

UNITED WISDOM

When an Idea Meets an Actual Need

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-30-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

When an Idea Meets an Actual Need

Epigraph

> *the negative instance is the most powerful*

Francis Bacon, Novum Organum, I.46; exact short fragment in the checked English edition, edited by Joseph Devey, 1902 imprint. Historical epistemology, not a measured customer study.

What this article is about

A good idea can seem an answer long before it is clear whose question it answers. Its author sees possibilities, imagines benefits, and invests effort; another person inhabits a particular situation with existing tasks, constraints, and ways to act. The two cannot be equated because an intention is intelligible or receives approval. This article asks how to understand an actual need without making the conversation partner confirm a solution chosen beforehand. We distinguish an account of difficulty, prevalence, existing alternatives, and readiness to participate; consider inconvenient answers and revision without devaluing earlier work. Bacon, Peirce, and Smith provide historical grounds for distinctions. The contemporary practice belongs to this article and is not a validated way to find a market. Its purpose is to match the next offer's scale to what has actually been learned while preserving another person's right not to need your idea.

I. An Idea and a Need Belong to Different Sides

An idea can matter to its creator before anyone else needs it. It connects experience, taste, hope, and invested time. That significance does not reveal a prospective participant's task. In a hypothetical situation, someone designs a complex planning service for small projects. They understand the product's possibilities but not when others actually struggle or which approaches they use already. Examining need means temporarily placing another person's situation before describing your solution. This neither abandons the idea nor declares it useless. It separates two sides: the creator has an offer; the other has a task, conditions, and the right to choose another approach. Their fit must be examined. Sincerity, an attractive concept, and invested effort cannot establish it independently.

This article considers the distinction before strong attachment to a particular solution. It sets no universal launch stage or point after which thinking becomes too late. Explore need early or revise understanding later. Avoid making every observation defend the idea. A mismatch supplies information about the connection between offer and situation. It determines neither

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

the creator's worth nor whether all earlier work was wasted. This scale permits questions without a concealed demand for approval. The subject is not recognition of talent, but where assistance is needed, which result matters, and which conditions enable participation. An idea retains room to develop while ceasing to be the only permissible answer before another person's question has been heard.

II. Identify a Situation Rather Than an Imagined Portrait

Describe a need through a situation. “People need clarity” sounds convincing but identifies little. “During a small project's handover, participants cannot tell which decision remains open” names people and a transition. Do not invent an ideal client with a detailed life and present them as an examined group. Identify information from your own experience as such; preserve conditions when it comes from another person's account. In a hypothetical workshop, one client struggles to select material. This does not mean every buyer needs the same service. Use the episode to form a question about similar accessible situations. Similarity itself needs a subject: identical words can describe different tasks and desired outcomes.

Distinguish the participant, difficulty, and consequences. Who encounters the question? What cannot be done? Why does it matter to the next action? Someone declining to change may face a minor inconvenience or a task different from your interpretation. Do not automatically call them unaware. They may assess change's cost differently. A situation description remains a hypothesis until suitable grounds arrive. Keep uncertainty visible behind an attractive audience name. Age, occupation, or group membership may matter without necessarily explaining the difficulty. This article establishes no market-segmentation method. It preserves a particular connection: this participant, during this transition, under these conditions, with this unresolved question. Then examine how an offer differs from existing approaches and which change it actually promises.

III. An Account of Difficulty Is Not Measured Prevalence

A few persuasive accounts may reveal a task's structure without establishing how many people encounter it or how frequently. These are different questions. Three acquaintances describing similar episodes first establish the contents of those accounts; how the sample represents a wider group remains unknown. Do not turn conversation into a market percentage without relevant data. A hypothetical service creator hears that project handovers waste time. Clarify whether this means searching for documents, repeating agreement, or waiting for replies. This makes the description more substantive without automatically increasing prospective users. Preserve the boundary before investments or promises. An appealing account can sound like established widespread demand while resting on limited material requiring further inquiry.

