

UNITED WISDOM

Choosing one question among several connected ones

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-29-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Choosing one question among several connected ones

Epigraph

> *“carefully to avoid precipitancy and prejudice”*

René Descartes, Discourse on Method, Part II, fragment of the first rule in John Veitch's translation.

What this article is about

Sometimes the difficulty is having too many questions, rather than none. Which format, what is ready, who will participate, how much time is needed, and whom is it for? Connected questions make any beginning seem insufficient: answering one leaves others unresolved. Yet discussing all at once can conceal which nearest decision actually needs information. This article proposes selecting one question for present consideration while retaining connections and grounds for returning to others. This requires neither always starting with the easiest nor expecting division to solve complexity. A hypothetical collection of stories distinguishes facts, preferences, consent and duties; examines which answer changes an available action; and leaves open what that answer does not establish. Threats, mandatory deadlines and specialist procedures may determine a different order. Choosing one question should serve the actual task, rather than permit bypassing an essential boundary.

I. Several questions in one notebook

Olga and several adults she knows are preparing a small collection of neighbourhood stories. In this hypothetical scene, some texts are written, others still discussed, and authors have not agreed the final selection. Questions accumulate: print or display digitally, how many stories to include, whom to invite to read, who will check texts, and which date to choose. Participants move between them during a meeting. Discussion may be substantive while leaving unclear which material is actually available for the next stage. This invented story represents no universal pattern of groups. It examines a difficulty in which connections exist but the order of present consideration remains unchosen.

Every question has grounds. Form affects access to reading, selection affects workload, checking affects quality, and timing affects promises. Choosing one requires no dismissal of the others. Yet one observation or agreement cannot answer everything simultaneously. An author may confirm a text's readiness without deciding about printing. A reader may prefer

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

paper without agreeing to check stories. Olga may suggest a date without authority to promise a finished collection for everyone. Recording responses as general approval creates apparent progress without distinguishing what participants confirmed and which question remains open after each answer.

Olga starts with a list in ordinary wording, rather than immediately constructing a complex diagram. Each can be linked to a decision: approve contents, choose form, propose timing, agree on checking. Some formulations remain broad. “How can we do this well?” gives no first thing to clarify. It can remain a direction, but present discussion needs a more definite subject. Choosing one question does not diminish the whole undertaking. It identifies where a meaningful answer is possible now, without treating it as the final solution of all related tasks or forgetting people whose participation remains unagreed.

The list also reveals actions begun without an answer. Someone is designing a cover for eight stories when only a few final texts exist. Olga can pause that assumption and clarify contents. Voluntary cover work that creates no obligations need not be called misconduct. But it cannot confirm eight ready stories. The connection has a direction: selection affects form, while attractive form does not establish a ready selection. This matters to the questions' order. Sometimes the next step is obtaining information, sometimes retracting a premature promise, sometimes retaining a draft until grounds for using it appear.

II. Fact, preference, consent and duty

“Which texts are written?” differs from “which authors are willing to include theirs?” The first concerns material's state, the second consent to a defined use. A ready file does not answer both automatically. It may have been written for another context or need revision before display. Olga can offer clear terms and seek an available answer, but cannot include material merely because it exists. Any preliminary agreement needs precise reading: scope, conditions and what was accepted. Choosing a question preserves the difference between a resource's existence and a right to use it, rather than turning all preparation into disposal of someone else's labour.

A reader's preference is likewise distinct from an executor's obligation. Loving paper books establishes neither printing availability nor someone else's duty to pay. Wanting digital form does not ensure that intended readers can conveniently access it. Desired form, accessibility and participant willingness need different answers. They can be connected without one vote supposedly deciding everything. A group choosing a format within its authority should consider known conditions. Where conditions are unknown, preference remains preference and grounds for examining possibility, rather than proof that the possibility already exists.

A duty arises from its grounds, not from selecting its question. Someone may have promised to check two specific texts by a particular day. That matters to the first collection's timing. It does not expand into checking all future material or indefinite availability. If completion becomes impossible, revision and consequences need an honest separate conversation. Choosing one question cannot erase a promise to make format work more convenient. Equally, a new request to check a story remains a request where no prior duty exists. This distinction preserves precision for the organizer and for someone entitled to decline a new task.

Before choosing, identify the expected answer's type. Is accessible information needed, Olga's decision, others' consent or examination of an existing obligation? A broad question may mix these. “When will everything be ready?” can conceal both an unknown duration of one's work and unconfirmed contributions. Clarify it without demanding false precision. Olga can name her available time, gather information about the material's state and propose discussion of actual scope. Any need for specialist assessment or authority remains. Good wording creates neither knowledge, consent nor a right absent so far; it makes their absence visible.

