


UNITED WISDOM

# When a plan fails: can meaning survive without the expected result?

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P26 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# When a plan fails: can meaning survive without the expected result?

## Epigraph

*We deliberate not about ends but about means.*

— Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics III.3; exact short sentence in W. D. Ross's translation, within deliberation that assumes an end.

## What this article is about

A plan can fail while its direction remains important. A meeting does not happen, a book remains unpublished, or an agreed venue becomes unavailable. Seeing the absent result, someone asks whether everything leading toward it was wasted. This essay considers that particular break, distinguishing a result, a way of acting and what made the action worth choosing. Selected passages from Aristotle, the Bhagavad-Gita and James help preserve these distinctions without becoming one doctrine of the correct response to failure. A lost possibility can remain lost; meaning need not compensate for it immediately. Some directions can continue differently, some need reconsideration, and some have no available form for now. Abandoning one plan need not cancel an entire past, while fidelity to a direction requires no continuation at every cost. A modest next decision can begin with what is known and leave an uncertain future uncertain.

## I. The evening that never happened

Imagine Alexey, a member of an amateur astronomy group. He prepared a public observing evening, arranged a venue and assembled simple materials for visitors. Shortly before the chosen date, the site becomes unavailable, and the group has no other agreed place. That planned evening will not happen. Looking at the prepared cards, Alexey wonders why the effort was needed. This scene is invented, rather than an investigated case or instructions for organising observations. A particular absence matters: the event failed in its chosen form. That does not yet establish whether sharing observation still appeals, another possibility exists, or the person wishes to continue the work now.

The plan had several aspects. One evening connected a date, venue, participants and expected outcome. Behind it may have stood a wish to help others attend more closely to the sky. Preparation involved work that already happened, independently of the meeting. These aspects can be distinguished without declaring them equivalent. Retained cards do not

constitute a completed event; a good intention does not make cancellation trivial. Yet the absent gathering does not automatically establish that every preparatory conversation or explanation was meaningless. Each assessment needs its own object. Judging all earlier work solely through one result makes some known experience disappear alongside an outcome that was never obtained.

Alexey need not decide now that failure was beneficial. Known facts suffice: this evening is cancelled, some materials remain, and further involvement has not been chosen. The description leaves room for regret and the next question. It promises no survival of the earlier direction. Someone may discover they wanted precisely that event rather than any similar gathering. The wish to share observation may remain while energy or conditions are absent. Distinguishing helps avoid conclusions before information. A failed plan can be taken seriously without a verdict on an entire life or a compulsory replacement attempt made solely to prove that the original preparation was not wasted.

## II. Result, means and direction

Here, the result is a particular expected event or condition. Means are the selected sequence of acts and circumstances. Direction is the essay's term for what made the attempt significant to the person. This distinction is no ready theory of every goal. The three may be closely connected: value can lie in meeting particular people at a particular place. Sometimes means can change without completely changing direction. Identifying the case requires more than generic advice to be flexible. What did the person actually wish to preserve, and which expectation is no longer feasible? The question leaves room for an ambiguous or currently absent answer, beyond choosing a replacement immediately.

For Alexey, the venue may have mattered because a particular phenomenon could be seen, while the gathering mattered for conversation with beginners. Reading the cards at home reproduces neither aspect fully. Declaring any alternative equivalent decides in advance what he may lose without regret. Yet one unavailable form does not forbid asking about another, where the question is wanted. Possibility and difference can remain together. A small conversation with one acquaintance may retain part of the direction without becoming the original evening. Its limited significance need not count as full compensation or proof that cancellation ultimately benefited every participant involved in the first plan.

The distinction also prevents the opposite simplification. If the original form never appeared, every other possibility need not be worthless. A person may discover that conversation about observing matters beyond organising a large evening. That belongs to present experience; it is not predicted for everybody. Nor does it compel continuation. A direction can matter while no act is presently available. Importance and immediate feasibility are different questions. Retained meaning does not become a command, and a pause does not prove it vanished.

Involvement retains conditions, agreement and limits that cannot be replaced by fidelity to an attractive goal, however sincerely that goal was held before the plan failed.

## III. Aristotle: deliberating about available means

Nicomachean Ethics III.3 considers deliberation about action with an end assumed. In Ross's translation, examples of a doctor and statesman show an assumed end directing a search for means. Encountering impossibility ends the search within the considered chain; apparently possible action is attempted. This is no contemporary promise of a workaround for every project. Deliberation's object matters here: known acts and conditions, rather than an entire future life at once. The discussion retains its historical ethical setting. Aristotle is not credited with our separate possibility of reconsidering an end's value after failure; his selected examples already assume their end.

