

UNITED WISDOM

A Hypothesis About a Situation and How to Check It

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-29-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A Hypothesis About a Situation and How to Check It

Epigraph

> *Our beliefs guide our desires and shape our actions.*

Charles Sanders Peirce, The Fixation of Belief, 1877, section III; checked English original. This is a philosophical claim, not a measured law of this situation.

What this article is about

When an explanation feels persuasive, we readily act as though its cause were established. Silence becomes disrespect, difficulty becomes incapacity, and one unsuccessful conversation becomes a final portrait of a relationship. This article examines a more limited route: how to formulate a hypothesis about a particular situation and choose an observation that could change it. Its concerns are facts and explanations, meaningful alternatives, anticipated signs, the cost of intervention, and an honest response to inconclusive results. Peirce, Bacon, and biblical wisdom offer different grounds for the question; the contemporary exercise remains an editorial proposal rather than a proven diagnostic method. Checking should neither expose somebody's "essence" nor compel participation. Its possible result is more modest: one link in understanding becomes more accurate and the next choice gains clearer grounds, while the right to stop or seek other help remains.

I. Between an Event and an Explanation

Imagine an ordinary workplace situation. You sent a colleague a proposal, received no reply for several days, and concluded that they are uninterested in working together. The event is narrower: a message was sent and no answer appeared in the chosen channel. Your explanation may be right, but other possibilities remain: the message was unread, deciding requires more information, or the person thinks somebody else should respond. Separating event from explanation matters because the next actions can differ. If there is no interest, another route may make sense. If the requested answer is unclear, clarifying it may suffice. If the message never arrived, a discussion of respect for you is premature. This hypothetical scene does not excuse every silence. It shows how far a conclusion can travel beyond what is actually known.

A hypothesis here means a possible explanation of a connection between circumstances and an observed result. Its purpose is not to make language sound cautious, but to identify a check

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

that could change our understanding. In The Fixation of Belief, Peirce distinguishes a conclusion's felt persuasiveness from its grounds; this is a historical philosophical argument, not a ready-made procedure for interpreting relationships. This article's contemporary bridge asks us to name what remains unknown alongside an explanation. The question then becomes an investigation of a particular connection rather than a trial of somebody's character. You can remain hurt by a missing reply while not knowing its cause. Your right to set a boundary does not depend on fully explaining another person's behavior. Nevertheless, the grounds for an accusation and the grounds for your next action still need to be distinguished.

II. A Testable Connection Instead of a Final Portrait

“That is the kind of person they are” says little about what observation might change the conclusion. Any reply can be dismissed as an exception, while no reply becomes further confirmation. A more definite hypothesis sounds different: “Perhaps the answer is delayed because the proposal does not state which decision is needed.” It connects a particular feature of a message with a particular difficulty. If clarifying the request produces a substantive reply, that connection gains some support. If not, there is a reason to consider another explanation. This does not reduce a person to their responses to well-written emails. It checks a limited possibility concerning this episode. “Perhaps” and “in this case” must remain actual boundaries of the conclusion. One successful conversation establishes neither the colleague's general goodwill nor the reliability of your communication in every circumstance.

This change matters particularly when explanations concern ourselves. Instead of “I cannot concentrate,” consider: “Starting this task may be harder when the first manageable portion is undefined.” You can compare it with a situation in which that portion has been identified beforehand, without diagnosing yourself or judging your entire life. The result may remain unchanged because the obstacle lies elsewhere: conditions are inadequate, the task is unclear, or energy is currently limited. A check should not promise improvement in advance. Its value may lie in giving up an attractive explanation that does not fit. Rejecting one hypothesis does not make somebody lazy or beyond help, nor oblige them to keep testing. It means only that the proposed connection does not yet explain the observed difference. This modest result preserves room to identify the actual task without unnecessary blame.

III. An Alternative Must Make a Difference

Inventing ten possible causes is easy; choosing two with an observable difference is harder. In our example, “the required answer is unclear” and “a particular piece of information is missing” can be distinguished: state the question, then ask whether information is lacking. But “they do not care” and “they are inwardly unwilling” may mean nearly the same thing without suggesting different checks. A variety of similar words creates the appearance of inquiry without opening new possibilities. A useful alternative changes the expectation: if the first explanation is right, one result is anticipated after a particular clarification; if the second is right, another. The expectation need not specify an exact number or rigid deadline. It must be clear enough that opposing observations cannot both be declared equally convincing without explanation. This is where checking begins to differ from constructing a confirming story.