III. Divide a difficulty while retaining connections

In Part II of Discourse on Method, Descartes proposes dividing difficulties and ordering thought. The selected passage describes his own route and cautions against unconditional imitation. Its mathematical ideal does not establish that every life question divides into independent parts that recombine without loss. Selecting the contents question here is a contemporary editorial decision, not literal implementation of Descartes' entire method. It helps only while retaining links between contents, form and timing. Without those links, a convenient small question can yield a correct answer that resolves nothing in the actual undertaking.

Olga records connections simply: know available contents before promising volume; consider readers and material before choosing final form; agree actual scope and contributions before naming shared timing. This need not be the only order. Information about readers may be gathered simultaneously if accessible without approving contents first. Not every connection is a strict prerequisite. An approximate view of work should not become a rigid staircase everyone must climb alike. Actual dependencies are checked against question content and answer consequences; parallel preparation remains possible where tasks really are independent.

The selected question needs its minimum context. To determine agreed contents for an initial collection, authors need to understand the proposed reading, displayed scope and recipients. If these conditions are insufficiently defined, a general “do you agree?” cannot settle contents. The offer may need clarifying first, or narrowing to permissible internal discussion. Division does not extract consent from its conditions. Trying to formulate one question may reveal an

earlier dependency than expected. That is a useful result: order becomes more accurate even if the initial question must change before anyone is approached.

Every possible branch of the future collection need not be drawn. The next decision requires significant connections and the answer's limits. Olga can record that agreed texts do not determine print quantity, distribution channel or costs. This short boundary prevents one answer claiming the whole task. A later dependency can be recorded with explicit grounds, retaining the earlier fact. The question map should support action and memory of uncertainty, not demand proof of the project's final structure before conversation. Its complexity follows necessity, rather than a wish to present the work as more certain than it is.

IV. Select by the decision, not by ease

Choosing a cover colour is easiest for Olga. It is pleasant and answerable independently, but clarifies neither available contents nor grounds for announcing a date. The easiest question need not be the nearest useful one. The opposite extreme is excessively broad: “what should the whole collection become?” Its importance is clear, yet an answer may be inaccessible. Between them, seek a question whose answer changes the next decision and can be obtained appropriately. For this hypothetical group, it concerns written stories offered for an agreed first reading. It helps estimate checking workload without promising a finished public book.

In How We Think, Chapter VI, Dewey distinguishes experienced difficulty from observations defining its character. This prompts caution about accepting the first convenient explanation as the established question. Olga initially thinks different tastes prevent choosing a format. It emerges that participants envisage different quantities: four brief stories versus eight long ones. Clarifying available contents changes the subject of format discussion itself. This is a hypothetical example, not an empirical law of collective decisions. The question becomes useful through the discovered connection, not because every taste dispute necessarily conceals missing facts.

Waiting's consequences affect selection. If an author must decide today about a particular display, that question may have a deadline absent from colour choice. If sensitive information risks disclosure, relevant requirements and help determine order, rather than exercise convenience. In an ordinary safe scene, consider what remains blocked until an answer and what can wait. Urgency grants no right to compel consent. It may require reducing contents, permissibly revising a promise or cancelling display. Choosing a question accounts for time and duties while retaining a decision in which the desired work does not continue now.

In III.3 Aristotle traces means toward an accessible beginning, including the limit where a route proves impossible. Here this prompts asking what an answer opens and who can take the next step. We do not adopt immutable aims as a binding contemporary rule; the original collection

may change. If no author accepts the proposed terms, more persistent repetition cannot solve the task. Conditions can change where permitted, or the option be rejected. The nearest question is chosen not to confirm a predetermined desired answer, but to allow several outcomes their truthful place in subsequent decisions.

V. Formulating one question

Olga selects: which written stories are their authors willing to provide for an initial internal reading under stated conditions? The formulation identifies material, participants and a usage limit. It excludes final printing, public distribution and future texts. Answers may identify available stories, no consent or conditions requiring discussion. Clarity does not secure consent. It does prevent a kindly response to the idea being recorded as permission for everything. An unanswered author's text does not automatically enter the selection because others are ready and a full list would suit the organizer.

One question may suffice for her consideration while separate approaches to people remain necessary. Each author has material and conditions of their own. Shared wording supports comparison of responses to one subject, not collective consent by default. Olga should preserve who answered what. Willingness to show only part of a text is no obstacle to conceal for symmetry; it is an actual selection condition. Needed clarification may be proposed while refusal remains available. Earlier discussion reserves no future collaboration, and publicly announcing someone's willingness should not precede agreement on its presentation.

