

UNITED WISDOM

Talking about future care before a crisis

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-14-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Talking about future care before a crisis

Epigraph

“Yet some of them have plans.”

Enid Bagnold, *A Diary Without Dates*, part III, pp. 124–125: after a general observation about suspended hospital life, a particular person appears with plans of his own. This is not a forecast of a patient's condition.

What this article is about

Vera lives independently. Her adult son Pavel suggests discussing what they might do if she needs help. He wants to prepare; she hears an announcement that her present life is already over. Her daughter Olga fears something else: any participation in the conversation will be recorded as a promise to provide future care. Help is not currently required, but the tension is quite real. This is a hypothetical scene, not an account of an observed family. It lets us consider the question without assigning an illness, a date, or a mandatory role.

This article concerns a voluntary conversation before a crisis: what can be learned now when future needs are unknown, resources will change, and preferences need not remain the same. Preparation, an assumption, and an accepted promise differ. No conversation guarantees agreement, adequate help, or safety. This is not a medical forecast, an emergency instruction, or the legal formalisation of decisions. The nearest article, R-14-N01, addresses distributing already known family resources; our subject is keeping future help open to discussion without presenting uncertainty as a completed plan.

I. Begin with permission to discuss the topic, rather than a completed scenario

Pavel arrives with a table: who will travel, where Vera will live, and how much to pay. He sees this as care. She sees a sign that the others have already decided her future. Even without an ill intention in the document, the order of the conversation matters. Someone can first propose discussing one possible change and ask whether the time is suitable. Agreeing to the topic does not mean agreeing to the table; declining today does not establish that a person never wants to consider anything.

Vera may want to talk about help with shopping while leaving accommodation aside. This need not be a consistent position for every year ahead. It is the scope of conversation available now. Pavel can also say that he is not ready to discuss every possibility in detail in a single evening. Voluntary participation applies to both people, not only to the person whose future is being considered. However, nobody can set another person's next conversation date, turning postponement into an accepted obligation to attend a family meeting.

Olga needs to know that participating is not equivalent to signing a promise. She can consider an option, ask a question, describe her current schedule, and still accept no future task. When that limit is ignored, preparation becomes a name for collecting commitments. People may then answer evasively to avoid being assigned a role. We are not establishing the cause of any particular silence; it is enough not to attribute willingness, a lack of love, or a final rejection of all possible relationships and actions to it automatically.

The first result is more modest than a complete plan: the participants have agreed on the subject and scope, or they have not. Sometimes postponing the conversation or choosing an independent person to talk to is safer. In threats, coercion, or danger, an ordinary family practice may be inapplicable; it does not replace suitable local support. There is no need to test that boundary through a risky refusal. Preparation makes sense where someone can actually influence the conversation, rather than merely confirming conclusions others have already written about their life.

II. A possibility is not a forecast

Pavel proposes a condition: if travelling to the shop becomes difficult for Vera. She replies that she currently travels without help. These statements are compatible. Considering a possibility does not show that it is imminent, while present independence provides no reliable knowledge for every year ahead. Conditions can remain conditional without assigning someone a hidden illness or a date of change. This conversation concerns permissible options for action, not an assessment of health. Medical questions require appropriate competence and particular circumstances that this scene does not establish.

An excessively detailed scenario can replace the unknown with a convenient picture. The family imagines gradual change, although actual needs might arise differently or never arise in the chosen form. It helps to distinguish what is known today from what is only being considered as a condition. They know, for example, that Vera prefers choosing her own groceries. They do not know what help will become necessary. Assuming Pavel will always live nearby does not become a fact merely because the table looks less complete without him.

They can choose a small example: how to discuss deliveries if those are needed someday. There is no need to list every possible loss to demonstrate serious concern. Yet a reassuring

assertion that the family will certainly manage everything supplies no knowledge either. The article does not propose concealing difficult questions or restricting anyone's speech through artificial optimism. It proposes distinguishing the degree of certainty in each statement. One comprehensible possibility is enough if the participants want to consider it and retain the right to stop at that scope.