Record where information came from: your episode, an identified participant's account, an available document, or research actually read. Every undertaking need not use identical sources. No material should be credited with more than it supplies. Current market size, financial assessment, or legal service conditions require separate verification and appropriate expertise beyond this philosophical article. Its earlier distinction concerns what is known about a task, assumed about prevalence, and needed before a consequential choice. A small project may serve a bounded situation without claiming mass demand; another step may require broader data. Neither route follows from an idea's attractiveness. Grounds should match the scale of a promise and action's cost so examining need does not become decorative confirmation of what the creator already decided.

IV. Another Person May Already Address the Task Differently

Your product's absence does not mean no approach exists. Someone may use a note, conversation, familiar tool, or role arrangement invisible to you. It may be awkward but adequate, or serve another important part of the task. Before declaring a new need, examine what the person already does and why they keep doing it. In a hypothetical studio, a complex agreement system competes with brief messages because projects are small. That choice does not show opposition to clarity; it shows the new arrangement's cost relative to the task. Meet an actual approach rather than an imagined void where people await your idea. Compare the existing route's benefits and limits under specific conditions.

In The Wealth of Nations, I.II, Smith considers exchange through participants' interests. This historically grounds another person's purpose without validating a modern product. Ask which change makes sense for the other side. Improvement under your criterion may require learning, time, or abandoning a useful habit. Nobody is obliged to pay that price. Offer another format, narrow the task, or acknowledge no suitable exchange yet. Every preference need not erase your purpose. Distinguish what you want to achieve from what someone else accepts as useful under their conditions. A mismatch informs further choice rather than authorizing explanations solely through ignorance, fear of novelty, or insufficient faith in the creator's talent.

V. Questions Should Allow the Idea to Remain Unconfirmed

A question containing its desired answer may obtain more politeness than information. “Our system would be more convenient, wouldn't it?” already asks agreement with your interpretation. A more definite question concerns an actual episode: “What happened in the latest handover? How did you identify the unresolved decision?” This original clarification proposal is no validated research script. It guarantees no accurate memory and does not turn a mediated account into direct observation. Participants may not remember, decline details, or find the question unsuitable. Preserve those limits. The aim is not to extract admission that a product is necessary, but understanding that can change your description. Leave room to hear that the difficulty differs, has another solution, or matters little to this person.

Do not ask someone to invent an entire group's hidden motives or predict behavior under every future condition. Possible use is an intention in that conversation, not an action already taken. A past account has its own limits. Separate direct information from your later inference. “The participant named three open questions” is narrower than “Every team needs a new service.” Personal or work data do not become unrestricted material merely because somebody agreed to talk. Clarify subject, intended use, and permissible recording. This article establishes no legal research or data regime; material questions require competent review. Everyday conversation can simply state why you ask and avoid treating refusal as an obstacle to circumvent with more cunning wording.

VI. Approval Is Not Readiness to Participate

People can sincerely praise an idea without needing to use it. “Beautiful,” “interesting,” and “I would try it” answer different questions: form, curiosity, or conditional intention. None automatically accepts actual conditions. In a hypothetical situation, acquaintances praise a service but decline a defined task because it is not currently needed. This does not establish dishonest praise; the answer's subject changed. Distinguish interest in an intention, an existing difficulty, and willingness to accept a contribution or participation cost. Readiness still guarantees no later behavior: decisions, circumstances, or understanding can change. Information remains limited to the actual offer and answer rather than expanding into promised future demand.

A definite answer needs an intelligible, honest proposal. Do not portray a concept as a finished product, conceal cost, or create false urgency for a test. Offer a bounded format openly, stating what exists and what remains unknown. Actual payments, data, or material consequences require current rules and appropriate competence; this article authorizes no arbitrary experiment with others' resources. Acceptance of a small format does not transfer automatically to a large one. It concerns named scope, conditions, and time. That limit may feel

insufficiently impressive to defend the idea. It makes the result substantive nevertheless: particular participation or refusal was received, rather than a pleasant story of everyone recognizing a future solution's necessity. Choose from that scale of knowledge while letting others remain participants rather than evidence of your correctness.

