

UNITED WISDOM

Neuroplasticity and the Promise of Unlimited Change

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-30-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Neuroplasticity and the Promise of Unlimited Change

Epigraph

> *“Plasticity … means the possession of a structure weak enough to yield to an influence, but strong enough not to yield all at once.”*

William James, Psychology: Briefer Course, 1892, chapter X, “Habit,” p. 135; a shortened sentence checked against the original.

This historical definition does not describe every modern cellular mechanism. It connects change with stability from the outset.

What this article is about

The brain changes with experience. That fact can readily become a promise: people can become anything if they train correctly enough. Yet several transitions separate the nervous system's capacity to reorganize from unlimited change in life. Which changes were measured? Do they persist? Transfer to other tasks? Does reorganization itself make life better? This article examines neuroplasticity as a real opportunity to learn, rather than a universal guarantee. We consider juggling and computer-training research, distinguish a skill from the image of a new personality, and ask why stability can matter as much as flexibility. The practical question is not whether you are trying hard enough. It concerns the specific change you need, conditions supporting its acquisition, and observations showing whether the chosen work actually helps.

I. Changeability is not a direction

Neuroplasticity is the nervous system's capacity to change; the word itself does not identify changes beneficial to a person. This first distinction disappears in promises of endless growth. Declaring every change an improvement prevents us from asking what we are learning and what it makes possible.

Imagine an employee practicing immediate replies for years. They become faster, recognize requests from their first words, and barely notice moving from rest into work. The skill strengthens. But they wanted more peaceful time with family. Relative to that goal, successful training may be a failure. Plasticity did not choose a direction; repeated actions and the environment did.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Another person learns to hear a brief request without immediately promising everything. The first attempts feel awkward. A pause appears, conditions need clarification, and answers sometimes wait. Outwardly, they have become slower. Yet this slowing may be the desired change. Speed alone would mismeasure the outcome because quality depends on the task, rather than an attractive property in isolation.

Discussion of brain reorganization therefore benefits from beginning with the language of activity. Reading musical notation, retaining an action sequence, and noticing the moment of consent more accurately are different goals. Each needs conditions and criteria. “Develop the brain” leaves these unspecified and allows almost any outcome to be presented as progress.

Changeability also does not mean every direction is currently available. Age, previous experience, personal circumstances, and task demands are conditions, rather than moral assessments. We can identify an available step without turning limitation into a verdict. Such precision preserves hope better than a promise blaming insufficient belief at the first difficulty. The possibility of change becomes useful when accompanied by an object, a measure, and permission to revise the work.

II. What juggling showed

A visible change in a brain measure belongs to a specific study and task. It is not a photograph of new character. This matters especially when research images become symbols of adult learning capacity.

In Joenna Driemeyer and colleagues' 2008 study, twenty healthy adults learned juggling while researchers repeatedly measured brain structure using MRI. Changes in gray-matter measures appeared in visual-motor areas after just seven days. The paper discusses their selectivity and change after practice ended. The measurement does not establish an exact cellular mechanism in one step or assess every participant ability.

Public retellings often reduce this to “you can reorganize your brain in a week.” A week here is no universal timescale for every reorganization. Juggling is a particular visual-motor task; the measure is a particular way of detecting structural differences. The necessary research is missing between this result and promises to change fear, relationships, or professional thinking within a week.

Imagine a learner keeping three balls in the air. They acquire a skill and perhaps a new relationship to mistakes. The second may matter personally, but MRI has not automatically measured it. Greater conversational patience would be a separate observation requiring its own comparison. If patience did not improve, juggling's value remains. Its benefits simply stay where they actually occurred.

Restrained reading does not diminish the result. It respects findings without turning them into universal advertising. Adult brains can reorganize with learning. Understanding the extent of that possibility in another task requires studying that task. Selectivity usefully reveals a connection between experience and change. It also reminds us that people have not received one dial for turning their entire lives in a desired direction.

III. When an exercise remains an exercise

Improving a practiced action does not guarantee improvement in all similar actions. This is the transfer problem: will learning work beyond the conditions of acquisition? Without that question, evaluating a program becomes too convenient.

In Adrian Owen and colleagues' 2010 paper, six weeks of computer training were studied in 11,430 participants. Practiced task performance improved, but the study found no transfer of improvements to untrained tests. This concerns the selected program and design, rather than proving all learning useless. It shows why transfer must be measured separately.

Imagine someone learning to select a correct symbol quickly on screen. They recognize the task structure better, are less distracted by presentation, and choose answers confidently. After a month it feels easy. Yet explaining a complex issue to a colleague remains difficult. That requires understanding another person's interests, selecting facts, and clear explanation. The general word “thinking” cannot make these one training task.