Alternatives should be chosen from available information, not from a duty to invent a reassuring version. If somebody explicitly declined participation, an unread-message hypothesis does not cancel their answer. Repeated breaches of an agreement also matter; their history cannot be erased for the sake of one new attempt. Yet history consists of distinguishable episodes rather than an unlimited right to assign motives. You may establish that somebody cannot be relied on for a particular task without establishing why they behave that way. That can be enough for a decision. Checking is useful where the result could change understanding or choice. If safety, an established boundary, or an explicit refusal already determines the choice, seeking further proof of a hidden character may be unnecessary or harmful. Inquiry needs a limited purpose of its own, rather than an endless duty to explain another person completely.

IV. What Exactly Did You Expect to Observe?

Before acting, it helps to distinguish the anticipated event from its interpretation. “After clarification, the colleague will identify which decision remains unresolved” is an observable expectation. “After clarification, they will finally respect me” is a much broader conclusion. Respect cannot be reduced to one kind of answer, and the request may remain difficult for other reasons. In a hypothetical household example, somebody suspects that discussions about purchases fail because too many questions are raised together. They suggest discussing one previously identified item and observe whether the conversation becomes more definite. This examines the structure of the discussion rather than measuring a partner's love. Without naming the observation beforehand, any change can become confirmation of a general portrait. We then gain another story about ourselves or somebody else while learning little about the proposed connection.

A criterion should not require another person to feel or decide exactly what would suit you. “I need time” may provide substantive information even without advancing the agreement you hoped for. “I do not want to participate” can resolve uncertainty and disappoint you at once. A check remains honest when failure to obtain the desired outcome is distinguished from failure of inquiry. You may learn something important without getting what you wanted. Conversely, a pleasant answer does not necessarily support the explanation if someone agreed out of politeness and their reasons remain unknown. Identify not only the desired sign but also what would count as insufficient information. This boundary protects participants from having to display their inner life for your reassurance. An observation answers its limited question; it does not authorize every further conclusion you might draw.

V. Begin with an Observation Already Available

Not every hypothesis requires a new trial. The relevant difference may already exist in available circumstances but have gone unnoticed. Suppose you think discussions always fail late in the evening. Recall two specific conversations while preserving their differences: their subject, available time, participants, and what counted as failure. This does not prove causality, but it reveals whether there is a basis for connecting the difficulty with the hour. One calm conversation already requires revising “always.” If every remembered episode looks alike, it remains uncertain whether those episodes were selected because they were painful. A useful observation starts with the limits of memory. Family life need not become secret statistics. Check whether the original description matches what you can actually reconstruct, and leave the rest unknown.

You can also reread your own message, examine an agreement, or ask somebody who directly knows an available fact. These actions are often less costly than trying to reproduce an argument. Documents still need context, however. A missing deadline in one message does not prove that deadlines were never discussed; a record of one decision does not capture every later change. An observation becomes more useful when its actual scope is stated. “Does the latest message identify who is responsible?” is narrower than “We never have clarity.” The first can be checked; the second needs another kind of inquiry. Checking need not involve more participants or disclosure. Where possible, choose a route that provides the needed distinction with minimal interference. An unavailable fact remains unavailable rather than inviting reconstruction from the most persuasive story.

VI. Another Person Is Not a Test Facility

Checking a relationship has an ethical boundary: do not deliberately create humiliation, jealousy, threats, or withdrawal of support to watch the response. Setting a trap and calling the reaction proof of character means altering the very situation supposedly being observed. The result will partly reflect your intervention. It may also cause harm regardless of its informational value. A more honest check concerns an intelligible proposal the other person knows about and can decline. You might agree to discuss one work question with materials supplied beforehand. There is no hidden provocation and no demand to expose a private feeling. Participation conditions belong to both people, not just the author of the hypothesis. Refusal tells you that the person declined under those conditions; it does not reveal every reason or authorize a secret second trial.

