

UNITED WISDOM

Showing unfinished work

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-25-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Showing unfinished work

Epigraph

> *What's sent abroad you never can revoke.*

Horace, Art of Poetry, translated by John Conington. This historical release counsel does not establish technical impossibility of every modern correction.

What this article is about

Showing a draft invites another person to encounter something still changing. The conversation may clarify a relationship or become a vague request to judge the project or its maker. A useful scale requires naming the showing's purpose, the version's state and a question the available passage can actually answer. This article follows Vera's hypothetical comic about a letter delivered to the wrong mailbox. She wants to understand one transition before final drawing, invites a willing reader and distinguishes their observation, proposed revision and her decision. Horace, Quintilian and Dewey offer different historical questions about private criticism, revision and inquiry into a difficulty. Comparing them establishes no universal waiting period or guaranteed feedback method. The practice preserves freedom not to show work, precise agreements and the distinction between a small viewing and release. Unfinished work is identified honestly without justifying every line or making a private response confirm the entire future piece.

I. Why show it now

Vera is drawing a short comic about a letter delivered to the wrong mailbox. Two pages have a panel order, but some drawings are rough lines and the final remark is missing. Before showing a draft to a reader she knows, she asks why she wants to do so now. In this hypothetical scene, a specific difficulty exists: between the second and third panels, it is unclear who holds the letter. That question can be examined before final drawing. It differs from wanting to hear that the work is good and need not invite judgment of the entire future comic.

A showing may examine a transition, discuss an intention with a collaborator, agree on future work or simply share something occupying attention. One purpose need not disguise another. Vera can ask for encouragement directly rather than stage a test whose required outcome is praise. If she needs the transition examined, kind words alone cannot answer. Clear purpose reduces uncertainty without guaranteeing a useful response. The reader may still misunderstand the question or prefer not to take part.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A showing can be too early for its chosen question. If Vera asks whether the ending is clear while its last panel is absent, there is nothing to examine there. A question about who holds the letter midway may not require a finished ending. Readiness is relative to the action offered to another person. It is not a percentage of completed drawings or the maker’s fatigue. Sometimes a missing element should be made first; sometimes an available passage can be shown with a clear limit. The decision depends on which uncertainty this version can actually clarify.

This article concerns adults’ ordinary voluntary creative work. A draft need not be open to everyone, and constant exposure of unfinished work need not prove courage. Agreements about showing other people’s information or material are separate from drawing readiness. Humiliation, threats or forced personal disclosure do not become useful openness exercises. Vera can choose the circle, time and extent of showing. That freedom does not remove actual commitments to collaborators or recipients; it permits naming the task and the present conversation’s boundaries first.

II. A draft needs to be identifiable

Vera labels the file as a draft and explains that the opening order is chosen, colour is absent and the ending will change. This tells the reader what exists. It does not ask them to imagine a successful missing part. Every imperfection need not receive advance justification; what matters is what affects the question. If a dark rectangle represents a person, the reader needs to know that. Otherwise they examine an empty space while Vera responds to criticism of a work nobody has yet seen.

Explanation can also be excessive. If Vera retells the plot and explains every transition beforehand, the reader no longer encounters the pages independently. That may suit a discussion of intention but cannot answer whether a transition is clear unaided. Viewing conditions need to match the purpose. She can provide the pages and a brief key to rough marks first, discussing details after an initial response. This is no universal rule against context. It distinguishes understanding arising from the page from understanding supplied by the maker’s explanation.

One page should not be presented as the complete comic. Two versions need distinguishing so an answer is not attached to an accidental file-opening order. A number or date can be simple; no elaborate archive is required. It is enough to know what was actually seen. Later memory may retain a general impression although the decision concerned a panel. Keeping the version makes the object recoverable without inventing a history in which every later change was already viewed and confirmed during the first meeting.

“Draft” does not remove responsibility for information already presented as factual or for treatment of the reader. It describes the work’s state. An actual person’s name does not become fictional because the drawing is unfinished. Our characters and letter are invented; other work needs that distinction made separately. An unfinished form can be shown carefully and honestly without promising eventual perfection. Describe what exists precisely enough for someone to understand the object and the kind of response being invited.

