

UNITED WISDOM

How a Worldview Changes an Everyday Decision

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W50 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

How a Worldview Changes an Everyday Decision

Epigraph

> *“There are things which are within our power, and there are things which are beyond our power.”*

Epictetus, Enchiridion §1, opening sentence in Thomas Wentworth Higginson's translation: text.

What this article is about

Several people agree that a promise was broken, yet propose different next steps. One considers restoring trust most important, another avoiding further losses, and a third establishing whether the person actually could fulfill the agreement. The divergence begins before action is chosen: in what counts as a human being, obligation, freedom, and a good outcome. Worldview operates here, often without philosophical labels. It selects what matters, connects an event with an explanation, and offers a standard of evaluation. Yet a general picture of the world cannot automatically yield a single everyday decision. Facts, roles, resources, uncertainty, and others' consent intervene. This article traces that path through a limited example of a promise, compares philosophical and religious orientations, and shows how to make a decision open to verification. We need not choose one system for our entire lives. Understanding which belief participates in a particular action, and where it needs clarification, is enough.

I. A worldview operates before receiving a name

A worldview is a set of ideas about the world, human beings, and the grounds of value through which we understand events. In everyday situations, it appears in the questions selected. One person asks whose will was disregarded, another what consequences will follow, and a third how relationships can be preserved. Not every emphasis constitutes a complete philosophy. Even an unsystematic belief can guide a decision, however, making it useful to bring that belief into view.

Consider a hypothetical case. A colleague promised to deliver material by evening and did not. A project participant concludes: “People cannot be relied on.” Here we have an event, a possible explanation, and a generalized picture of humanity. The last does not follow from one broken promise. Nevertheless, it already suggests action: control everything yourself. Another

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

participant says: “Every delay must be understood and forgiven.” This formula also precedes investigation of facts and possible consequences.

Before arguing over these worldviews, reconstruct the episode. What was promised, were the conditions understood, what happened, and was notice of the delay given? Perhaps one person expected a working draft and another a final version. Perhaps the obligation was clear, but a new constraint arose. Perhaps the breach is recurring. These differences do not settle the moral question themselves, but prevent a general theory from replacing the matter at hand.

A worldview thus becomes a participant in conversation instead of its invisible ruler. It directs attention: what we want to preserve, which harm is unacceptable, and which explanation seems sufficient. It need not describe another person's motives beforehand. A mature picture of the world allows facts to refine it. If every new episode confirms the same answer regardless of its content, belief no longer helps orientation. It turns life's diversity into endless repetition of a ready-made story.

II. An assumption stands between event and action

A decision usually depends on what we assume as well as what we know. In the hypothetical promise case, delay might be explained by disrespect, overload, misunderstanding, or a technical problem. Some explanations are compatible; others are not. Their status should be named before acting. Otherwise, an action looks like a response to fact while actually responding to an unverified motive.

An assumption becomes particularly persistent when it fits a general worldview. Someone convinced that respect exists only under strict control may see flexibility as an invitation to further breaches. Someone who attributes every conflict to insufficient love may avoid a clear conversation about deadlines. Both risk excluding information outside their habitual explanation. This describes the logic of possible choices, rather than diagnosing their personalities.

A small gap between observation and conclusion helps. “The material did not arrive at the agreed time” is verifiable. “I am not valued” needs other grounds. These may emerge: repeated disregard, an explicitly stated attitude, or refusal to discuss consequences. Their absence should not be filled with certainty. Clarification can be direct: what prevented delivery, and when is a result possible? It guarantees no honest answer, but changes the grounds of the next choice.

Questioning assumptions does not mean waiting indefinitely. Once a deadline has passed and consequences are growing, we can act under uncertainty: find a replacement, reschedule part of the work, or set a new limit. The decision rests on actual risk, rather than final knowledge of another person's soul. This limited scope strengthens action. We need not prove someone

generally bad to change an unreliable arrangement, or declare them unconditionally right to acknowledge a real constraint. Between condemning a personality and ignoring consequences lies specific responsibility.