This boundary does not make everyday checking useless. It changes its design: instead of “How can I force someone to reveal their true nature?” ask “Which limited condition are we willing to clarify together?” In a hypothetical couple, one person thinks an undefined subject obstructs conversation; the other thinks insufficient time is the main obstacle. They can agree to discuss one identified question at a mutually convenient time. This changes two conditions together and therefore cannot isolate a single cause. But it can provide practical information: conversation was or was not possible under the agreed combination. The result concerns a way of interacting rather than exposing another mind. Such limited knowledge can be enough for life. It need not be exaggerated to count as useful, nor should agreement become a duty to continue once a participant no longer wishes to take part.

VII. Changed Conditions Do Not Establish a Cause

Even a useful comparison is rarely a clean experiment. On the day you identified the first portion of work, rest, urgency, available information, or mood may also have changed. “Starting was easier today” is narrower than “Defining a portion always removes the difficulty.” Without additional grounds, you cannot select the preferred change as the cause among all the changes that occurred. In Novum Organum, I.46, Bacon warns against bending instances toward an accepted idea; this is philosophical criticism, not a modern measurement of error frequency. Here it reminds us that naming a coincidence does not explain it. You can identify a useful combination of conditions and use it while remaining uncertain about any single cause. A practical conclusion may be more modest than a causal one and still matter. That distinction keeps one successful day from becoming a universal law.

Different actions also answer different questions. Clarifying a deadline checks whether a clear deadline makes an agreement more definite; it does not test an entire team's capacity to collaborate. Making a task easier shows behavior under easier conditions, not the ability to

complete the original workload. Reducing the participants confines the result to that group. These boundaries do not diminish what was achieved. They prevent promises of transfer to circumstances where important conditions will differ. Write: “This approach helped in this conversation; its usefulness when interests conflict is still unknown.” That is more precise than a general conclusion about correct communication. A further attempt, if needed at all, can address a new uncertainty. It need not repeat the earlier one for reassurance or mistake several similar outward features for completely equivalent life situations.

VIII. Give an Unwelcome Observation a Real Place

A check exists only if some possible result would actually weaken the hypothesis. If every silence proves disrespect and every reply proves an attempt to conceal it, the explanation is protected against all events. It may express an important feeling, but it is not testable in that form. Identify beforehand at least one observation that would require revision. If a colleague establishes that the message never arrived, the claim that they refused to answer that particular message loses its support. This does not oblige you to forget other episodes. It requires correcting one specific link. Checking remains meaningful when unwelcome observations are not dismissed in advance as irrelevant. Otherwise, information is gathered to protect an accepted explanation rather than learn, even while we continue asking questions, keeping records, and describing ourselves as open to new knowledge.

A negative observation does not automatically prove the opposite either. An unanswered clear question does not show indifference to everything that matters to you. You can conclude that clarification alone was insufficient to obtain a reply under these circumstances. If identifying the first portion did not help you begin, neither laziness nor inability to work has been established. Rejecting a hypothesis should stay within the scale of its check. Sometimes the result requires acknowledging insufficient information rather than choosing a new cause. This is harder than replacing one confident explanation with another because uncertainty remains uncomfortable. Yet uncertainty need not immobilize you. You may make a limited decision from available facts, such as seeking another participant or requesting clarification of the task, while leaving the cause unresolved. A decision and its explanation are related, but need not reach completion together or with equal confidence.

IX. An Inconclusive Result Has a Shape Too

Not every outcome distinguishes the chosen explanations. Somebody replies to a different question, starts work but stops for a new reason, or agrees to a conversation before an unexpected event intervenes. Such an outcome need not count as either success or failure of the hypothesis. First describe what happened and which distinction remains impossible. “A reply arrived, but whether the person understood the proposal is unknown” is one example. Uncertainty becomes more useful when it has a precise location. It is no longer a general feeling that nothing can be known. You can see which link remains unresolved and whether it merits further action. One literal clarification may suffice: “Have I understood correctly that no decision has been made yet?” Or you may acknowledge that this approach cannot supply the needed information. More questions do not automatically make an earlier check informative or justify deeper intrusion.