In the observing scene, Alexey can distinguish wanting a meeting from having an available means. Intense desire cannot make a venue available. Existing cards do not produce new participants' agreement by themselves. One limited question can be clarified: is there a suitable condition for some continuation genuinely wanted now? The answer can be negative. Abandoning a particular chain then acknowledges conditions without necessarily confessing personal inadequacy. The essay proposes no unsafe or unagreed way of holding the evening at any cost. Deliberation keeps a particular object when stopping an unavailable act remains a genuine option rather than evidence of insufficient devotion to an interest.

Aristotle also concerns cases whose outcome is not completely determined. An ability to act differs from knowing the future result. This prevents a cautious new attempt from being replaced by a guarantee. If an agreed venue later appears, the gathering will still depend on several conditions. A limited decision can acknowledge that uncertainty; it can also be declined if the available form does not fit what is wanted. Present information matters in either case. A person need not seek enough alternatives for the search's duration itself to prove significance. Deliberation serves a choice and can end where further searching has no available object.

## IV. The Bhagavad-Gita: action and its expected fruit

In the selected passage from the Bhagavad-Gita's second chapter, Edwin Arnold's translation connects the motive of right action with its fruit. Krishna addresses Arjuna within a religious dialogue where action, piety and liberation have particular grounds. This is not turned into a secular productivity slogan, nor the battle setting into a reader's duty to continue every undertaking. A narrower comparison is possible: an act's quality and its expected reward are different objects. It establishes neither that consequences are irrelevant nor that all work is good independently of its purpose and manner. The selected teaching remains religious rather than a measured response to a cancelled modern event.

Alexey may have prepared an explanation attentively without obtaining the evening for which it was prepared. The explanation's content can be considered while the gathering's absence is acknowledged as fact. Preparation thereby acquires no automatically good meaning. Some material may be inaccurate or uninteresting even to him; that needs its own consideration. But outcome is not the only information about an act. Attention to an accessible explanation and another person's real question already had a particular form. Cancellation need not retroactively erase it. This belongs to the essay's contemporary reasoning, rather than a claim that Krishna discussed our cards or meetings.

Loosening a demand for one fruit does not relinquish responsibility for consequences. If the group promised an event, communicating cancellation matters in its own right. Where another's work was used, actual arrangements remain relevant. Those objects cannot dissolve into an account of pure intention. Someone may also regret the absent event without taking an examination in nonattachment. Religious perfection is not appointed as the required reaction. Comparison distinguishes action, motive and outcome rather than removing one. In our scene, available attention to participants can remain beside lost results; its continued significance does not prove that the result was never wanted or that regret must end.

## V. James: planning and knowing the future

James 4:13–17 places a plan for trade and gain beside uncertainty about tomorrow. Its answer has religious grounds: the Lord's will, criticism of boasting and attention to known good. It considers no contemporary project-management procedure and establishes no ban on all planning. For this topic, it can accompany the distinction between an intention and a known outcome. An appointed date is not yet an event that happened. An agreed expectation can be conscientious while depending on conditions. Acknowledging that dependence requires neither calling every planner presumptuous nor explaining failure through inadequate faith, correctness or moral maturity. The religious passage remains distinct from such diagnoses.

While the evening was possible, Alexey could describe a plan dependent on an agreed venue and other conditions. After cancellation, another precise description is available. Honesty about the future does not require never promising anything; it distinguishes a promised contribution from an expected collective result. Someone can undertake material preparation without possessing the whole sequence of external events. Specific arrangements can be clarified without treating intense desire as if it already secured the gathering. The essay supplies no legal definition of a promise. It shows how confident language can conceal the difference between one's own act and an outcome requiring more than one participant.

The selected passage's final verse attends to known good and action. That stays within a Christian address, rather than becoming a universal duty immediately to repair every failed plan. Alexey's present object may be small: communicate cancellation clearly, promise no unknown date, or ask whether prepared materials are wanted. Another act is possible if genuinely available. Its significance does not depend on everyone judging cancellation beneficial. It concerns a present object and actual people. Attention need not compose the entire future before answering one known question, and promises no return of the lost event through precision alone. A modest response retains its own scale.