III. Value and prediction answer different questions

A worldview connects what is considered good with how the world works, but these aspects must not be confused. “Trust matters to me” expresses a value. “If I remain silent, trust will recover” is a prediction. The first does not prove the second. We can want peace while choosing the wrong means, or defend justice through an action that increases injustice. A decision therefore requires separate scrutiny of the connection between end and means.

In our hypothetical episode, a participant wants to avoid humiliating the colleague. They conceal the delay from others and finish the material themselves. This may be a reasonable one-time exception. Repetition, however, can hide the team's actual workload and provide false information about deadlines. Caring for someone does not automatically justify concealing working conditions. Dignity can also be preserved through an accurate message without public accusation.

Another participant values discipline and wants to punish the person immediately. The goal of clear obligations does not establish whether punishment will help. Their role, accountability arrangements, recurring breaches, and available remedies must be known. An action violating our own agreements may undermine the predictability we intended to strengthen. The means must be evaluated through consequences and constraints, rather than merely the forcefulness of the proclaimed value.

This distinction also permits recognition of partial results. A conversation may clarify conditions without restoring trust. A new agreement may help the project without resolving hurt feelings. These are different achievements; none should represent them all. Such specificity does not impoverish a worldview. It allows us to examine how value enters real life. Respect then means a clear way of treating people, rather than a slogan; responsibility means a limited sphere of action and consequences someone acknowledges, rather than a feeling of burden.

Clarifying facts does not remove every difference. Participants may agree about the delay while evaluating acceptable risk differently. One wants to preserve cooperation because of accumulated trust; another needs a predictable deadline owing to obligations toward third parties. The conflict concerns goals and conditions, rather than incorrect information alone. Expecting someone to want the same thing after an explanation confuses understanding with agreement. Sometimes a decent result is to recognize incompatibility clearly and choose another arrangement without mutual diagnosis.

It also helps to ask whose value was declared shared. A manager may invoke team loyalty while protecting personal convenience. An employee may invoke freedom while overlooking an accepted obligation. These possibilities do not establish motives beforehand, but suggest checks: who benefits, who can object, and which rule would apply if roles changed? A general formula becomes more honest when it withstands that change of perspective. It must explain particular treatment of people, rather than merely sound good from the position of whoever has greater freedom to choose.

IV. A Stoic perspective distinguishes participation from power over outcomes

In §1 of Epictetus's Enchiridion, what lies within our power is distinguished from what does not. This is a proposition of Stoic philosophy, rather than a contemporary instruction to control every feeling at will. For everyday decisions, a limited question helps: which sphere of action belongs to me, and which depends on others and circumstances? Distinguishing these does not mean withdrawing from events.

In the promise episode, someone can explain consequences clearly, propose new conditions, or investigate replacement options. They cannot guarantee the colleague's remorse, complete project success, or the disappearance of unpleasant feelings. If a decision is judged only by whether everything uncomfortable disappears, responsible action can still seem a failure. A more precise assessment distinguishes participation's quality from the outcome while retaining the obligation to consider consequences.

A dangerous use of the Stoic formula begins when everything difficult is declared external and therefore indifferent. Organizing an agreement, seeking help, and changing conditions can also fall within available action. Lack of omnipotence cannot establish a duty to endure every arrangement. Nor can instant composure be demanded as proof of philosophical maturity. Our contemporary application must allow for limited resources and actual conditions.

The useful Stoic question is therefore specific: what can I do now without promising what depends on another person? Sometimes it is a brief message, refusal of a new obligation, or a pause for clarification. The point is clear responsibility, rather than emotional superiority over participants. Giving up demands for a complete guarantee permits earlier action without thoughtlessness. It also gives grounds for revision after new information, instead of defending the action as an eternal test of one's strength.

V. Dignity limits convenient means

An ethical choice cannot be evaluated solely by how quickly it solves a task. In Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, Section II, Immanuel Kant formulates the requirement to treat humanity also as an end, never merely as a means. This is a philosophical ground, rather than a statistical prediction of benefits. It limits certain actions even when they appear efficient.