An absent sign differs from an absent opportunity to observe it. If you do not know whether a message was read, a missing reply cannot be compared with a reply to a certainly read message as if conditions were identical. A task interrupted by an external event does not show how it would have ended without that event. Everyday life does not require an elaborate table for these distinctions. A brief note beside the result is enough: “channel unconfirmed,” “conditions changed,” or “participation ended.” This preserves the observation against later transformation into an overly elegant conclusion. It also helps determine when to stop: if a sign cannot be observed without crossing boundaries, that impossibility limits inquiry. Somebody's right to keep part of their experience private is not a technical defect in your check. It belongs to the situation and must be counted among its conditions.

X. The Cost of Checking Is Part of Its Meaning

Not every available action is worth taking for information. Another observation may cost trust, unnecessary spending, excessive strain, or disclosure of somebody else's information. The question then concerns the permissibility of the check as well as the explanation's truth. A small step is preferable not because small is always good, but because its consequences may be easier to assess and stop. A hypothetical manager can first clarify whether a task is understood instead of unexpectedly changing conditions for the entire team. Even clarification should respect a person's time and contain no hidden coercion. The more serious the possible consequence, the less justification there is for presenting an everyday attempt as a sufficient check. Health, safety, substantial financial decisions, and legal obligations may require appropriate expertise; this article assigns no independent experiment for them.

Reflection may conclude that a hypothesis should not be tested now. The reason can be substantive: no consent, inadequate resources, irreversible consequences, or information

available through another route. Declining is neither cowardice nor intellectual dishonesty when its grounds are stated. Keep the possibility untested and avoid acting as if it were established. You might decline a shared project because no answer is available without accusing a colleague of a particular hidden intention. Or postpone a change until suitable professional advice is available while leaving the earlier explanation unproved. Checking serves life; life does not serve a duty to complete every invented check. Inquiry has a limit of usefulness. If another observation would no longer change any permissible choice, continuing may merely add costs and create an appearance of movement where another action or a deliberate stop is needed.

XI. Revision Does Not Erase Earlier Experience

Revising a hypothesis does not mean your feelings were pointless. If the message failed to arrive, waiting for a reply was still a real experience. The explanation of silence changes, not the fact that you waited. This distinction allows revision without humiliating yourself or requiring another person to confirm your earlier story to protect your dignity. Preserve the sequence: this information was available, this possibility arose from it, then a new fact appeared and the description changed. Such a history shows understanding developing; it need not become a judicial archive of every mistake. In a hypothetical conversation, someone can say, “I thought the question had been ignored; now I know the message was not received.” Both the earlier difficulty and the new clarity remain. Neither defending the accusation nor pretending the expectation and feeling never existed is necessary.

Revision can be partial. One fact may weaken one connection while leaving other questions open. Knowing why a reply was delayed does not necessarily establish deadlines for future work. A manageable portion helping you start says nothing yet about the suitability of the whole workload. The entire picture need not change at once. Revise the dependent part and retain the other unknowns. Earlier material is neither discarded wholesale nor retained wholesale for consistency's sake. Distinguish what was actually checked, what now has weaker support, and what was never observed. “More likely” here means no calculated percentage; it concerns comparative grounds that should be explained. This discipline makes a new hypothesis an heir to earlier inquiry rather than another persuasive story that forgets its history whenever mood or circumstances change.

XII. Knowing a Connection and Choosing an Action

A supported hypothesis does not supply a ready-made decision. Even if a clear subject helps conversation, you must still decide whether to continue and under which conditions. Establishing a delay's cause leaves the question of whether its consequences are acceptable for shared work. An informational conclusion concerns a connection; a practical conclusion concerns choice in light of purposes, boundaries, and participants. Proverbs 18:13 disapproves of answering before listening; this is biblical wisdom, not an experimental law. It preserves an ethical dimension: another person should not become merely a character in our completed explanation. Listening does not require accepting every proposal or abandoning a boundary. You can understand a reason more accurately, recognize it as real, and still choose different participation, another task, or an end to an agreement.

The original email scene may end simply. You learn that a decision is pending because particular information is missing; now you can provide it, decline further involvement, or discuss a new deadline. The hypothesis changed the conversation's subject: an intelligible unresolved question replaced an accusation of indifference. In another version, the check clarifies nothing and you choose the next step from the fact that no answer is available. Both results can be honest. The observation must stay within its scope, and the chosen action must not hide behind an allegedly inevitable scientific conclusion. A person remains responsible for choosing even when the explanation is sound. A small check does not complete all understanding. It makes one link more accurate, and sometimes that changes more than another final formula about who you are or what somebody else has permanently proved to be.