## VI. Another means need not be equivalent

After cancellation, friends suggest an indoor conversation without observation. It may be genuinely possible where venue and participation are agreed. Yet it differs from the original evening: the shared view of the sky disappears, visitors change, and materials serve another use. Differences need not be dismissed to keep continuation cheerful. Alexey can accept a limited format precisely as limited, or decline if it preserves none of what he wanted. Distinguishing forms permits a choice beyond accepting the first available substitute. A kind offer does not make a new possibility compulsory merely because it would make earlier cards useful again or provide a visible answer to the failed plan.

Considering a substitute means naming what it preserves and changes. Conversation may retain explanation but not shared observation. A private meeting may retain contact but not an open invitation. A later date may retain form while needing renewed agreement. These are editorial examples, not a compulsory menu. Their particularity makes the cost of change visible without declaring small forms better or worse than large ones. What survives matters differently to different people. Discussion may end in disagreement. A shared goal cannot be used to appropriate another's interest simply because one participant still finds it important, especially when that interest was attached to a form no longer available.

A person may discover that direction was more closely tied to the original form than expected. Alexey wanted that shared evening, rather than becoming a permanent organiser of discussions. This is no bad answer. It clarifies a real wish and limits the new proposal.

Preserving meaning need not mean continuing the same undertaking. Meaning may remain in remembered intention, regard for completed preparation, or acknowledging that an attempt ended. The essay establishes no sufficiency of memory for everyone. It simply requires no proof of the past's significance through uninterrupted new action. The absent form can remain particular without cancelling other activities that may become available later.

## VII. Earlier effort and present agreement

Preparation can make continuation feel necessary lest everything be wasted. Here this concerns cards, conversations and participants' time, rather than a financial model or an economic recommendation. The philosophical question is smaller: does completed effort itself establish agreement to every further act? The essay provides no such ground. The past matters for understanding conditions and promises; present involvement requires present possibilities. Someone can acknowledge preparation's value and decline another format. That does not erase earlier work. It distinguishes a known contribution from continuation not yet chosen, with consequences of its own. Those consequences cannot be accepted on a person's behalf solely because much has already been done.

Other participants need not retain earlier readiness after conditions change. Someone agreed to assist for one evening, not a series of meetings. A contributor may have expected a particular use of material. Certainty that everyone understands the direction's importance cannot fill these differences. If another undertaking needs their time or work, the specific possibility needs clarification. The essay determines no contractual duties from an imagined scene. A goal's significance and present agreement cannot substitute for one another. A hope remains shared insofar as people actually participate, rather than insofar as another organiser wishes to see them participate or believes the common past already supplied every necessary answer.

Agreement can change without a complete account of every cause. A participant may say the new format is unsuitable now. Necessary information can be sought without demanding an explanation of an entire private life. Alexey can retain a wish while the other retains a limit. Actual consequences of an earlier arrangement may need separate discussion or an appropriate process; compulsory adoption of a new interpretation of cancellation cannot settle them. Precision prevents direction from becoming pressure. An undertaking can remain important to its chooser without making each subsequent request binding on everyone who once assisted. Its significance does not appoint consent where consent remains unasked or unavailable.

## VIII. When the direction also needs reconsideration

Failure sometimes changes more than means. A person discovers that the earlier project is no longer wanted or contained conditions they now reject. This possibility remains beside fidelity to direction. Alexey may have valued a large event and later notice a primary wish for recognition of his organising ability. That is one possible course within the imagined scene, not an exposure of every project's hidden motive. The interest can be acknowledged without humiliation and a choice made about change. Clarifying an end requires neither calling earlier years false nor proving a new wish morally superior. A particular revised understanding can remain particular, without becoming an entire judgement of the person.

Elsewhere, the direction remains wanted but its cost changes. What was an available shared evening now needs much more work, different conditions and involvement from people for whom it is unsuitable. Interest in the sky does not entail accepting every such cost. A new form can be declined without declaring the interest gone. A limit does not oppose meaning: it helps determine how meaning might connect to a present act. Contemporary reconsideration of ends and costs belongs to the essay's reasoning. It is neither attributed as a ready formula to Aristotle, Krishna or James nor presented as an established method for avoiding regret over a choice.

Reconsideration may remain unfinished. Someone can know what is unwanted now without knowing what will replace it. That interval need not become an incorrect life without a goal. Ordinary activities, relationships and necessary questions can persist without another large project. A practical need deserves attention in its own right; waiting for definitive meaning should not conceal it. The essay specifies no pause's duration and predicts no inevitable emergence of a truer direction. It preserves participation in choice without completing the entire account merely because the earlier plan already has a known negative outcome. Knowing one ending need not amount to knowing every possibility that follows.