In a hypothetical team, a manager may conceal the actual deadline from a colleague, expecting faster work. If someone lacks material information, their consent does not concern the actual task. The manager's convenience is purchased by restricting another person's choice. The Kantian question is not a prohibition on all work demands. It concerns whether participants can understand conditions and acknowledge the action as their own. An honest agreement can contain a difficult request; deception deprives that request of its grounds.

This perspective also distinguishes using a skill from using a person merely as a means. Work inevitably connects people's needs: one prepares material, another organizes the project, and a third pays. Cooperation itself does not violate dignity. A violation should be investigated where significant information is concealed, consent excluded, or someone disregarded as an independent participant. Clarity is therefore practical even without adopting Kant's entire system.

Dignity does not specify one correct deadline or distribute resources automatically. After a boundary is established, several permissible options remain. Work can be postponed, roles changed, scope reduced, or cooperation ended. Each requires facts and coordination. General ethics supports the quality of choice without freeing us from details. Those details reveal whether respect was real: was the response heard, refusal possible, the consequence explained, and a clear rule applied to oneself as well as another?

VI. Consequences broaden the circle of participants

In Utilitarianism, Chapter II, John Stuart Mill connects moral evaluation with well-being, including more than the acting person's pleasure. For our task, attention to affected people and the distinction between immediate convenience and lasting consequences help. This does not automatically justify any sacrifice through calculated benefit. The philosophical system requires more discussion than a single everyday table.

Two people made the promise, but delay can affect an editor, a client, and other workers. If someone again quietly finishes the material overnight, the project is saved for the next day. This may be justified. Yet the long-term arrangement worsens if hidden labor is treated as a free, endless resource. Considering consequences restores those whose participation is absent from the latest conversation to the picture.

Assessment requires honest uncertainty. We cannot precisely measure every future experience and should not simulate accuracy where none exists. We can identify several likely consequences, their grounds, and major risks. Some options will clearly be unsuitable; others remain comparable only after clarification. If consequences depend on a new agreement, talking with participants yields more than privately calculating their presumed wishes.

The conflict with the preceding section is useful here. A means convenient for the majority may restrict one participant's dignity. General well-being and a prohibition on deception do not always suggest the same first step. Comparison need not end in artificial unity. It reveals each argument's cost and can help find an option that respects an important boundary while reducing harm. Sometimes no option avoids loss. The decision then includes acknowledging that loss and responsibility for it, rather than promising that the right worldview eliminates a real situation's complexity.

VII. Roles and relationships clarify obligations

Obligation depends on an accepted role as well as general value. A promise to a colleague, a relative's request, and a client contract may sound similar while differing in conditions. Understanding roles reveals what someone undertook and which expectations arose without consent. A traditional position should not be confused with an unlimited right to direct another person.

In the Analects, 2.22 and 15.18, translated by James Legge, truthfulness and carrying out what is right belong to worthy conduct. These passages arise within a Confucian context of relationships and cultivation. They are not identical to Kant's ethics of autonomy. Both approaches nevertheless let us ask how words connect with actions while retaining different philosophical grounds. In the hypothetical workplace scene, this concerns clarity about an accepted obligation.

Someone may have said “I'll try” and received an expectation of a guarantee. Another promised a completed result while privately reserving the right to revise the deadline. While this difference remains hidden, participants dispute morality without agreeing on the phrase's meaning. Clarifying the role and form of promise is more useful than immediately finding someone guilty by character. If conditions really were clear and breached, this check does not cancel responsibility; it specifies its subject.

Relationships also affect acceptable forms of conversation. We can report a breach without humiliation, ask for an explanation without interrogation, and change an agreement without accusing someone of total human inadequacy. Politeness need not conceal a decision. “I can no longer rely on this deadline” can be respectful and firm. A mature role gives participants

clear duties and rights, rather than just a title. Loyalty then appears in clear fulfillment or honest refusal, rather than endlessly maintaining a promise that cannot actually be kept.

VIII. Nonattachment to the fruit does not mean indifference to consequences

A religious orientation changes action's meaning and must not quietly be presented as a secular efficiency technique. In the Bhagavad Gita, Chapter II, translated by Edwin Arnold, action is discussed alongside the attitude toward its fruit and a spiritual goal. This conversation between Krishna and Arjuna has a particular narrative context. It cannot universally authorize anyone's unquestioning fulfillment of any assigned role.