Transfer can be a separate part of a design. If the goal is explaining thoughts to people, check explanations with people. If the goal is speaking in changing circumstances, one flawless rehearsal in silence does not establish the outcome. Preparatory exercises still matter. They take their place within a route rather than replacing its final check.

Distinguishing nearby similarity from distant promises is especially important. An acquired method may help with a similar task without establishing increased general wisdom. Wisdom involves evaluating goals, understanding consequences, and revising decisions. Measuring it need not be forbidden. But a convenient measure cannot quietly replace it, followed by a claim that wisdom was what someone bought. The broader the transfer promise, the clearer its supporting conditions and evidence must be.

IV. The brain needs stability

Stability does not oppose healthy development. Without it, learning would not last long enough for use. Someone completely losing previous skills after every new impression would be flexible in a profoundly impractical sense.

James's historical definition in the chapter on habit connects yielding with retaining form. It does not replace neuroscience today, but helps pose a useful question: how can we change without losing everything learned? What matters is an appropriate relationship between retention and revision, rather than maximum changeability itself.

Imagine a musician who does not reinvent every finger movement. Automated elements free attention for phrasing, sound, and partners. When circumstances change, habitual performance may need correction. Mature skill includes both movements: relying on what is stable and noticing where it no longer fits.

A similar distinction occurs in relationships, without proving an identical neural mechanism. Respect for another person's refusal need not be reconsidered daily. What help they currently welcome deserves reconsideration. A stable principle supports flexible action. Calling all stability rigidity removes support; calling every correction inconsistency removes responsiveness to life.

We might therefore ask what to preserve so a change remains our own, and what to relearn so previous support does not obstruct us. This philosophical question concerns purpose and continuity. A brain image cannot settle it. Images can contribute to investigating conditions, but do not assign value to what changes.

Limitation then ceases to appear as a defect needing complete elimination. Sometimes it serves a life someone wishes to preserve. Development means handling stability more precisely, rather than heroically fighting every repetition.

V. Repetition needs discernment

Repeated action can reinforce accuracy or error. “Repeat more” is therefore too thin a formula. Does the person have opportunities to notice results and change the next attempt?

In Nicomachean Ethics, book II, Aristotle connects acquiring an activity with performing it, while distinguishing good and bad performance. His argument about character is no contemporary brain experiment. It reveals a logical boundary: the number of actions alone does not determine quality.

Imagine someone rehearsing a difficult conversation. Repeating an accusation twenty times may make it polished. Trying to separate an event from assumptions about motives changes the task. They now practice expressing a checkable complaint, rather than confidence in the initial label. The distinction is visible in what is said without consulting a hidden neural picture.

Feedback need not involve constant external evaluation. Comparing a result against a chosen criterion may suffice. Did you ask a question the other person could answer freely? Is the case

clear? Can correction still occur? A criterion makes the attempt part of learning, rather than a ceremony of expressing proper intention.

An overly broad assessment obstructs this. “I was a bad conversational partner again” does not identify what to relearn. “I interrupted before hearing the condition” identifies a sequence. Next time it can be checked. This offers an attainable way of distinguishing a task, rather than guaranteed personality transformation.

Discernment gives practice direction. Error ceases to prove impossibility and need not become an obligatory sign of success. It becomes information about an action still unsuccessful. Without information, more repetitions do not necessarily add understanding. Clarifying the task, changing conditions, or recognizing an exercise unsuited to the goal may be the next useful step.

VI. The environment enters learning

A skill exists under conditions rather than separately from them. Asking someone to change while preserving everything supporting the old sequence lets plasticity promises conceal the task's structure. Working on conditions may matter as much as repetition.

Imagine an employee wanting to stop automatically accepting extra work. Alone, they can decline calmly. In meetings they are interrupted, requests are tied to threatened evaluation, and reflection time is denied. The task now includes an actual distribution of power, as well as wording. Attributing everything to inadequate brain flexibility would be convenient for the system and inaccurate for the person.

A feasible adjustment may be small: receiving requests in writing, separating deadlines from immediate agreement, or clarifying scope beforehand. Even this may exceed one participant's control. Recognizing limits matters because it identifies the appropriate level of response. Personal learning and changes to agreements need not exclude each other.

Language learning offers another example. Ten minutes of exercises amid notifications and ten protected minutes are different conditions. Identical exercises still involve different attention sequences. This does not establish a universal notification ban or one ideal environment. We need to identify conditions fitting the work and available in current life.

Discipline consequently changes meaning. It involves more than overcoming obstacles through intention. It includes arranging repeatable circumstances: where action begins, what obstructs it, how results become visible, and which resources are needed. This examination need not speak for neuroscience when it simply checks everyday organization.

Neuroplasticity leaves room for learning; the environment partly determines what and how we learn. Neglecting either side can turn a scientific concept into an individual duty to fix circumstances depending on many people.