The question needs an expected sign of answer. Here that is a definite list of materials and agreed internal reading conditions, not the organizer's mood after correspondence. “The idea is good” can be acknowledged as support while the text question remains open. A conditional response retains its condition; a missing response is recorded without speculating about reasons. Precision makes the question workable: its answer relates to the selected decision. It also preserves a boundary where clarification should end and an incomplete selection may be preferable to filling every row through pressure.

Timing follows context. Olga can choose when to review available answers and propose the next workload. That sets no mandatory deadline for others unless accepted. An earlier agreed reading date needs accounting for, with changes honestly reported to affected participants. Selecting one question removes unnecessary topics from a present request without removing timing conditions. A later answer may open a new possibility; it does not rewrite previous contents and promises retrospectively. Useful wording accompanies an honest time record rather than replacing it.

VI. One answer does not untie every connection

Suppose four authors agree to provide short stories for internal reading. Particular contents on particular terms are now known. Four texts can be proposed for checking instead of eight assumed ones. Final form, public distribution, cost and reader participation remain unresolved. Positive responses about first reading do not establish a finished collection. An intermediate result suffices for its place if its meaning is not enlarged. It may fall below expectations yet remains factual grounds for the next decision. Other questions return in a changed context where material and some conditions are better known.

If a text needs revision, a new question emerges: may its initial form enter agreed internal discussion, or does the author prefer waiting? This need not return everyone to the beginning. Other confirmed material remains available while its conditions persist. A separate decision need not force every option into the same shape. But if this text's absence changes the collection's central idea, the shared aim needs revisiting. A part's significance depends on its relation to the whole. The same absence may be minor in one undertaking and essential in another; no omission can be declared unimportant in advance.

An answer may reveal a premature question. Authors are willing to discuss providing texts but do not understand the recipients. Audience and access conditions need clarifying. This establishes neither obstruction by people nor a meaningless question. It exposed an underestimated dependency. Olga can clarify the offer while retaining the absence of final consent. The earlier question may then return in a new context if participants are willing. This differs from repeating a request endlessly until the desired answer arrives: actual terms or information change, while refusal retains its meaning rather than becoming the recipient's error.

The shared result can be described in two sentences: what was clarified and what remains open. Here the former concerns available internal-reading contents; the latter, form and further use. Add which decision is now accessible to Olga and which requires others. This need not become bureaucracy for every small conversation. It helps where a single positive answer can easily be mistaken for general agreement. Clear connections may need only an ordinary list. Precision promises no disappearance of disagreement. It supports substantive discussion: people may retain different wishes and judgments despite identical information about contents.

VII. Retain other questions without hidden promises

Deferred questions should remain visible. Olga records: form after material and recipients' needs are clarified; public use after separate agreement; timing after available scope and participation are defined. This promises no eventual resolution of everything. It identifies connections and return conditions. Cancellation or change may render some questions irrelevant. People should not be kept awaiting an agreement the organizer does not yet intend to offer. “We are choosing internal-reading contents now; publication is unagreed” lets participants understand scope without guessing which future duties will arise from today's brief answer.

Genuinely independent questions can receive parallel work. One participant checks a ready text within agreed boundaries while another gathers available information about reading form. This is compatible with choosing one question for the present decision. The distinction concerns attention and dependencies, not prohibiting simultaneous action by several people. Parallel work needs clear subjects and grounds for participation. If both quietly decide for someone else or alter the same material without coordination, speed does not make the work dependable. Required dependencies remain explicit. Where independence is real, everything need not be artificially queued for the scheme's tidiness.

Not every open question needs immediate investigation. Exact print quantity may matter only after a public-form decision not yet made. Gathering numerous printing offers now may be unnecessary. But when cost determines whether to continue at all, that question moves forward. Priority belongs permanently to no one type; it changes with context, obligations and replies. Dewey rejects a rigid depth of inquiry for all cases. We apply this as proportion, not permission to ignore inconvenient information. Deferral can have grounds and a return condition, rather than uncertainty being declared insignificant by preference.

Deferred must especially remain distinct from settled. “We will return to publication consent” is not permission to publish now. “We will clarify expenses later” does not make expenditure available. “We will discuss an editor's participation” promises no presence. The distinctions preserve actual boundaries as a small internal step starts resembling a finished large project. If participants need certainty sooner, the organizer must honestly identify what is available rather than reassure them with imagined future responses. Retained questions serve truthful continuation, not confidence exceeding current knowledge and actual agreement.

VIII. Return to the whole after the selected question

After clarifying contents, Olga revisits the original intention. Four short stories may make meaningful internal reading or fail to convey the intended breadth. The former opens a permissible question about form; the latter requires reconsidering scope or the first collection's purpose. Fewer texts cannot be declared victory or failure beforehand. They are assessed against content and task conditions. Selecting one question yielded a definite answer without removing responsibility for the whole. Returning to the shared aim distinguishes useful small decisions from activity that answers convenient questions successfully without approaching the desired result.