## IX. The past's significance without another promise

Prepared materials can remain traces of real work even if unused. This establishes neither a duty to keep every possession nor that every effort was right. Content, relationships and consequences can be considered separately. A conversation may have clarified a formerly obscure question; some work may have been mistaken. Both observations can coexist with cancellation. Where the past has several known aspects, a missing result need not rewrite them all through one word. Particular information matters, beyond compulsory gratitude for failure or a general optimistic conclusion replacing everything the person actually wanted and did not obtain. Different assessments can remain available without one total story of redemption.

Alexey's memory of preparation may be mixed. Some conversations matter while organising another evening is unwanted. Time may be regretted alongside interest in an explanation found. A consistent history need not contain only one feeling. Meaning does not always require the same assessment of every part. It can include distinguishing what was wanted, mistaken or simply unknown. This is no therapy and promises no disappearance of difficulty. It makes the account less total: a particular failure need become neither evidence of general worthlessness nor a compulsory step toward future success. Mixed recognition of the past can persist without being corrected into a more convenient story for others.

Someone may try to help by promising that everything will prove worthwhile. That promise concerns a future they do not know. More precise support can ask whether help with a particular part is wanted or conversation is enough. Alexey need not adopt somebody else's certainty as his answer. Later use of materials would be a separate event, not an already established justification of cancellation. If no use appears, known aspects of the past do not automatically lose significance. Limiting hope leaves room for it without appropriating another's outcome. Support can remain attentive without a persuasive explanation of why everything supposedly had to happen in precisely this way.

## X. The next question can be smaller than the former plan

The interlocutors retain different grounds. Aristotle distinguishes an assumed end from deliberated means. The Bhagavad-Gita's religious dialogue concerns action through motive, fruit and piety. James addresses planning through an unknown future and the Lord's will. They offer no single contemporary recovery procedure. Within this topic, comparison considers different boundaries: what is available to act upon, what differs from promised reward, and what remains unknown about the future. The modern inference stays the essay's responsibility: a direction's significance can be distinguished from one result, without appointing every subsequent act or guaranteeing that the direction itself stays unchanged. The texts meet without merging their doctrines.

A modest next question may be available to Alexey: does anyone now want an explanation of the cards? Or: does he wish to continue the discussion at all? The answer need not restore the cancelled evening's scale. One conversation can matter within its own limits; declining participation for now can fit present conditions. Actual consequences of earlier arrangements still persist, requiring an appropriate process where relevant. Personal meaning is no evasion of particulars. Each answer need not prove that the larger plan must eventually succeed. An act today can be clear while the subsequent history remains without a completed form or an assured satisfactory conclusion.

Meaning can survive without the former result, but that is a possibility rather than a command or promise of compensation. Meaning may change, remain partial, or stay an open question. A

person may find no immediate substitute and decline to call loss beneficial. Value in what already happened can also be recognised without another success proving it. A plan connects action with expectation; failure can separate them and call for reconsideration. Particular facts, others' agreement, one's limits and an unknown future all retain a place. None need disappear into a single beautiful version where everything was either wasted or necessarily turned out for the best.

## What this means in practice

If considering a failed plan is useful, choose an ordinary situation currently available for reflection. This is a voluntary editorial exercise without established efficacy. It requires neither private disclosure, immediate resumption nor finding benefit in loss. Reading may simply end.

Separately name the expected result, chosen means and what made the direction important. Then identify one known present fact. For example: the meeting will not happen; no agreed venue is available; sharing observation still matters, but new involvement is unchosen. If the aspects cannot be separated, clarity need not be invented. Value may have belonged to that particular event. That answer can remain.

Ask whether one wanted and genuinely available next question exists. It may concern conditions, materials, conversation or a personal limit. A negative answer is possible. A substitute need not justify earlier effort, and agreement to the former plan cannot simply be carried into another without clarification. Actual consequences or necessary practical needs require an appropriate response beyond a reflective note.

The exercise may finish with a more precise description rather than another plan. It guarantees neither calm, restored meaning nor success in a subsequent attempt. Loss remains loss, while possible value in other aspects remains a separate question.

## Key quotation

> *ye know not what shall be on the morrow.*

— James 4:14; exact short continuous clause in King James Version. The subsequent religious response is retained in context.