Vera might answer that she will decide about a particular option later. This is a meaningful answer about the manner of future choice, although it provides no completed action. They can record that a preference has not been established, rather than presume agreement to the most convenient proposal. Preparation need not remove every unknown. Its limited result is understanding which questions cannot yet be settled, which can be discussed, and what will require asking the person again. Such a record provides no medical, financial, or legal guarantee of a future decision.

III. A future recipient of help remains a person with a life of their own

In the selected passage of Bagnold's diary, part III, her generalisation about suspended hospital life is followed by Scutts writing down plans. A particular exception immediately meets the author's observation. This is a historical wartime hospital scene, not research into present family needs.

In our hypothetical family, Vera's activities can likewise disappear from the conversation. Travel, food, and sums remain in the table, with no question about what she wants to keep choosing. A possible need for help does not describe the entire content of a future life. Vera might think about familiar people, reading, faith, plants, or a pet. These things can be named without promising to provide every option. Their understood importance and their feasibility are separate questions that should not be confused.

Pavel may regard some wishes as insignificant because he is busy looking for a dependable arrangement. Olga, conversely, may be prepared to discuss only favourite activities while avoiding difficult conditions. Neither view supplies the whole picture. Needs, preferences, and limits must meet if help is actually required. Before that, however, there is no requirement to take away a person's ordinary present by making them describe themselves solely as a future care recipient. That image may be someone else's hypothesis, even when the family is confident in its foresight and good intentions.

Nor should attractive plans be required as proof of independence. Vera may not want to discuss anything yet, tire of listing things, or prefer uncertainty. The value of her voice does not depend on the quality of a presentation about the future. Other participants gain no right to fill the pause with their answers. They can leave the question open and acknowledge that this

conversation provided only part of the information. A personal life need not become a family project with an obligatory positive outcome. Having or lacking a written plan does not itself establish someone's ability to decide other matters.

IV. A wish does not appoint the person who must fulfil it

Vera would prefer to stay at home if possible. Pavel immediately translates this into Olga's obligation to visit daily. But a preference about place contains neither a helper's consent, information about necessary involvement, nor confirmation of an available option. They can hear a wish without promising to fulfil it. This distinction particularly matters before a crisis, when today's willingness may change. Otherwise, one person talks about a desired life while another quietly becomes responsible for making the entire picture happen under any future conditions.

A wish can be explored without turning it into an order: what exactly matters about home? The familiar neighbourhood, a separate room, an animal, or choosing one's own routine? An answer sometimes reveals different elements that are not equivalent to one unchanging address. However, asking must not become a way to persuade Vera into an option more convenient for the family. She can keep her original preference. Conversation merely clarifies its meaning; it does not promise that every element can be moved, replaced, or combined with necessary future help in actual circumstances.

Olga can state her present limit: she is not currently accepting a promise of daily involvement several years from now. That does not answer for every future form of help. She might later consider a particular task, or lack that possibility. Pavel can look for other options without appointing her as a resource. Preliminary discussion must not count as a contribution already available for distribution. If someone really offers an action, its conditions and scope need clarity, rather than an expanded interpretation of a brief, well-intentioned agreement to hear about the subject.

Mutual recognition can remain without trading in human worth. Vera need not abandon a preference to avoid upsetting Olga. Olga need not promise any involvement whatsoever to prove love. Incompatible answers may nevertheless leave a real gap. The attractive word family cannot close it. The next discussion might concern available options rather than searching for someone to blame for the absence of a completed solution. This article neither determines nor releases relatives from legal obligations; it distinguishes the content of a voluntary conversation from questions needing separate, competent consideration.

V. Record a present voice without presenting the record as authority

The official British NHS page about an advance statement of wishes lists preferences, values, and ordinary aspects of life someone can discuss and record. Its context is future end-of-life care. We use only this limited example; the page's legal status, forms, and powers are not transferred to the reader.