What this means in practice

Choose one episode that actually affects the next decision. Describe the event before assigning a cause: which message, action, or missing answer is known, how it is known, and what the record lacks. State one possible explanation beside it. If that explanation describes somebody's whole character, narrow it to a connection concerning this episode. For example, replace “I am always ignored” with “Perhaps the question remains unanswered because the required decision is unclear.”

Identify a reasonable alternative that changes the expectation, and record an available sign that would weaken the first version. Do not require another person to confess the feeling you want them to have. Examine existing information next. A message, agreement, or literal clarification may already provide the distinction, making a new trial unnecessary. If information is missing, keep that absence visible.

If a small trial remains useful, assess its conditions and cost. Another participant knows the proposed subject and can decline; there is no provocation, secret monitoring, punishment, or

irreversible risk. Choose a minimal change and acknowledge which circumstances cannot be kept identical. Where medical, legal, or financial expertise or protection of safety is needed, an everyday trial cannot replace appropriate help.

After observing, describe the result before the conclusion. Distinguish support for the hypothesis, weaker support, and insufficient information. Record what changed in the explanation and what remains unknown. A disappointing outcome may yield useful knowledge; a pleasant one may leave the cause unclear. Neither establishes a participant's entire character.

Finally, identify the next choice separately. You can continue a conversation, change conditions, seek help, or stop. A complete causal account is not required before protecting a reasonable boundary. Preserve a brief history: initial information, proposed explanation, observation, and revised conclusion. This is a suggested reflective approach without a guarantee of results. Its purpose is to preserve the scale of knowledge and responsibility, not organize endless testing of yourself and others.

Key quotation

> *He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him.*

Proverbs 18:13; checked displayed KJV. This biblical wisdom teaching retains its religious context and provides neither a diagnosis nor a judgment of a person's dignity.

Connections between traditions

1. **Persuasion and grounds:** Peirce (section II) separates a conclusion's attraction from its grounds; Bacon (I.46) criticizes bending instances toward accepted ideas. Both question convenient explanations, but Peirce's logical argument and Bacon's historical program are not one contemporary experiment.

2. **Listening and inference:** Proverbs 18:13 disapproves of answering before hearing; Peirce examines inference from known premises to something unknown. Both invite examination of a missing ground. A religious judgment of conduct is not reducible to a logical criterion.

3. **Unwelcome instances and another person's answer:** Bacon (I.46) attends to negative instances; Proverbs 18:13 preserves the need to hear a matter. The contemporary bridge is refusing to dismiss information beforehand. A person is not a laboratory instance, and the biblical line prescribes no experiment.

4. **Confidence and action:** Peirce (section III) connects belief with action; Proverbs 18:13 gives a moral boundary to premature answers. Their similarity concerns consequences of conclusions, while a philosophical account of habit and biblical wisdom retain distinct grounds.

5. **Doubt and an honest stop:** Peirce (section IV) discusses living doubt; Bacon (I.46) examines protection of accepted ideas. This article proposes bounded checking instead of defending a version at any cost. That practical bridge is ours: neither source sets a universal frequency, intervention boundary, or measured benefit for the exercise.

Primary sources

1. Charles Sanders Peirce. The Fixation of Belief, 1877 — philosophical essay, sections II–V within recorded reading scopes; grounds versus felt certainty, and belief's relation to action. Not a complete account of Peirce.

2. Proverbs 18:12–17, KJV — primary biblical wisdom text; 18:13 supplies the key quotation about hearing before answering. No Hebrew collation.

3. Francis Bacon. Novum Organum, I.46 — philosophical criticism of bending observations toward accepted ideas; selected aphorism from the English 1902 edition edited by Joseph Devey. Not a contemporary empirical study.

Tags

hypothesis, situation, observation, explanation, fact, inference, grounds, confidence, doubt, alternative, checking, criterion, expectation, causality, coincidence, context, consent, boundary, intervention, uncertainty, negative instance, revision, decision history, choice, responsibility, Peirce, Bacon, Proverbs, philosophy, biblical 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.