VII. Change need not be complete

A small change can have major practical value without creating a new person. Promised total transformation makes these outcomes harder to notice: anything short of a radical break with the past begins to seem inadequate.

Imagine a parent wanting to stop feeling irritated. That goal is too broad for an initial check. They instead choose a moment: stop arguing once they no longer understand the child's words. Later they more often interrupt their own speech and return to the question afterward. Irritation remains, but the action sequence changes. This is a real outcome relative to the task, without proving the emotion has vanished.

“Reprogramming” tempts us by promising an entirely new stable mode. But a person is not a set of settings to which we have complete access. They have history, significant relationships, and several simultaneous goals. Acquiring one sequence better can leave life's contradictions unresolved. That limitation does not make the work fictitious.

Duration now becomes a question. Did the new action work only on a convenient day? Remain available later? What happened when circumstances changed? These questions are more useful than requiring constant inspiration. They test skill availability rather than the persuasiveness of a new-identity narrative.

A small outcome may open another step without obliging anyone to take it. People can stop at a useful improvement. Constant program expansion can make completion unreachable: every resolved task is replaced by something deeper. Plasticity becomes an endless debt to an ideal never submitted for checking.

An attainable goal allows an ending. Learn a particular action, check retention, and decide whether it suffices now. Completion respects both changeability and limited human time. It leaves resources for the life that motivated learning.

VIII. Ancient discipline is not early neuroscience

Repetition practices long predate brain imaging. Comparing them with contemporary learning can be meaningful while retaining different objects and grounds. Similar attention to small steps does not mean an ancient text predicted a particular MRI finding.

In Tao Teh King, chapter 64, a large tree growing from a tiny shoot accompanies warnings against action that spoils things. James Legge's translation contains both gradual development

and limits on forcibly seizing an outcome. This is a philosophical basis for discussing ways of acting, rather than instructions on neuronal plasticity.

For Aristotle, repeated activity participates in character formation. James discusses habit within the psychology and physiology of his period. Contemporary juggling research measures a connection between learning and a structural indicator. These lines can meet in asking how practice leaves a trace. Their answers retain different scales: moral formation, habit theory, and a particular experimental observation.

Contemporary readers may take a useful question from a classical text: am I accelerating change in a way that destroys its conditions? That remains an interpretation applied today. An ancient source does not give it medical factual status. Scientific research, in turn, does not decide which character to cultivate or for what life.

A good comparison therefore moves both ways. Classics help ask about purpose, proportion, and effort's cost. Experiments help prevent promises extending beyond the measured task. Neither side should decorate the other with prestigious names. Together they offer a more complex picture: actions change people, but direction, limits, and usefulness require separate understanding. Change's possibility alone does not answer whether that change should continue.

IX. How a promise changes our response to failure

Unlimited promises readily turn difficulty into blame. If everyone supposedly can achieve anything, lack of results must be explained through personal defects. Scientific language then supports moral pressure the research did not establish.

Imagine a program promising complete transformation of thinking in a month, without defining success. When participants report a familiar recurrence, they are told resistance reveals the depth of reorganization. Improvement means the program works; increased difficulty means it works even deeper. No outcome can now alter the promise.

A criterion set beforehand protects against this circle. It need not be complex: did the action succeed in comparable cases, persist later, and avoid increasing an unwanted cost? Failure must be able to inform assessment of methods and conditions, rather than merely diagnose the participant's attitude.

Hope remains, becoming conditional and active: an available attempt, a way to observe results, permission to change routes. Useful change may be smaller than promised. Another resource or support may be needed. A person may decide the original goal no longer fits. These can be reasonable outcomes even when advertising calls them inadequate motivation.

Effectiveness should therefore remain connected with dignity. People need not earn respect through successful reorganization. Learning concerns an action they wish to acquire. Their value in relationships does not depend on learning speed. This boundary also makes success clearer: a useful possibility rather than proof of superiority over people with different conditions and pace.

X. A good goal survives without an attractive image

Practical change should be recognized where it is needed, even without an impressive brain image. Otherwise neuroscience's prestige displaces the human task: clear improvement is replaced by a search for evidence of something impressive inside.

Imagine someone learning to explain prices and deadlines clearly. Previously they spoke vaguely, accepted incompatible expectations, and later felt angry. Now they more often notice questions before agreeing, clarify boundaries, and confirm agreements in writing. The conversations and consequences matter when evaluating this work. MRI may have no role.

This does not oppose behavior and biology. Activity has biological conditions, but every useful outcome need not be measured at every level simultaneously. If the task is learning to read, actual reading provides necessary information. Investigating a mechanism needs different methods. Error begins when one level is made the compulsory certification of another without reason.