In our scene, an ordinary note after the conversation is possible: the date, the question discussed, what Vera currently prefers, and what remains unknown. There is no need for a document portraying a final decision for every eventuality. The note can distinguish her words from Pavel's assumptions and what Olga actually offered. If a participant does not want a personal answer recorded or circulated, that is another question of consent. Discussing future help does not open unrestricted family access to another person's personal information, correspondence, or documents.

The words present preference matter: years later, the record should not be presented as proof that someone permanently lost the ability to change an answer. However, this article does not establish who may make medical or legal decisions, or how, in a complex situation. Such questions cannot be settled by an ordinary note or our interpretation of voluntary participation. When necessary, relevant rules are established in one's own jurisdiction with appropriate professionals. Here, only the subject of a conversation is recorded; no power of attorney, medical directive, or confirmation of special authority is being created.

The participants might discover that no note is needed. They prefer speaking and are not ready to retain information. That need not mean no preparation has occurred. Conversely, a tidy file does not confirm agreement from everyone it names. A record's existence, an accurate account, and actually accepted involvement need to be distinguished. A saved text can help return to a question, but it does not guarantee memory, performance, or future compatibility between options. Its usefulness is limited by what was actually discussed, who may see it, and a willingness to consider subsequent changes.

VI. Revision need not wait for a major change

A year later Olga moves away. Pavel thinks the entire preliminary conversation has now lost its meaning. Some information, however, may remain accurate: Vera still values familiar surroundings, while her daughter's specific participation was never promised. A changed condition does not automatically erase everything discussed. They need to identify what changed and which answer is needed again. Preparation can accommodate incomplete stability. A plan has not failed if it was never presented as a reliable picture of every participant's life for many years ahead.

A small preference can also be reconsidered. Vera no longer keeps plants or wants to visit friends more often. To the family these are minor matters; to her they change the meaning of some options. There is no need to wait for a crisis to recognise a changed wish. Constant monitoring does not become obligatory either. Checks that are too frequent can make future care the principal subject of every visit. Participants may agree to revisit a particular question after a noticeable change or at someone's request, if that arrangement suits them today.

A suggested date for the next conversation remains a suggestion. It creates no agreement by itself. Vera may prefer not to schedule a regular meeting; Pavel may decline to promise periodic complete revision. They can retain a more limited way to report a changed condition. Olga, for example, may be willing to say when her capacity for a particular involvement becomes clearer. This is not an obligation to disclose every change in her life. Reporting should concern the subject discussed while preserving each person's personal sphere, rather than becoming a family account of every decision.

Once actual needs arise, the earlier conversation remains history rather than confirmation of adequate care. Current circumstances, competence, available resources, and the person's voice will need consideration. In urgency, ordinary conversation may be unsuitable. The article does not propose delaying necessary help to update a note or obtain agreement around a table. Preparatory practice has a limit: it helps distinguish an old assumption from a current question, but cannot replace suitable actions and professionals once circumstances extend beyond voluntary discussion of a possible future.

VII. Changing times do not make all decisions equivalent

In Ecclesiastes 3:1–15, changing times accompany reflection on labour, God's gift, and the human inability to comprehend God's entire action. This is a theological text, not a calendar for family decisions. The subsequent context was read separately; it cannot be removed to obtain a convenient slogan about change.

For our conversation, the comparison is limited to distinguishing the present moment from knowing the entire future. Foresight does not make the family omniscient. Yet acknowledging limits to knowledge means neither that every action is equally acceptable nor that preparation is pointless. Vera can be asked voluntary questions now; her future agreement cannot be confirmed for her. Pavel can offer help, but has no proof that all resources will remain. This is the author's reasoning about the scene, not a conclusion about family duty derived from a religious text.

Someone for whom faith matters may want to include it in future preferences. Another participant need not share that tradition to hear the significance of a particular observance, meeting, or quiet. Yet the family gains no right to declare the religious answer a symbolic triviality or promise an action on behalf of someone who does not accept it. A particular question can remain open. Respecting its significance is not the same as shared faith, fulfilling any request, or confirming that the required participation will be possible in the future.

