

UNITED WISDOM

Is meaning found or made?

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Is meaning found or made?

Epigraph

> *Man is nothing else but that which he makes of himself.*

Jean-Paul Sartre, Existentialism Is a Humanism. Philip Mairet translation. Text.

What this article is about

The question of meaning often sounds like a choice between finding an existing answer and making one ourselves. Yet these words operate at different levels. We may dispute the ultimate ground of life, recognise our convictions or decide how to participate in a particular activity. Confusing them makes a small choice into a duty to invent the universe, or turns belief in a given ground into waiting for daily instructions. This article distinguishes searching and making while preserving genuine disagreement between religious and nonreligious answers. A hypothetical scene in a small library explores what a person encounters, what they choose and which form of participation they answer for. The scene proves no philosophy and promises no fulfilment. It gives the question a more precise scale so an unknown ground and available action can be considered without substituting for each other.

I. Finding an answer and forming a direction are different acts

The question of whether meaning is found or made contains several questions. Does human life have a purpose independent of our decision? How does a person recognise what matters? How does an acknowledged value become concrete participation? The first concerns the world, the second understanding and the third action. Confusing them makes the absence of a ready plan look like proof that there are no grounds, or makes a personal decision prove that no ground can exist beyond it. Yet someone may recognise the value of care without knowing what form it should take today. They may also construct a project and still ask whether it is sufficiently justified. Different levels remain within the same life.

Imagine someone offering time to a small community library. Readers find the opening hours inconvenient, some books are difficult to locate, and the room needs ordinary care. The person had been looking for a worthwhile activity and now sees an opportunity. In one sense they found a task: the need existed before they arrived. In another they formed their participation by identifying what they could do, agreeing a schedule and devising a way to work. A successful outcome would still not prove that libraries are the final meaning of human existence. It supplies grounds for this involvement. Recognising scale protects a useful experience from being required to answer a question about the entire world.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

We will therefore distinguish an overall meaning of life, recognition of significance and the form of participation. This is the article's editorial framework, not a doctrine shared by every source. A religious teaching may affirm a ground given to the person and require a personal response. A philosophy of free self-definition may reject a predetermined essence and still demand responsibility. Everyday involvement may combine discovering a task with making a response without settling the worldview disagreement. Found and made cease to be exclusive only where they refer to different acts. Where the disagreement concerns the ultimate ground, it remains a disagreement.

II. An inherited answer still needs understanding

A ready answer may enter a life before the question is asked. Family, culture or community explain why to work, care and choose. This does not automatically make the answer false or alien. It supplies a language in which significance can first be named. But receiving an answer differs from understanding it. Someone may confidently repeat duty, love or service without knowing how those words bear on a particular decision. Engaging with an inherited ground therefore need not begin with refusal. It may require understanding what it claims, what actions follow, and where it is merely used as a habitual demand. Respect for a tradition is compatible with that clarification.

In our library scene, the participant was taught that knowledge should be passed on. The phrase once sounded general; now a teenager cannot find a needed book. The inherited value acquires an object. The person still needs to establish whether help is wanted, in what form and who decides. A worthy ground does not authorise unilaterally reorganising somebody else's work. Passing on knowledge can matter while a particular way of doing it is mistaken. Distinguishing these protects a personal project from being defended simply in the name of a value. Meaning is recognised, then the action is examined. Revising an unsuitable action need not destroy the ground that prompted involvement.

A different outcome is possible: the person understands an inherited rule and no longer accepts its ground. The question is then more serious than changing a schedule. Naming the precise disagreement is more useful than declaring an entire culture meaningless from one example. Is the problem its account of the person, its authority, a practical demand, or their connection? Some parts may still matter. A considered conversation permits preservation, disagreement and a temporarily open conclusion. Independence need not be proved by breaking with everything received. Developing one's relation to an inheritance may mean specifying what is accepted, rejected and unresolved. It becomes something answered, rather than an automatic script or automatic enemy.