If the next question concerns recipient access, one volunteer's preference cannot establish a general conclusion. Their answer concerns their reading method and particular material. It may expose a difficulty without establishing everyone's needs. Olga can clarify intended recipients and known access methods, retaining information limits. Specialist accessibility or safety requirements need relevant procedures and competence; ordinary internal discussion does not replace them. A particular answer helps within its scope. Extending it to every reader needs other grounds that the exercise does not itself create.

New facts can change the order. An intended day becomes unavailable, an author withdraws an unagreed version, or a significant usage restriction emerges. Returning to a deferred question is then no failure of discipline but a response to changed conditions. Name which fact altered the order and retain existing results where still valid. Otherwise work either begins again indefinitely or continues an old scheme against new grounds. Flexibility connects to precision rather than arbitrary mood. Participants can understand the new order through actual consequences for material, time and promises.

Choosing one question temporarily bounds consideration without reducing responsibility for connections. It should allow an answer that changes the decision, retain consent conditions and leave uncertainty open. Other questions receive places and return grounds; the whole idea remains revisable. Neither Descartes, Dewey nor Aristotle guarantees success for this contemporary scene through a few identical steps. Their different contexts help clarify order, difficulty and available action. Participants still decide whether to continue in a smaller form, change the offer or stop. A clearer question makes the choice more explainable without deciding its outcome.

What this means in practice

1. Name several connected questions. Link each to a decision needing its answer. Their simultaneous arrival does not make them one difficulty. Record threats, mandatory timing or specialist procedures separately where these determine order.

2. Distinguish answer types. Which require facts, your choice, others' consent or examination of existing duties? Ready material does not authorize use; preference creates neither a resource nor another person's promise.

3. Select one question for this decision. Which accessible answer actually changes the next step? It need not be easiest. Retain essential conditions and appropriate inquiry; refusal and uncertainty must remain possible outcomes.

4. Record the answer's boundary. What does it establish, and what remains unresolved? Conditional or incomplete responses must not become full consent. If a premature dependency emerges, revise the offer or order while retaining earlier facts.

5. Return to connections and the whole. What became available, which question now matters, what condition requires revisiting a deferred one? Continue, reduce scope or stop with promises accounted for. The exercise guarantees no success and replaces neither specialist requirements, authority nor participant consent.

Key quotation

> *“the acts of observation that serve to define the character of the difficulty”*

John Dewey, How We Think, Chapter VI, p. 74 of the 1910 edition, sentence fragment. Defining a question does not guarantee a correct answer.

Connections between traditions

Context	Article question	Limit
Dewey, Chapter VI	Define difficulty before accepting a convenient explanation	No group diagnosis or proven consent technology
Descartes, Part II, four rules	Select a question while retaining order and connections	The mathematical ideal establishes no independence of life-task parts
Aristotle, III.2–3	Check which answer opens an available action	Aims remain revisable; others' participation needs grounds

Three distinct contexts suffice for the argument without becoming a shared fixed sequence. Contemporary consent, priority selection and returning to the whole are editorial proposals.

Primary sources

1. John Dewey, How We Think, D. C. Heath, 1910, Project Gutenberg 37423. Complete Chapter VI, pp. 68–79, displayed lines 592–664, was actually read; definition of difficulty and proportion are used. A thirteen-word English fragment at p. 74, line 638, appears with its own Russian rendering. Metadata and the transcription note were separately read in this task. The philosophical and educational context replaces no specialist procedure and establishes no exercise efficacy.

2. René Descartes, A Discourse on Method, John Veitch translation, Project Gutenberg 59. A selected continuous Part II passage, lines 77–116, was actually read, including four rules at 103–108 and cautions about the author's own path. This claims neither the whole Part II nor the complete work. The particular print edition remains unestablished. A six-word English fragment at line 103 appears with its own Russian rendering. Historical prejudices and mandatory doubt of all beliefs are rejected.

3. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Book III, W. D. Ross translation, Internet Classics Archive, complete III.2–3, lines 52–80. This article uses bounded paraphrase and commentary without literal quotation. The particular print edition remains unestablished; assumed historical professional ends make no contemporary aim immutable and do not reserve help from others.

Historical text, English translations and editorial apparatus are distinguished. Short fragments and paraphrase establish neither worldwide clearance nor complete source import.

Tags

question, connected questions, priority, choice, difficulty, decision, facts, preferences, consent, duties, uncertainty, order, dependencies, whole and parts, preparation, shared work, authorship, material, conditions, responsibility, boundaries, revision, proportion, parallel work, timing, observation, action, Dewey, Descartes, Aristotle

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.