Differences between sources are more useful here than a general consensus. The diary shows a particular observation limited by an individual; NHS describes a British area of future wishes; Ecclesiastes retains a person's relationship to God and limits of understanding. None tested our family practice. We do not call them one theory or promise that comparison will reduce anxiety. It merely keeps several different grounds for thought visible, so the reader can see where the text actually read ends and the proposed way of considering a personal conversation begins.

VIII. Small expectations call for precision today

In part II of Bagnold's diary, the narrator herself takes to bed and notices the importance of small expected actions and promises. A change of position changes her attention. This is the author's experience, not proof that someone knows future needs in advance or that every helper must undergo the same experience.

Vera asks Pavel to send the name of a service after today's conversation. This is already a separate current request. If he accepts it, the future remains unknown, but a small action has a particular object. Leaving it undone should not be excused by the unresolved larger subject. Nor should sending a link be treated as proof that an adequate care option has been found. Preparation includes limited actions of this kind, each with its own scope, timing, and actual result.

Olga might decline to promise a future visit but offer to check what information a local organisation supplies. The limit matters: checking information is not booking, payment, or a recipient's agreement to use a service. If availability has not been established, that should be said. The family might learn that a link is outdated, conditions do not suit, or no answer arrived.

These states do not make the conversation useless; they show precisely what remains unconfirmed. An institution's name cannot be presented as actual help for a particular person.

Precision in small promises also matters when ending a conversation. Pavel may say he will return to one subject after checking, or accept no such deadline. Vera may expect a message because she understood differently. They can check the particular object if they want to, instead of demanding general trust in good intentions. The article does not promise to remove differing interpretations or restore trust. It retains a simple distinction: an unclear future makes neither today's accepted words unlimited nor their small fulfilment a guarantee of the whole future outcome.

IX. Not every question needs everyone present

Pavel wants to invite distant relatives so nobody can later say they were not asked. Vera prefers to speak with him first. The full family membership is not a condition for her present preferences to be real. Inviting others may require separate agreement, particularly when personal information is involved. Yet talking as a pair does not allow accepting promises for absent people. They can keep a small circle without presenting its answers as a collective family decision. The participants influence a discussion's scope without automatically establishing its moral superiority.

Olga might want to state her limit to Pavel privately without explaining every reason before relatives. He should not expand the information into a general account of her life. If the limit matters for the option under discussion, they can establish what may be passed to Vera. This does not promise a resolution of complex competing interests. Sometimes someone declines to disclose a reason but can directly state the absence of a specific promise. That distinction allows discussing available scope without demanding personal history as the price of having a limit.

Some questions are not suitable for the family to answer at all. They can hear a preference about familiar routines but cannot confirm the clinical feasibility of a future arrangement. They can agree on an ordinary message but cannot establish legal powers. Whom they ask and what that person's answer can confirm need to be distinguished. Naming a professional also does not replace actually consulting one and receiving an answer. Until then uncertainty remains; a profession's name does not verify an assumption. This article does not select a professional or service for the reader's circumstances.

Vera may finally say that one personal question will remain with her for now. This supplies no knowledge of its content but states a boundary of the present conversation. Under suitable voluntary conditions, it can be heard without demands to fill the gap immediately. Not every unknown must become shared knowledge for participants to discuss one agreed subject. A

possible future need for help does not mean a person's entire personal life already belongs to family planning today. Once circumstances change, particular questions must be reconsidered in their actual scope.

X. An open question can be enough to finish with

By the evening's end, Vera has not chosen a future place to live. Olga has not promised daily involvement. Pavel has no complete table. But they have learned that retaining choices about ordinary things matters to Vera and that this conversation appoints nobody to carry out a task. This is a partial result. It proves neither family harmony nor adequate future help. They can recognise it without inventing completion or blaming participants because uncertainty still exists after a serious discussion.

An open question can be more accurate than a completed entry. Vera may not yet know whether she wants to consider deliveries, while Pavel does not know their actual availability. A next step can address one of those gaps if there is agreement and suitable conditions. They need not move through the entire list. They can also decide to establish nothing further now. Stopping should not be presented as confirmed safety or a hidden promise to return. It is today's conversational boundary, distinct from a final decision about the future.