For contemporary comparison, we can distinguish action from expectations of personal reward. A team member helps finish a task while demanding that the help prove their exceptional worth. Without recognition, the earlier action is declared meaningless. A freer relationship to outcomes may support clear action without guaranteed gratitude. This is our limited interpretation, however, rather than a complete account of yoga or dharma.

A dangerous substitution occurs when nonattachment becomes a prohibition on evaluating consequences. Someone is told not to check whether an action is harmful because the outcome is “none of their business.” This strips action of responsibility. The distinction must remain: controlling every outcome is impossible, but considering available information, refusing questionable demands, and revising arrangements after results are possible. Lack of a guarantee does not mean absence of involvement in consequences.

In our hypothetical case, someone can help once without a hidden gratitude ledger while stating that they will not permanently carry another person's workload. Generosity and boundaries need not contradict each other. Generosity concerns a specific voluntary act; the boundary concerns future arrangements. Clear communication preserves both. If help proves that another person is now forever indebted, it has become a hidden contract. If a boundary prohibits all help, it too has ceased to fit the living situation.

IX. A verifiable decision includes conditions for revision

A worldview becomes more useful when we can specify beforehand what might change a particular choice. This does not require abandoning all beliefs at the first objection. It concerns a belief's connection with the episode. Which information matters, what result is expected, and which consequence would show that the means failed? Without these questions, any action can be declared right afterward.

A hypothetical team agrees on a new deadline and an interim handover. The aim is to see whether completion is possible before the final day. If interim material arrives at usable quality, the earlier explanation of complete unreliability needs refinement. If the promise again disappears without notice, changing the role or workflow is reasonable. The check concerns an agreement and observable action. It does not turn someone into an eternal label or guarantee identical performance on every future task.

The cost of trying must also be considered. Not every decision should be tested experimentally if failure could irreversibly harm someone or deprive them of an essential resource. For a limited everyday choice, a small reversible step is preferable where possible. Trying wording, interim coordination, reduced scope, and clear communication often supply useful information without extensive risk. This is proportionality, rather than a promise of complete safety.

Revision includes our own part. Perhaps the initial request was unclear, the goal changed, or someone overestimated their resources. Acknowledging this does not require assuming all another person's responsibility. It restores accuracy. A mature worldview does not turn every adjustment into an identity defeat. It permits retaining a value—trust, for example—while changing how it is enacted. Sometimes changing the means expresses loyalty to a principle an old habit no longer supports.

Available choice also depends on resources. Someone may understand the desired step yet lack time, authority, or a safe opportunity to take it. Worldview interpretation must not turn every limitation into deficient courage. At work, one participant can refuse without significant loss while another risks losing necessary income. The ethical question remains, but their range of action differs. Before recommending firmness, investigate actual consequences and available support. A shared principle does not equalize participants' circumstances.

This suggests another next step: first create an opportunity to choose. Gather information, find a reserve, clarify authority, or reduce dependence on one decision. This is substantive preparation, though not yet final action. It should not be called cowardice simply because it looks less dramatic than immediate refusal. Preparation can also become endless postponement; a clear criterion of sufficiency is then needed. The question is not the right pace for everyone, but whether a particular step brings someone closer to an available choice and how they can recognize that.

X. A general picture should help us see particulars

A worldview helps orientation when it returns us to a situation with more distinctions. It obstructs when it covers particulars with a general formula. The Stoic question about participation, Kant's limit on means, Mill's attention to consequences, the Confucian connection between word and action, and the religious question about fruit have different grounds. They should not be assembled into one compulsory system. We can compare which aspects of a decision they reveal.

After comparison, the hypothetical broken promise ceases to test all human nature. We can distinguish delay, possible explanations, accepted roles, harm to others, available means, and the next limit. Sometimes the result is restored cooperation; sometimes ending it; sometimes retaining uncertainty while taking a limited step. No option is confirmed by a philosophical formula's beauty alone. It requires connection with the actual picture.

