is now appropriate and offer an available contribution. They need not guess exactly what will restore the relationship and cannot demand that the offer immediately count as sufficient. The friend retains their judgment. Honest action is possible without guaranteed previous trust. Self-humiliation is unnecessary while recognizing that trust changes through subsequent actions, rather than the apology's strength.

Acknowledgment and detailed explanation must not be confused. Explanation sometimes helps identify what to change. But if it occupies the entire conversation and leaves the other person comforting the author, the consequence disappears again. Briefly name when difficulty arose and why no message was sent, then listen. If the exact cause is unknown, say so rather than invent a deep account for persuasiveness. Incomplete knowledge does not prevent acknowledging an already known action.

Checking repair need not involve lengthy recording. Establishing whether the agreed step occurred and a response was received suffices. A favorable outcome that does not exist must not be added. Transferred money differs from restored trust, an apology from an accepted apology, a new intention from new behavior. These distinctions preserve dignity without using personal relief as proof that an external obligation has closed.

X. Reliability involves visible actions and honest limits

After one case, someone may want to decide finally whether they are reliable in general. That evaluation needs more information than one episode. Practically, retaining several rules for particular participation helps more: promise after checking resources, name unknowns, warn when circumstances change, avoid declaring a new option agreed without a response. These editorial guidelines need connection with circumstances. They create no universal system of guaranteed reliability or exclusion of future mistakes.

An honest limit sometimes helps relationships more than beautiful agreement. The friend knows two hours are available and can plan. If they continually hear an uncertain promise of a whole day, they must either risk or recheck. Reliability here concerns available information. But

moral superiority must not be inferred from every refusal. Refusal also has a cost and subject. Examine it as carefully as agreement, rather than declaring it mature solely from its form.

Kindness supports this work because a limit can be seen without immediately defending one's entire personal image. One can acknowledge: I overestimated resources here; this is what I learned; this is how I want to change the next promise. The mistake need not be proved useful or necessary. It may simply have been a mistake. Subsequent examination and action become useful if they actually change the available way of participating, rather than merely its account.

Return to the beginning. Someone need not choose between arriving at any cost and silently disappearing. They can contact the friend, state resources, hear the need, offer a specific option, and record the result honestly. The original promise remains or changes through communication. Self-support is not presented as performed work; performed work is not made a condition of human dignity. Between them remains an actual relationship in which both participants have a voice.

For several future promises, one selected guideline can be checked, such as communicating changes earlier. Decide beforehand what is observable: when difficulty was discovered and when it was communicated. Recording the whole of life or calculating a moral score is unnecessary. If the guideline does not help, examine whether it is too general, disconnected from the actual obstacle, or requires different external organization. Support retains permission to revise the approach; responsibility retains the need to examine what it actually does for relationships.

What this means in practice

Choose one small, current promise. Record the precise words, recipient, scope, deadline, and known dependence of another person on the outcome. If words are not remembered, name uncertainty and clarify. Do not begin with the most serious conflict. The practice examines a moderate situation; clinical efficacy is not established, and it grants no permission to change substantial external requirements.

Separately name your state and available resources. Formulate support that withstands facts: this is difficult, but I can name the limit without insulting myself or accusing the recipient. Then define the next action and suitable moment. If resources are insufficient, prepare a specific proposal for change and communicate the known consequence. Do not promise another person's help without their agreement.

After the conversation, record the actual status: promise confirmed; changed by agreement; proposal not yet accepted; violation already occurred and needs repair. Do not upgrade status through good intentions. Then perform the selected step and check it within a reasonable time.

If unsuccessful, examine new information and conditions, preserving another honest conversation rather than automatically intensifying internal punishment.

Finish with two separate lines: how I treated myself, and what happened to the promise. Both can contain partial outcomes. Such accuracy permits learning without a performance of complete overcoming or another global verdict. The next case needs its own examination, but a clearer question is already available: which action now preserves self-respect and another person's actual possibility of planning their life?

Key quotation

“universal law” — Kant, Fundamental Principles, Section I, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation. The Russian edition provides an original editorial translation. This belongs to Kant's examination of a maxim, rather than a scientific law of behavior or a requirement to fulfill any promise regardless of content. Text.

Connections between traditions

Kant's foundation of duty, Buddhist goodwill, and psychological implementation intentions differ. The article compares only honest treatment and movement toward specific action, retaining different moral foundations, religious aims, and empirical status. I30 concerns responsibility after mistakes; I-13-N01 pauses and deserving; I-13-N03 internal demands; I25 accurate description rather than verdict. These connect catalog topics rather than assert publication.

Sources

S1. Immanuel Kant. Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals, 1785; Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation, Project Gutenberg No.5682. Opening Section I and the false-promise discussion with context were read, rather than the whole treatise. Kant was an eighteenth-century philosopher. Limited paraphrase and brief fragments; territorial rights and host permissions are not declared universal. The moral argument is no experimental finding.

S2. Peter M. Gollwitzer. Implementation Intentions: Strong Effects of Simple Plans. American Psychologist 54(7), 1999, 493–503. DOI10.1037/0003-066X.54.7.493. Author university PDF. Abstract and definition of the intention distinction on opening pages were read; full paper not read. The author researches action psychology; the publication names Universität Konstanz, with no current position inferred. APA copyright noted; brief paraphrase, no quotation or reproduced procedure.

S3. Karaniya Metta Sutta, Sn 1.8, Thanissaro Bhikkhu translation, Access to Insight, revision30 November2013. Whole short text and rights notice read. The translator is a Buddhist monk and Pali-text translator. CC BY-NC4.0 noted; commercial permission not established. Brief paraphrase only, no translation quoted; religious instruction is not turned into evidence of practice efficacy.

Tags

self-kindness, promise, responsibility, agreement, honesty, performance, intention, plan, limit, resource, reliability, difficulty, shame, dignity, support, consent, privacy, Kant, Gollwitzer, goodwill, Metta Sutta, Buddhism, morality, friendship, help, repair, practice, United Wisdom

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 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.