A conversation before a crisis need not describe life as waiting for loss. Afterwards they can return to an ordinary evening together if they want. Vera remains someone with present activities; Olga and Pavel remain people with plans and unknowns of their own. Preparation has a place within that life without replacing it. The most honest result may be unceremonious: some things were heard, some remain unsettled, nobody's agreement was invented, and an actual change will require considering actual circumstances again.

What this means in practice

If conditions suit a voluntary, non-urgent conversation, propose one question about possible future help and ask whether the person wants to discuss it now. They can decline, narrow the subject, or stop. Assign no medical forecast, person responsible, or obligatory date for the next discussion. Choose an ordinary subject: a routine preference, a way to receive information, or the significance of familiar surroundings. You need not do this practice if it does not suit your circumstances.

Distinguish four states: what is known today, what is a conditional possibility, what someone currently prefers, and what anyone actually offered to do. A recipient's answer is not a helper's promise. If recording, establish agreement, access, and the record's present character; an ordinary note creates no legal or medical powers. Leave unknowns unknown without automatic agreement on behalf of a silent participant.

Finish with one accepted small action or recognition of an open question. Separately check whether a present promise with a specific object has arisen. The practice does not guarantee agreement, adequate care, health, safety, or future resources. In urgency, threats, coercion, or specialised questions, it may be inapplicable and cannot replace suitable help. The limited result is a more accurate understanding of the present conversation, rather than a completed decision about a future life.

Key quotation

> *"One is always expecting something."*

Enid Bagnold, *A Diary Without Dates*, part II, unposted letter, p. 91, second sentence of the paragraph about expectation. The bedridden narrator's voice, not a universal account of people receiving help.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Significant difference	Limit
Bagnold and anticipated help	What remains outside a general picture of dependency?	A historical hospital observation differs from voluntary family conversation before need arises.	No clinical forecast or test of the practice.
NHS and present preferences	What can be heard and recorded beforehand?	British end-of-life information has a specialised context.	Limited example only; no transfer of legal forms or powers.
Ecclesiastes and limited knowledge	How do present time and the entire future differ?	Theological relationship to God's action is not family planning.	No ground for coercion, waiting without help, or treating every action as equivalent.
Preference and promise	Who actually accepted particular involvement?	A recipient's desired option and a helper's agreement have different content.	No automatic role assignment or guarantee of resources or adequate care.

Sources

1. Enid Bagnold. *A Diary Without Dates*. Project Gutenberg No.31124, English text with printed page indicators retained. Selected contexts actually read: part II, pp. 91–94, unposted letter, and part III, pp. 123–125, including a particular exception to a general observation. The whole book was not read; the electronic version's exact underlying printed edition has not been established. Two short Russian quotations are the current author's translations. Gutenberg's US availability is not declared permission for every jurisdiction. Primary text.

2. NHS. *Advance statement about your care wishes*. The whole substantive page and related *Why plan ahead for end of life care?* were read. Only a limited example of discussing preferences is used. Displayed review dates are 19 September2023 and 3 August2023; the next-review dates had passed by access on 7 October2026. An update during2026 was not confirmed. Legal, clinical, and local organisational rules are not transferred. Wishes, context.

3. *Ecclesiastes*3:1–15, King James Version on BibleGateway; both specified continuous passages were read. Exact printed issue not established; the context of God's gift and human limitation is retained. No direct quotations. 3:1–8, 3:9–15.

Tags

family, care, future, preparation, conversation, preference, consent, uncertainty, promise, involvement, recipient, voice, record, revision, time, limit, independence, conditions, help, resources, plans, Bagnold, NHS, Ecclesiastes, dignity, choice, privacy, trust, voluntary participation, responsibility

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. Continue the conversation: **@andrey.zarinsh**.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. She researches and practically tests approaches to unity and mutual understanding between people and cultures. Continue the conversation: **@ilkutki**.