VII. Name Beforehand What Would Answer the Question

Before offering a bounded format, identify the question it can actually clarify. For example: does a participant need an overview of unresolved decisions before handing over a task? Their explanation of why it helped, or why existing arrangements were sufficient, may answer that question. It does not yet answer whether a future service will be profitable. Mixing several subjects beforehand makes any favorable result appear to confirm the entire intention. Someone used one page, and the author concludes that price, scale, audience, and working arrangements are all correct. Those conclusions are not contained in that event. The hypothetical keeps the assumption within its actual size: a named function in a particular situation, rather than the whole project's viability at once. A larger decision needs further relevant grounds and examination of material conditions. The result can still matter without being assigned more work than it can do.

Name a possible answer that would limit the idea too. The participant already hands over tasks comfortably through conversation; the overview adds nothing needed; completing it takes more attention than it saves. These do not establish failure for every service. They are conceivable answers in the chosen case. After the event, do not quietly replace them with another criterion because the original became inconvenient. Revise a criterion when a genuine error in the question is discovered, while acknowledging the revision and its reason. Keeping the initial record distinguishes new understanding from defending an old conclusion. This is an original discipline of reasoning, not a standardized research protocol. It sets no sample size, trial duration, or statistical threshold. Its narrower purpose is to keep the question from changing retrospectively whenever another person's answer fails to support the desired decision.

VIII. A Negative Instance Has Weight of Its Own

In Novum Organum, I.46, Bacon considers understanding's tendency to retain an accepted opinion and favor instances supporting it. The epigraph's fragment on a negative instance belongs to that philosophical context. It is historical reasoning about knowledge, not a measured study of customer behavior. Our contemporary application asks that an answer limiting the idea enter consideration alongside convenient answers. When someone explains why a new format interferes with their work, recording only other people's interest is insufficient. Understand disagreement within its own context too. It may concern an unnecessary function, participation conditions, or a misunderstanding needing clarification. A negative instance's force does not authorize assigning its meaning beforehand. Receiving an inconvenient account and understanding what it concerns are connected tasks; neither can be replaced by treating rejection as merely a difficult attitude.

Nor should a first refusal automatically order abandonment of the entire intention. One answer can contradict an overbroad statement such as “Everyone needs this,” without establishing how widespread the need actually is. Ask which assumption can no longer remain unchanged. If a participant already achieves the needed result, the idea adds no value for them under the stated conditions. If the result matters but the proposed format is inconvenient, the limit concerns that format. If circumstances have changed, reconsider the case's present relevance. These distinctions do not cancel an inconvenient answer; they give it a definite subject. Bacon's philosophical ground does not replace contemporary research. It reminds the author that evidence's convenience to an idea does not determine its significance, and that an appropriate continuation may begin by reducing earlier certainty rather than finding another way to protect it.

IX. Do Not Quietly Expand One Context to Everyone

After a substantive conversation, it is tempting to think the real person for whom the idea exists has finally been found. That may be an important starting point without resolving differences between situations. A hypothetical participant hands over a task monthly, has preparation time, and works with a regular colleague. Another does this daily with changing partners. The same difficulty's name establishes neither the same scale nor participation costs or suitable format. Do not transfer the first answer to the second merely because both said “handover.” Nor should everyone who does not fit be declared the wrong audience so the original idea remains permanently correct. Distinguish grounds for choosing a situation from subsequently excluding an inconvenient answer. When the boundary changes, name the change and examine whether the question originally needing resolution has survived.

Precisely limiting a result does not devalue the work. Say, “The need is described for this situation; another situation lacks sufficient grounds so far.” That is a more useful starting point than “People liked it.” It permits a further substantive question: does the difficulty recur elsewhere, do existing solutions differ, or does another participation cost emerge? A small reversible decision need not cover every conceivable market. Its promise must nevertheless match its grounds. This article specifies no universal number of conversations and derives no commercial forecast from a qualitative example. Decisions involving substantial resources, responsibilities toward others, or professional requirements need more than preliminary clarity. Further examination should concern the actual consequence instead of making a pile of records appear comprehensive. Appropriate caution follows the scale of commitment and remaining unknowns, rather than requiring an automatic halt after every mismatch. Limited knowledge can support a limited decision while remaining openly limited.