III. A given ground does not eliminate a personal response

In Augustine's Christian framework, orientation towards God precedes describing one's life as a self-sufficient project. The opening of the Confessions relates rest to the Creator. Augustine, I.1. This concerns a ground, not merely a mood. Kierkegaard's available journal excerpt dated 1 August 1835 combines asking what God wishes of him with seeking a truth he can live by. Journal excerpt. Personal appropriation here does not abandon the religious ground. The short entry does not represent Kierkegaard's entire teaching.

For this comparison, recognising a ground differs from possessing a ready instruction. A believer may regard life as a gift and still choose a profession, a form of care or a way to serve. That conviction does not authorise us to say which choice it prescribes. A particular tradition, text, situation and the person's understanding are needed. Nor does uncertainty at work prove inadequate faith. Someone can have a clear worldview answer without a clear practical plan. The uncertainty concerns application, not necessarily the ground. A respectful discussion distinguishes levels before asking where the question arose and what support is needed to answer it.

Ecclesiastes 3 places human action within time and limited knowledge, calling enjoyment of labour God's gift. Ecclesiastes 3, KJV. This is not a modern slogan requiring everyone to love their job. Its tension between participation and grasping the whole prompts our editorial question: are we asking one decision to explain existence completely? A smaller task might be doing available good in circumstances that provide no final picture. That question is the article's proposal, not an answer automatically attributed to every religious tradition.

IV. Making meaning is not ordering a personality

In Existentialism Is a Humanism, Sartre rejects a predetermined human essence and describes people defining themselves through existence and action. The lecture also emphasises responsibility towards others. Sartre. This is his atheistic philosophical ground, not an experimental fact about every reader, and it differs from the preceding religious answers. Creating oneself should not become a promise of instant redesign at will. The argument concerns more than a desired picture in the mind: choice involves action and responsibility. This limited distinction is retained without claiming to summarise his entire philosophy.

The library participant can call themselves someone who values knowledge. The label does not decide how they lead a meeting, answer a question or consider another person's time. If they arrive only to confirm an image of themselves, readers' needs become scenery. Forming participation means encountering results: are books easier to find, do the hours work, and does the team still agree? These are practical questions in our example, not proof of a philosophical system. They distinguish a story about oneself from work that responds to

someone else. Meaningful action has an object and consequences that a beautiful explanation of intention cannot fully control.

The language of making has limits. A person does not choose every starting condition: body, history, resources and other people cannot be obtained by deciding. Create meaning becomes cruel when used to explain every failure. We do not infer that everyone is fully to blame for their situation. Participation in shaping a life and dependence on circumstances can coexist. The question concerns available freedom here, rather than imagined unlimited power. Helping the library may require transport or free time that is unavailable. Refusal or a smaller contribution then does not prove failed self-creation. It responds to actual conditions as well as a wish.

V. An encounter reveals something we did not invent

An existing need limits how arbitrary a project can be. A reader cannot find a book regardless of how beautiful the participant considers their plan. Opening hours remain inconvenient regardless of the wish to call a new programme successful. These are encounters with something not created by interpretation. Understanding may still be mistaken, so asking and observing come first. Another person's answer remains an independent consideration. If visitors need a simple sign, an elaborate lecture programme does not become suitable because the volunteer wants to lead it. Finding a task means letting what is encountered affect the response. Otherwise searching becomes a way to appoint the world as confirmation of an already chosen self-image.

A need does not choose the person's entire life. Seeing that the library needs help does not require giving it every free hour. Other relationships, work and limits remain. The question becomes what can be supported, which responsibility can be accepted and who should know its boundaries beforehand. An encounter creates no infinite obligation. If every discovered shortcoming immediately becomes one's own duty, meaning begins consuming the possibility of living. The form of response therefore matters. Someone can help organise the catalogue once, lead one meeting or help find another contributor. These distinctions do not make the need less real. They connect it with the reality of the person responding.