Freedom not to adopt someone else's worldview matters too. Readers can accept a particular distinction without becoming Stoics or followers of a religious school. Such borrowing should be identified as limited application. This respects the source better than claiming every useful idea was already every tradition's common teaching. Comparison broadens the question while preserving the answer's boundaries, rather than erasing the thought's origin.

A decision remains a human action under incomplete knowledge. Worldview does not release us from incompleteness; it offers grounds for acting and accepting responsibility. Clearer grounds make choices easier to discuss without diagnosis, coercion, or personal attack. Everyday wisdom appears in this transition: from a large picture to a precise question, from that question to manageable action, and from the result to another check. The general picture retains value because it helps us see a living situation, rather than because it has replaced it.

What this means in practice

Choose an upcoming decision with identifiable participants and limited scope. Record what is known without explaining motives: what happened, which agreement existed, and what result you need. Beside it, name the assumption underlying your first proposed action. If it concerns another person, mark it as an assumption and find an appropriate way to clarify it. Not every unknown needs a question; sometimes an action can address risk without a final judgment of personality.

State value and prediction separately. “Honesty matters to me” differs from “Harsh public criticism will restore honesty.” Check which means actually supports your goal. Then examine two sides: who is affected, and which boundary cannot be crossed for convenience? If these

questions conflict, do not conceal it under a general phrase. Name the cost and available alternatives.

Define your sphere of responsibility. Which message, coordination, or action can you undertake? What requires others' consent? Which result are you unable to guarantee? This helps avoid impossible promises without turning lack of guarantees into grounds for inactivity. Where possible, choose a small reversible step. An important irreversible decision requires more information and a different level of scrutiny.

Return to facts after acting. What changed, what remains unknown, and which assumption received support? Results may be partial: arrangements are clearer but feelings unchanged; a resource found but trust unrestored. Do not make one result represent the whole path. Worldview works here as support for continuity, rather than an examination in perfection. Its usefulness appears in acting more honestly and revising means without surrendering one's own dignity or others'.

Key quotation

> *“So act as to treat humanity … in every case as an end withal, never as means only.”*

Immanuel Kant, Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, II, 4:429. Abridged wording from Thomas Kingsmill Abbott's translation: text. The omitted qualification concerns one's own person and the person of every other.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity	Boundary
Epictetus §1 ↔ Bhagavad Gita II	Action is distinguished from complete possession of its outcome.	The Stoic ground and the religious text's goal differ.
Kant II ↔ Mill II	A decision concerns people beyond immediate convenience.	Dignity and well-being provide different grounds and can conflict.
Analects 2.22 ↔ Kant II	A promise requires connection between word and action.	Confucian relational ethics is not Kantian autonomy.
Epictetus §1 ↔ consideration of consequences in Mill	Participation and observation allow more precise evaluation.	Limited control does not cancel attention to consequences.
Religious action ↔ contemporary workplace help	A voluntary act can be distinguished from expectations of reward.	The authors' analogy does not make a work situation enact an entire religious doctrine.

Primary sources and research

1. Epictetus, Enchiridion §1, translated by Thomas Wentworth Higginson. Sphere of power and limits of outcomes; the main text is used, rather than historical claims in the 1948 foreword.

2. Immanuel Kant, Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, II, translated by Thomas Kingsmill Abbott. Formula of humanity and the false-promise example.

3. John Stuart Mill, Utilitarianism, II. Well-being of affected participants and limits of personal convenience.

4. Confucius, Analects 2.22 and 15.18, translated by James Legge. Truthfulness and carrying out what is right in relationships. Modern numbering 15.18 corresponds to Book XV, Chapter XVII in Legge.

5. Bhagavad Gita, II, translated by Edwin Arnold. Action, fruit, and religious purpose; the poetic English version is not presented as a literal Sanskrit translation.

Tags

worldview, decision, action, value, fact, assumption, responsibility, promise, agreement, trust, consequences, dignity, freedom, choice, Epictetus, Stoicism, Kant, Mill, utilitarianism, Confucius, Analects, Bhagavad Gita, dharma, fruit of action, roles, relationships, revision, uncertainty, boundaries, everyday ethics

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 these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.