## Connections between traditions

Selected passages are compared with their different grounds retained. The result/means/direction distinction and contemporary reconsideration of an end belong to the essay.

| Two textual grounds and locators | Concepts and different grounds | Mechanism and specific limit |
|---|---|---|
| Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics III.3: an assumed end directs the search for means. Bhagavad-Gita II, Arnold, carrier lines 407–426: right action's motive differs from expected fruit. | Aristotle concerns practical deliberation with an end assumed; Krishna connects action to piety, devotion and liberation. Means to a result and a religious relation to fruit are different doctrines. | Cancellation allows available means and completed action's quality to be considered separately. The passages prove neither that every intention is good, that consequences are irrelevant, nor that an equivalent substitute always exists. |
| Aristotle III.3 ends a considered search upon encountering impossibility. James 4:13–15 places future commerce beside an unknown tomorrow and the Lord's will. | Feasible action's boundary differs from a religious limit on certainty about the future. Intense wishes and detailed plans do not establish knowledge of every condition. | The former venue's unavailability can be acknowledged without a total self-verdict. These passages forbid no planning as such, forecast no event, and make abandoning a chain no evidence of inadequate faith. |
| Bhagavad-Gita II, lines 407–414, keeps action and piety beside refusal to make fruit the motive. James 4:17 connects known good with action in a religious address. | Krishna's teaching about action differs from the Christian demand addressed to someone knowing good. Shared attention to an act does not erase religious grounds. | Communicating cancellation can matter within its own scale without promising the entire evening's return. The passages require no continuation of every project, prescribe no contemporary battle, and guarantee no measured efficacy of a modest step. |
| Aristotle III.2 distinguishes a wish for impossibles from choice concerning apparently feasible acts. Bhagavad-Gita II, lines 410–426, connects equability toward outcomes with yoga and devotion. | Wish/choice concerns practical action; religious equability toward fruits has a different ground and end. | A retained interest in the sky appoints no new attempt without conditions. The passages require neither numbness, identical reactions nor rejection of necessary help; a contemporary pause is not declared accomplished yoga. |
| James 4:15–16 places the Lord's will beside criticism of boasting. Bhagavad-Gita II, lines 407–426, distinguishes religious motive and liberation from calculated reward. | Christian criticism of a presumptuous future and Krishna's teaching form no single assessment of failure. Each retains its own address. | An unknown result should not become promised compensation. Comparison establishes no predestined lesson, inadequate spirituality in an affected person, or inevitable superiority of another undertaking. |





UNITED WISDOM

| Two textual grounds and locators | Concepts and different grounds | Mechanism and specific limit |
|---|---|---|
| Aristotle III.3 includes friends' assistance in considering feasible action. James 4:13 depicts people speaking about shared future travel and trade. | Action with others and a confident future account have different objects; religious criticism replaces no present clarification of an arrangement. | The essay separately infers a need to clarify current participation when a plan changes. These passages themselves formulate no modern contractual process, appoint no person's time, and carry no earlier agreement into every new form. |

## Primary sources

1. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics III.2–3, W. D. Ross translation. Both selected sections, displayed III.1 context and translator identification were read: book III. The discussion distinguishes wish, choice and deliberation about means with an end assumed. Contemporary reconsideration of the end is an additional editorial inference, not attributed to Aristotle's selected examples. No Greek collation or complete work reading is claimed.

2. Bhagavad-Gita, selected chapter II passage in Edwin Arnold's verse translation, carrier lines 407–426 and nearby 388–433. This continuous passage, the displayed opening of chapter II's dialogue and edition information were read: The Song Celestial. The title identifies New York, Truslove, Hanson & Comba, 1900. Krishna's address to Arjuna retains piety, devotion and liberation as grounds. This carrier supplies no individual Sanskrit verse numbers here, so exact alignment is not claimed verified. No Sanskrit or complete work reading is claimed.

3. James 4:13–17, King James Version. All selected verses and version identification were read: James 4:13–17. Criticism of certainty about future commerce retains its religious answer concerning the Lord's will, rather than becoming a ban on all plans or assessment of a person's faith after failure.

United Wisdom translated the short Russian quotations from the named English editions. The English epigraph was checked against Ross; the key quotation against KJV. Arnold is paraphrased without direct quotation. Alexey's scene, the contemporary distinction and voluntary exercise belong to the essay. Worldwide permissions are unestablished and remain UNKNOWN.

## Tags

plan, failure, result, direction, meaning, goal, means, choice, possibility, limits, Aristotle, Bhagavad-Gita, James, action, motive, fruit, expectation, uncertainty, responsibility, arrangement, cancellation, preparation, involvement, consent, pause, completion, change, hope, life transition, voluntary participation

## 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.