In our scene a visitor says that a new discussion group is unnecessary, while finding a book for their child matters. The volunteer is disappointed, having imagined a fine conversation. That disappointment can become informative. An intention to offer something has met information about its fit. Recognising the answer does not end one's concern for knowledge. The form can change while the ground remains, or the volunteer can conclude that this library is not presently the place for their project. Encounter provides information without promising agreement. Meaningful involvement includes the possibility that a good plan is unsuitable here even when the wish to realise it remains strong.

Finding and making can therefore complement each other in a practical situation. A person discovers an interest, relationship or task, then forms an action through which they can respond. This does not establish that every religious or philosophical teaching says the same thing. It describes a bounded scene of participation. The outcome may be small: no destiny was discovered, but the need for an intelligible catalogue and somebody able to maintain it became clear. A small scale does not diminish the work. It makes its actual substance examinable instead of requiring a final explanation of life. The involvement has conditions, a recipient and limits within which its meaning can be discussed.

VI. A chosen ground still faces other people

A chosen direction is not morally justified solely by sincerity. Someone can be deeply engaged in work that harms others or conceals important information. The intensity of their experience does not settle responsibility. In our scene a volunteer may want greater attendance and publish children's photographs without clear agreement. A good purpose does not remove that separate question. This library example is no universal legal instruction; applicable rules need specific checking. The editorial principle is already intelligible: meaning for the maker does not absorb the autonomy of people affected. Their response, interests and limits remain part of the situation rather than obstacles to someone's self-realisation.

Sometimes the dispute concerns time rather than obvious harm. A new project takes evenings previously shared with loved ones. Calling it a discovered vocation can make discussion seem petty. The label does not cancel earlier agreements. The person can explain the new ground, hear the other side and specify changes. Some time may be redistributed, or a different schedule and smaller commitment may be needed. This discussion does not show that meaning is absent; it makes participation responsible. Finding or making a direction does not give someone the right to set its price for everyone else. A considered choice stays connected with obligations and other people's lives.

There is also an internal check on the commitment. After calling something significant, what actions will the person support when novelty fades? The answer needs no lifelong vow. It can state a near-term period, a role and a condition for review. At the library that might mean four Saturdays on the catalogue rather than eternal dedication. The limit does not make involvement unreal. It gives others a clear basis for relying on the person. Elevated language can otherwise conceal uncertainty: nobody knows what was promised or when a result is expected. Meaning gains practical seriousness when the link between words and actions can be discussed without simply believing in another person's intense feeling.

Responsibility should not become a demand for universal approval. Loved ones may not value a person's chosen activity. Their disagreement alone gives them no final authority over that life. Another person's preference, an affected commitment and a real risk need distinguishing.

Respect can coexist with rejecting an assessment. The form may change while the direction remains. In our scene one person dislikes library work itself; another needs an evening already agreed for family time. These are different grounds for discussion. Naming them reduces the pressure to choose between complete submission and complete disregard. Independent participation can remain independent within responsible relationships.

VII. Disagreement about grounds cannot be removed by a convenient formula

A religious account of a given ground and an atheistic account of free self-definition do not become one doctrine because both call for action. They differ about the origin of significance and what justifies human life. Comparison must preserve the disagreement. Otherwise it advertises universal agreement by making authors endorse a conclusion chosen beforehand. A reader may have no final position, but precision still matters. One argument can be convincing, another remain unfamiliar, and a particular distinction prove useful for reflection. This is more honest than presenting all sources as ways of saying the same thing when their grounds are incompatible.

Two library participants can express this plainly. One regards helping as service to God; the other sees freely chosen human responsibility. They can agree about a catalogue and opening hours without agreeing on metaphysics. Cooperation proves no identity between their views. It shows that practical conditions can be agreed for a particular task. Shared work should not require permanently silencing questions about grounds either. A difference may matter in another decision. Considered cooperation leaves room to explain and discuss reasons. Respecting a person need not require accepting their answer as true or identical to one's own.