III. An invitation does not create a duty

Vera asks whether her acquaintance can view two pages and answer one question about a transition. She names an approximate duration and does not immediately send the whole archive. Someone may agree to viewing without agreeing to detailed editing or a group discussion. Those actions differ in scope. A later conversation would require another invitation. Agreement to a brief viewing does not mean permanent availability for the creative process. A precise invitation clarifies participation without making the reader responsible for completing the work.

Declining or not answering does not by itself mean the comic lacks interest. The person may be busy, dislike the format or not want to examine unfinished work now. Vera need not guess why. She can invite another willing reader, revise the question or continue alone. Silence also must not become a positive response in her account. No response is currently available: that is the fact. This keeps participation voluntary without using a personal relationship as a hidden guarantee of the assessment the maker wants.

The maker can request that a draft not be forwarded or shown to others. If that matters, agree before sending it. A request does not make distribution technically impossible; the medium and willingness to transfer material still matter. Horace’s Art of Poetry places private criticism beside caution before release. His verse about not recalling what has gone abroad is used here as a historical reminder of private and wider circulation, not a claim that every modern file cannot be deleted or corrected.

If discussion turns into demands for personal disclosure or acceptance of humiliation, Vera can end it. She can identify the boundary: the invitation concerned a transition, not her worth. That guarantees no calm response and is not advice for a threatening situation. In this ordinary scene, either person can end a voluntary viewing. The reader may also say they cannot answer usefully. The boundary can then support a clear ending without necessarily signalling a broken relationship or failure of the whole creative task.

IV. The question must allow an answer

“What do you think?” gives the reader many directions: drawing, plot, colour, mood or simply Vera’s decision to begin. Those responses may miss the letter’s movement between hands. She asks more precisely: who, as you read it, holds the letter in the third panel? The question neither supplies a correct answer nor demands praise. The reader can identify a character, say it is unclear or name the clue used. These answers concern the present transition and allow disagreement with the maker’s intention.

In How We Think, Chapter VI, Dewey distinguishes a felt difficulty, its definition, a possible solution and further examination. This historical account of inquiry is not a test of comic-viewing methods. It helps formulate a question that can meet an observable object. Vera does not ask the reader to confirm everything she hopes to express. She chooses one uncertainty and observes reading. The answer does not finish thought automatically; it must be related to panels before choosing a suitable change. An assumption remains open to examination rather than becoming factual through an invitation.

A question can become too narrow and miss a significant obstacle. If characters are indistinguishable in the opening panel, an answer about the third depends on an earlier difficulty. Vera allows that to be reported: the reader can say if another part obstructs answering. This does not invite rewriting the whole comic in one conversation. She identifies the obstacle separately from the first question. The next action may change the opening rather than add an arrow beside the letter. Precision helps while leaving visible the conditions that make the question answerable.

Not every showing needs to be a test. Vera can choose an open conversation about impressions, recognising that impressions are what she receives. They should not later become proof that every transition is clear. Different questions invite different answers. One conversation can include several kinds if they remain distinguished. Here understanding of action comes first, then a general impression if wanted. That sequence is an editorial proposal for this task, not a compulsory feedback order or a promise of protection from an unwelcome or unexpected response.

V. An answer belongs to the version seen

The reader says the first character still holds the letter because the hand stays in place in the second panel. Vera intended a handover and sees a mismatch. Her intention and this person’s reading are available facts; the panel needs examining too. An absent handover may concern form. A present but weak sign at this scale is another problem. The response helps reveal a relationship without identifying its cause automatically. Misunderstanding need not immediately prove reader inattention or a general inability to draw.

Keep the answer at its actual extent. “I could not tell who held the letter” does not mean “the entire plot is unclear.” “I like the opening” does not mean “the comic is ready for release.” Vera should not enlarge a response to support confidence or despair. She can retain the words or an accurate paraphrase, agreeing on recording where it concerns the reader. A particular observation remains material for a decision, not a universal audience verdict or a view of the entire project.

After a drawing changes, the previous response belongs to the old version. Vera can say she addressed an observed obstacle, but not that the same reader already confirmed the correction. That requires another viewing if needed and willingly offered. An obvious error may need only the maker’s examination; every line need not be resubmitted. The basis should remain honest. Revision, another response and a release decision are separate events. They may follow one another without any arising automatically from a favourable memory of the first meeting.