The reverse boundary matters equally. An attractive measure cannot replace the change someone sought. A program may show scan differences while still needing to check whether the promised action became available. A measure's scientific complexity does not remove questions about its connection to claimed benefit.

Goals themselves must remain revisable. Someone wanting constant calm may discover that clarity in a particular conflict matters more. Precision reduces the ideal image and increases practical attainability. Learning gains an ending, checking an object.

Neuroplasticity returns to its place: explaining the possibility of certain changes and opening questions about conditions. It does not assign a single norm for future humanity. A changeable brain belongs to a life of goals, relationships, and limits; that life is where we decide what to learn and whether the outcome already suffices.

What this means in practice

Suppose you are learning to ask a clarifying question rather than promise hastily. Calm practice works, but haste returns with a manager. This need not prove learning useless or lack of will. Conditions changed: status, limited time, and the risk of appearing inconvenient. The next trial should account for those conditions. Prepare a short phrase, clarify response deadlines, or rehearse with someone willing to help. Then check whether you could ask the question in the real situation. Transfer gains an opportunity, and plasticity becomes bounded, observable work. Transfer still cannot be promised beforehand; action reveals it.

Identify one action to acquire. Instead of “become more flexible,” choose something recognizable in an episode: clarify a deadline before agreeing, read a short text without prompts, or calmly state one boundary. Avoid choosing an entirely new personality at once. Check that the action serves your current goal rather than merely appearing worthy in someone else's description.

Describe the starting situation and available conditions. When is the action needed? What happens immediately beforehand? Which part depends on you, and which needs agreement with others? Conditions making an attempt impossible provide information about the task. They need not immediately become evidence of insufficient effort.

Choose a manageable exercise and direct check. Record exercise results separately from life results. A prepared phrase may be spoken well yet remain unusable in a real meeting. Further work then concerns transfer rather than disproving all progress. Feedback should reveal the specific sequence still needing change.

After several attempts, compare results with the initial goal. What became easier? Remained unchanged? How much time and energy does it cost? Is there a price you do not want to keep paying? Neuroplasticity promises no universal number of days; task and checking method determine the timeframe. Treatment and rehabilitation require appropriate specialists and studied protocols. This practice concerns ordinary learning, rather than choosing medical care.

If the change helps, continue or finish this stage. If no result appears, clarify tasks and conditions before increasing effort. Another method, smaller goal, or pause may be needed. The possibility of learning does not demand continual proof of unlimited changeability. It allows gradual acquisition of skills making a chosen life more workable.

Key quotation

> *“For the things we have to learn before we can do them, we learn by doing them”*

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, II.1, 1103a32–33; checked against W. D. Ross's translation.

This argues for acquiring ability through activity. Its significance does not depend on attributing contemporary knowledge of neural mechanisms to Aristotle.

Connections between traditions

Lines of thought	Similarity	Boundary
Aristotle ↔ James	Repeated action helps form a stable way of acting.	Moral theory and nineteenth-century psychology are not one experimental explanation.
James ↔ juggling research	Experience connects with possibilities of nervous-system change.	Historical habit theory does not establish the cellular nature of measured MRI differences.
Tao Teh King 64 ↔ Aristotle	Process, proportion, and performance matter.	Daoist limits on seizing outcomes and virtue formation have different grounds.
Juggling ↔ Owen's computer training	Task acquisition is checked through observation in both cases.	Structural measures, exercise performance, and transfer are different outcomes.
Classical discipline ↔ contemporary everyday practice	We can begin with a defined action and examine consequences.	The contemporary checking scheme is an author application, not an ancient neuroscience protocol.

Primary sources and research

1. William James, Psychology: Briefer Course, 1892, chapter X, pp. 134–146. Passages defining plasticity and habit were read; historical reference and epigraph.

2. Driemeyer et al., Changes in Gray Matter Induced by Learning—Revisited, PLOS ONE, 2008, 3(7): e2669, DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0002669. Abstract, methods, results, and discussion were read; twenty adults, a specific task, and MRI interpretation limits.

3. Owen et al., Putting brain training to the test, Nature, 2010, 465:775–778, DOI 10.1038/nature09042. Available abstract and results description were read, not the entire restricted text. Supports only the six-week program and absence of detected transfer within it.

4. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, book II, W. D. Ross's translation, 1925; II.1–4. Passages on activity, habit, and performance quality were read; source of the key quotation.

5. Lao-tse, Tao Teh King, James Legge's translation, 1891, chapters 63–64. These chapters were read; gradualness and limits of action, without attributing neurophysiological knowledge.

Tags

neuroplasticity, learning, habit, James, Aristotle, Tao Teh King, stability, flexibility, juggling, MRI, gray matter, skills, learning transfer, computer training, feedback, practice, goal, conditions, repetition, change, environment, measurement, evidence, development, limits of promises, attainable step, independent choice, outcome criterion.

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.