Plural answers do not mean that every answer is equally well grounded. Consistency, consequences, sources and possible objections can be examined. An argument can be contested without diagnosing its author. If someone calls a purpose an external sign, another person can ask how the sign is distinguished from interpretation. If meaning is called a choice, the question can be why that choice is significant rather than merely convenient. Such questions guarantee no agreement. They make grounds visible and clarify whether the disagreement concerns facts, values or a worldview. Sometimes naming the depth of disagreement is more useful than a kindly formula concealing different subjects.

This article has limits too. A few brief passages cannot settle the meaning of life or represent every school. Particular religious and philosophical answers are used with their status and reading scopes preserved. The library scene illustrates distinctions in action without proving a system true. A reader can study a source further, revise an argument or leave the question open. No compulsory progression towards faith or away from it is proposed. Useful reading

allows freedom of response. It offers grounds for more accurate thought rather than promising to close a large disagreement through examples or treating an unresolved conclusion as a personal defect.

VIII. An unfinished answer can support actual participation

Lacking a final formula does not require suspending every action until one is found. A person may be unsure about life's overall meaning and understand why they want to do particular work. The library offers readers, books, an interest and an agreed period. That can be enough for bounded involvement. It does not make the larger question unimportant; that question remains separate and may occupy the person seriously. A responsible action with intelligible immediate grounds need not wait for a completed worldview. The question of the whole can have a place in life without cancelling everything particular until it is settled.

An unfinished answer does not mean constantly changing commitments. After agreeing to four Saturdays, an open philosophical question does not make others subject to sudden uncertainty. The person can keep the immediate promise and later decide about continuing. Changed circumstances should be communicated and a handover discussed. Distinguishing revised grounds from fulfilling an accepted commitment makes reliability possible without lifelong certainty. A decision can be temporary in duration and serious in substance. Why am I doing this now can have an honest answer while why do I exist at all remains open. Each answer has a scale that should not be silently enlarged.

Limited involvement can sometimes make a person's relationship to the activity clearer. They thought they enjoyed leading discussions and discover that organising material matters more. A public result seemed necessary, while one appreciative question proves more significant. These are possibilities in a hypothetical story, not a scientifically guaranteed effect of small actions. The opposite may be learned: library work does not fit, interest is absent or time is scarce. That is information rather than an inevitable failure to find meaning. A bounded experience is useful when both answers are allowed and it has not already been appointed to prove a required conclusion. Otherwise the person again defends an image of destiny instead of attending to what happened.

Not every meaning should be tested as a project outcome. A relationship, religious faith or moral conviction has a different structure from a convenient catalogue. Its expressions and consequences can be discussed, but one practical trial cannot establish all its value or truth. The scene is therefore no universal method of measuring meaning. It shows one way to distinguish an encountered task, chosen participation and an action's form. Other questions require other grounds and conversations. Proportion matters here too: a small experience should not be asked to confirm what it cannot establish, nor should a large question be rejected because it lacks a convenient short procedure.

IX. The inquiry continues through a relation to life

Found or made is more useful at a precise scale than closed hastily with one word. At the worldview level, answers genuinely disagree about whether a ground exists independently of choice. At the level of understanding, a person recognises what matters. At the level of action, they form participation under actual conditions. The levels can support one another without giving identical answers. The library volunteer can discover a need, choose responsibility and remain uncertain about the philosophical question. That uncertainty does not make the work unreal, nor does a successful catalogue prove a worldview true. Each part has its own substance without ruling over every other.

The work in our scene ends without a ceremonial discovery of destiny. A reader can find a book, the team knows who updates the sign, and the participant has decided what they can continue. That may be enough today. Their grounds may be revisited later and understood differently. The story promises no feeling of fulfilment from every useful activity; its outcome is more concrete. Participation happened and the relation to it became clearer. This need not be decorated with claims that the universe revealed a path or that a new essence was completely created. It remains a considered decision under limited circumstances, with worth that does not depend on grand language.