Readers may understand the scene differently. Examine which differences involve the image and viewing conditions rather than treating a majority as final truth. One may have used a small screen and another paper. Two interpretations may both be supported by the drawing. Vera must then decide whether ambiguity suits her intention. It can matter artistically, but should not simply be declared intentional retrospectively to avoid changing an awkward transition. Different responses clarify the decision while leaving the maker able to choose and explain the next direction.

VI. Distinguish an observation from a proposed revision

A reader may identify an obstacle accurately and propose an unsuitable solution, such as explanatory captions beneath every panel. Vera understands that the handover is invisible but wants a story mainly told through movement. She can accept the observation and seek another way: change the hand position or divide the action. Declining captions does not mean ignoring the observation. These decisions can be stated separately, avoiding a choice between total obedience to advice and total denial of what another person saw.

Horace’s criticism concerns particular lines and revision, although its poetic scene includes harsh historical judgments. The useful concern here is specificity, not permission to humiliate a contemporary maker. Quintilian X.4 considers addition, removal and alteration while retaining a limit to further work. These contexts provide no correct comic-revision list. They distinguish examining form from endlessly changing everything. Vera can identify an issue, select a manageable change and examine the relevant relationship afterward. Change count alone does not measure care.

Disagreement does not necessarily mean unwillingness to learn. A reader may prefer another genre, fuller explanation or different pacing. A preference can be heard without becoming a compulsory law. Conversely, calling something taste should not hide a concrete uncertainty: an indistinguishable letter is not explained solely by affection for brief comics. Vera separates observation, interpretation and preference as far as the conversation permits. She can ask where the response arose. The reader need not provide a full analysis for their reading experience to be described accurately.

Vera remains responsible for decisions within her role. A jointly made comic requires agreement on shared changes; commitments to an editor cannot be cancelled by a general appeal to creative freedom. Here she makes a personal project and can choose which observations to act on. Keeping a reason for a change or refusal clarifies further work rather than judging the reader. A reason may not yet be available, and a decision can wait. Postponement need not become a promise eventually to accept every suggestion received.

VII. A small showing and release are different decisions

After revision, Vera understands the transition better and can choose the next step. She need not immediately release both pages to everyone. A brief viewing answered one question; release calls for considering the ending, captions, material and circulation. Those conditions belong to this project. They are not fulfilled merely because a reader now understands the letter. She can acknowledge the local result and continue another part. The small showing retains value without carrying a promise to confirm the whole future piece and every use condition.

A request not to forward a draft can accompany a small showing, while a public version circulates differently. Editing one page does not necessarily change saved copies. Horace’s historical line does not make further work pointless. A maker may clarify a description, replace an available version, explain a change or contact known recipients. Options depend on circulation. Vera chooses what to transfer with those circumstances in view, claiming neither complete irreversibility of every file nor absolute control of every future copy another person could make.

If Vera later describes the response, a private conversation should not become someone’s public endorsement without agreement. Viewing does not itself permit naming or quoting the reader. She can describe her decision without identifying them: one viewing revealed uncertainty about the letter’s movement, and she changed a panel. A literal quotation needs agreed use. This distinguishes participation from public recommendation. Gratitude for actual help should not silently enlarge the invitation the reader originally accepted.

A small meeting may end without a useful answer. Rough drawings were unclear, time was insufficient or the question exceeded the passage. That concerns the showing, not necessarily the comic’s value. Vera can change preparation, draw a needed element or continue without another meeting. A polite smile should not become invented confirmation, and one answer need not justify endless repeated viewings. The small showing has a limit within which observation, uncertainty and no result can all be described accurately.

VIII. Unfinished work can be shown honestly

Unfinished work need not resemble a finished piece to support a meaningful conversation. Vera has pages, a question and identified missing parts. That can support a limited transition viewing without supporting every possible judgment. Honest description helps participants encounter the same object. It guarantees neither shared taste, gentle criticism nor creative success. A more modest action is available: select an appropriate object, invite willing participation and distinguish what was seen, said and decided. Such a showing may support further work without evaluating the maker’s whole person.