X. Attachment to an Intention Is Not an External Ground

When an idea has required long work, someone's refusal can sound like refusal to recognize that work. The author may explain how much effort was invested, which possibilities will emerge, and why the other ought to see its future. Explaining an intention is permissible, but the extent of attachment creates no need in another person. Someone who does not need the offer need not participate to justify your effort. In the hypothetical, a prepared system seems too important to its author to reduce to one function. Yet that function helped the other person while the remaining features added unnecessary steps. Recognize this result without declaring all earlier work meaningless. It helped reveal a previously hidden limit. That meaning of the past does not create an obligation to continue the same scale in the future or to persuade another person to adopt it.

Separate how revision affects you from the grounds available for the next decision. Feelings matter to a person without automatically answering on behalf of other participants. Take time, discuss difficulty with an appropriate conversation partner, and preserve useful parts of the work. Do not require a future user to confirm the idea as a way to restore its author's confidence. The opposite extreme is unnecessary too: strong attachment does not make every judgment false. It identifies where checking a conclusion's grounds particularly matters. This examination does not diagnose character or prove that convinced people understand needs less well. It distinguishes internal reasons to continue from external grounds for an offer. A person retains dignity when an intention changes; another retains a task of their own, which need not support someone else's life story. Both can be respected without pretending that emotional significance establishes practical fit.

XI. Revise the Form While Retaining the Actual Question

A conversation may show a real need addressed inconveniently by the idea. Revision need not abandon all the work. Examine function, format, conditions, and scale separately. A hypothetical participant needs a clear list of unresolved decisions but does not need a complex new system requiring daily maintenance. A simpler way to obtain the list may become a suitable offer. That remains an assumption needing an answer, not a recommendation that every developer shrink a product. Sometimes complexity serves the actual task; sometimes simplification removes an important possibility. The described situation and participant's actual result should ground revision. Connect change to a discovered limit, or the author may merely replace one attractive form with another without coming closer to the need. Redesign's appeal is not itself evidence that the original difficulty has been addressed.

Near the beginning of The Fixation of Belief, section II, Peirce discusses reasoning and its relation to how things stand. His observation that we are not perfectly logical creatures should not reproach a user who rejects an offer. Our application addresses the author first: a conclusion's felt persuasiveness still needs examination of its grounds. Changing a form can respond reasonably to information or evade an inconvenient question. Retain the connection: which answer was received, which condition did it limit, and why does the proposed change concern that condition? Peirce supplies neither a modern development scheme nor a measured method of finding customers here. We use the philosophical context actually read without attributing a procedure from unread portions to it. The next step remains a definite offer with unknowns honestly named, rather than a declaration that revision has finally proved the idea.

XII. Let the Next Step Match the Knowledge Obtained

Clarification may lead to several decisions: continue within a bounded format, change the offer, investigate what is missing, or stop this particular intention. None inherently demonstrates courage or reasonableness apart from its grounds. If the participant's task is understood and a small format is suitable, examine its actual conditions. If a need is named but the solution does not fit, reconsider their relationship. If the difficulty itself remains uncertain in the chosen situation, premature refinement may deepen attachment to an unexamined answer. When available grounds do not support continuation, stopping can preserve resources for another undertaking. None guarantees the correct choice in every circumstance. The author's task is to explain the next step through knowledge obtained and unknowns acknowledged, instead of relying only on a desire to preserve the idea unchanged. The decision's scale should remain within what those grounds can carry.

End with a brief record rather than a triumphant conclusion. What was actually heard and observed? What remains assumed? In which situation does it matter? What can no longer support the earlier form? Which question needs answering before a more consequential promise? This record neither appropriates another voice nor substitutes your interpretation for their view. Distinguish an actual answer, your interpretation, and a chosen action while respecting permissible handling of others' information. An idea relates substantively to a need when another person ceases to be imagined confirmation. They can agree, limit, suggest a different subject, or decline. Respecting their answer guarantees no commercial success. It permits more honest continuing work: making an offer for an actual task rather than searching for a task required to justify an offer you already love. Revision and refusal then remain information rather than obstacles that the other person must remove for you.