An answer may be recognised within faith, formed through choice or remain unavailable. Each position should be discussed through its grounds rather than reduced to mood or personality type. Belief in a given purpose need not mean passivity. Self-definition need not mean arbitrariness. Doubt need not mean an absence of values. A substantial conversation begins after these short labels are set aside. It asks what is accepted, why it convinces and how it affects relations with oneself and others. An article cannot issue a final answer in the person's place, but can clarify the space in which an answer develops while preserving genuine differences and limits.

Searching need not resemble waiting for a single hidden instruction. Making need not resemble manufacturing a life from nothing. A person encounters the world, accepts or questions an inheritance, notices others and chooses available action. The worldview disagreement remains open where it is genuinely open. Concrete participation gains grounds where those can be identified. There is room between these facts to think and act without a promise of complete certainty. Sometimes an honest first response is to stop confusing the larger question with the immediate task. The unknown and the chosen can then each have a place, without one being made proof that the other is absent.

What this means in practice

Choose one question you have called a search for meaning. This is an editorial exercise in clarifying language, not a tested method for obtaining meaning. Ask whether the question now concerns an ultimate ground of life, a conviction you are trying to understand, or participation in a particular situation. Several levels may be present. Give them separate sentences instead of demanding one answer. For example: I do not know whether life has an assigned purpose; I value access to books; I can discuss one evening helping at a library.

Consider what your decision does not create: other people, actual conditions and existing commitments. Then name what depends on choice: whether to join, what amount to offer and which conditions to clarify. Circumstances need not prove helplessness, nor does choice establish complete control. When others are affected, their response is part of the situation rather than confirmation of your inner story.

Finally, mark a question that will remain open and an action that does not require pretending it is settled. You may choose no action today. Returning to a source, a conversation or quiet reflection is possible too. The exercise cannot settle a worldview dispute or test the correctness of faith. A possible outcome is a clearer distinction between what you believe, what you recognise and which form of participation you are prepared to offer in an actual world.

Key quotation

> *And also that every man should eat and drink, and enjoy the good of all his labour, it is the gift of God.*

Ecclesiastes 3:13, King James Version. Text.

Connections between traditions

A shared question does not make the grounds identical.

Question	Comparison	Boundary
Is an ultimate ground given?	Augustine; Sartre	Christian and atheist grounds are not merged into one teaching.
What does a person answer for?	Sartre; the library scene	Choice does not mean power over all circumstances.
How is a personal response recognised?	Kierkegaard; editorial distinction	A journal fragment does not represent an entire philosophy.

Question	Comparison	Boundary
What does a person encounter?	Ecclesiastes; participation	Gift and human limits retain their religious context.
Can action precede a final answer?	Four different grounds; the exercise	Practical possibility proves no metaphysical proposition.

Primary sources

1. Jean-Paul Sartre, Existentialism Is a Humanism. Philip Mairet translation; existence, choice and responsibility; epigraph.

2. Augustine, Confessions, I.1. J. G. Pilkington, revision by Kevin Knight; religious ground.

3. Kierkegaard, journal entry, 1 August 1835. Short teaching excerpt; translator unidentified, paraphrase only.

4. Ecclesiastes, chapter 3. KJV; verse 13 supplies the key quotation.

Russian quotations are original United Wisdom translations from the stated English editions. The library and exercise are editorial examples, with no efficacy claim.

Tags

meaning, search, making, grounds, choice, responsibility, participation, worldview, faith, doubt, conviction, value, freedom, circumstances, self-definition, action, gift, limits, religion, philosophy, existentialism, Sartre, Augustine, Kierkegaard, Ecclesiastes, library, encounter, commitments, understanding, direction

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.