Horace considers private criticism and caution before release, Quintilian revision and its limit, and Dewey movement from difficulty to an examined solution. These are different historical tasks and genres, not one feedback method or empirical validation of this scene. The connection belongs to our editorial discussion. Sources help pose questions; Vera finds answers through the pages and an actual conversation. Neither long waiting nor comment count establishes readiness. The basis must concern what was actually made and examined.

Afterward, Vera chooses one handover revision and leaves the ending for later. She can thank the reader for a precise response without promising to accept every future suggestion. Uncertainty about an undiscussed detail can remain. Keeping that distinction need not make creativity bureaucratic; it preserves a small result at its scale and lets another question arise without false confidence that everything is confirmed. The work remains unfinished, with one relationship clearer. That is a particular development, not a quality certificate for the project or a duty to show it more widely immediately.

The practice below demands no compulsory openness. It proposes showing one manageable version when a willing reader and a clear purpose are available. An observation, a decision or recognition that the passage could not answer the question are possible outcomes. It promises neither an end to nervousness nor only useful criticism. Participation can remain precise: intention is not finished form, a private response is not everyone’s view, and revision is not an already confirmed result. Unfinished work then has an intelligible status that permits discussion and continuation without requiring each showing to settle everything.

What this means in practice

Choose one current version and state why you want to show it. If you want to share or receive encouragement, say so. For a question about understanding, check that the relevant element exists and can be viewed. Postpone if the answer requires an absent part.

Describe the draft’s state: what exists, what rough marks mean and what is missing. Do not explain the entire meaning beforehand if you want to examine what the form conveys. Name the passage’s boundary and retain the version actually seen.

Invite willing participation with a clear scope. Agree on duration, one question and further circulation where relevant. Declining or not replying does not automatically assess the work. Viewing is not agreement to a publicly quoted response or endless editing.

Ask about a concrete action or relationship without supplying the desired answer. Permit reporting an obstacle that makes answering impossible. Distinguish the reader’s words, your interpretation and their proposed revision. You can accept an observation and choose another change.

Afterward, record one available result and a next step. The response belongs to the viewed version; later revision has not already been confirmed by it. A small showing does not replace consideration of release readiness. The practice guarantees no calmness, quality or useful criticism; an honest outcome may be a more precise question or continuing without another showing.

Key quotation

> *some limit, after all, must be set to correction.*

Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria X.4.3; brief excerpt from H. E. Butler’s translation. The context is an orator’s practical work.

Connections between traditions

Context	Distinction actually read	Draft question	Boundary
Horace, private criticism	Advice before wider release	Whom to invite and why	Nine years is no mandatory contemporary period
Horace, criticism of lines	Observation concerning a particular part	Where understanding failed	Historical harshness does not justify humiliation
Quintilian, X.4.1–2	Addition, removal, alteration and an interval	Which relationship to revise	No tested comic method
Quintilian, X.4.3–4	A practical limit to revision	When to end the present revision	No refusal to correct significant errors
Dewey, Chapter VI	Difficulty, suggestion and examination	What this passage allows learning	Historical inquiry philosophy, not guaranteed feedback

Primary sources

1. Horace. Art of Poetry, in The Satires, Epistles, and Art of Poetry of Horace, translated by John Conington; Project Gutenberg 5419. The continuous passage from private criticism and nine-year advice through the faithful critic was read, displayed lines 5178–5256. Exact Latin verse correspondence and physical imprint were not separately verified. Historical caricatures are not diagnoses.

2. Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria X.4.1–4, translated by H. E. Butler, Loeb Classical Library Vol. IV, 1920; LacusCurtius. The complete revision chapter was read and the translator confirmed in the work index. The transcription is labelled not yet proofread. No whole-work reading is claimed.

3. John Dewey. How We Think, 1910, Chapter VI, pp. 68–79; Project Gutenberg 37423. The whole chapter was read within the displayed context. Inquiry is applied editorially, not presented as an experimental test of this viewing.

Short EN quotations were checked against the interfaces; RU renderings are United Wisdom’s own. Historical translations, site material and territorial rights remain distinct; this record permits no complete primary-source import.

Tags

draft, unfinished work, creativity, showing, feedback, reader, comic, question, version, revision, observation, interpretation, preference, consent, boundaries, invitation, attribution, release, Horace, Quintilian, Dewey, inquiry, form, transition, agreement, responsibility, private viewing, decision, traditions, United Wisdom

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.