What this means in practice

Take one idea and name the situation before describing a solution. Who encounters which difficulty, when, and how do they act now? Record where this understanding came from: personal experience, an account actually heard, or an assumption. Do not present an invented portrait or general audience image as researched information.

Formulate one question actually needing an answer, such as which unresolved task someone cannot hand over in a convenient way. Let them describe a recent case and existing alternatives without prompting a compulsory conclusion about your solution. Respect refusal and permissible handling of others' information; collect no unnecessary detail merely to make the record persuasive.

Distinguish what you heard, your interpretation, and an intended action. Approval, an account of difficulty, and acceptance of particular conditions concern different subjects. Name what could limit the initial idea. If offering a small format, state honestly its availability, scope, and unknowns. Material payments, data, and consequences require relevant rules and expertise rather than an improvised experiment.

After the answer, identify the assumption supported in a limited sense, what changed, and the situation within which the conclusion remains relevant. Do not transfer one case to an entire market or replace an inconvenient answer with a description of the person's character. When revising a question or criterion, retain the revision and its grounds instead of rewriting the initial intention retrospectively.

Choose a next step: bounded continuation, change, further clarification, or stopping this intention. Explain it through knowledge obtained and material unknowns. This original practice guarantees neither demand nor success. Its result may be a more precise question or a clear refusal. Respecting that result preserves work and dignity without requiring another person's

need to justify your attachment to an offer. A smaller conclusion can be a substantive outcome when it better represents what the encounter actually showed.

Key quotation

> *We are, doubtless, in the main logical animals, but we are not perfectly so.*

Charles S. Peirce, The Fixation of Belief, II; exact short sentence from the checked transcription of the 1877 English essay. Philosophical reasoning, not diagnosis or a development procedure.

Connections between traditions

1. **Offer and the other's side:** Smith (Wealth of Nations, I.II) considers exchange through a participant's interest; Peirce (Fixation of Belief, II–IV) discusses reasoning, belief, and grounds. Our bridge distinguishes an idea's appeal to its author from its relation to another task. This creates neither one value theory nor guaranteed demand.

2. **Convenient answers and negative instances:** Bacon (Novum Organum, I.46) criticizes preference for supporting instances; Peirce considers limits to our logical character. Comparison addresses the author first, without measuring modern cognitive bias or declaring a disagreeing user illogical.

3. **Personal history and external grounds:** Peirce distinguishes belief and reasoning's grounds; Smith considers appeal to another's interest in exchange. Recognize invested work's meaning without obliging another to justify it. Philosophy yields no commercial price, prevalence, or behavioral forecast here.

4. **Revision and a result's limits:** Bacon grounds attention to limiting instances; Peirce supports examining a conclusion's grounds. Distinguishing function, format, and conditions belongs to our article. Neither source sets a universal sample, duration, or viability test.

5. **Preserved differences:** Smith concerns exchange, Bacon understanding's tendencies, and Peirce reasoning and belief fixation. These do not become one ancient customer-research method. Original practice connects particular questions to limited knowledge while retaining a participant's right to decline.

Primary sources

1. Francis Bacon. Novum Organum, I.46 — primary philosophy; aphorism fully read in the English edition edited by Joseph Devey, 1902 imprint. Supporting and negative instances; this transcription's translator is unidentified and no Latin collation was performed.

2. Charles S. Peirce. The Fixation of Belief, II–IV — primary 1877 philosophy in a Wikisource transcription; named sections actually read. Reasoning and grounds for belief; no original periodical collation or procedure from unread section VI.

3. Adam Smith. Wealth of Nations, I.II — primary historical text; chapter fully read in Project Gutenberg's English transcription, exact print edition unidentified. Exchange participants' interests, without market statistics, investment forecast, or financial advice.

Tags

idea, need, offer, participant, situation, difficulty, existing solution, approval, readiness, participation, question, evidence, assumption, ground, negative instance, context, prevalence, inference limit, function, format, condition, revision, attachment, effort, dignity, refusal, Bacon, Peirce, Smith, exchange, reasoning

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.