

UNITED WISDOM

Fear and uncertainty: what exactly do I not know

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I13 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Fear and uncertainty: what exactly do I not know

Andrey Zarinsh · Maria Evilkut

Epigraph

> *“when you do not know a thing, to allow that you do not know it”.*

Confucius, Analects II.17, excerpt, translated by James Legge. Project Gutenberg edition.

What this article is about

Fear sometimes begins with an unanswered question. What will happen? Can I cope? How will someone respond? Yet the word unknown can hide different gaps: missing facts, unpredictable choices, insufficient skills or no safe route. They require different actions. One more message is not always useful, and reassuring ourselves that everything will be fine does not establish what needs knowing.

We examine how to turn the unknown into a definite question without self-diagnosis or treatment promises. A scientific review shows why anticipating possible threats matters without identifying an individual's cause of fear. Philosophical and religious texts offer different relationships to knowledge limits and action's outcomes. The practical task is separating information, forecasts, resources and available choice. Sometimes a fact can be found; sometimes several outcomes need preparation. Sometimes danger is already known, while the route to reduced risk remains uncertain. A more accurate map guarantees no calm but can reveal which answer is needed for the next step.

I. The unknown needs a more precise name

Asking what one fears need not yield one answer because an event contains several unknowns. A conversation may be certain while its topic, the other's response and one's own capacity remain unclear. These gaps can merge into a general sense of threat. Separating them does not require calling fear mistaken. It identifies the question and which answer could change an immediate decision. Treating everything as one uncertainty makes searching endless: each detail leaves other gaps intact, suggesting information never helps.

A hypothetical manager writes that they want to speak tomorrow. An employee fears dismissal. The message establishes timing and a conversation, not its topic. Dismissal may be supported by conflict, downsizing or an earlier threat, or inferred without those facts. Keep them

separate. The topic might be asked where available; the manager's decision may remain open; the employee's resources require preparation. Missing guarantees do not mean no useful action exists, but action cannot turn a forecast into a fact before evidence arrives.

In Analects II.17, Confucius connects knowledge with acknowledging what is known and unknown. This is Confucian ethical instruction, not an experimental anxiety-reduction method. Our application preserves information's status. The message and certain dismissal occupy different places. A clarification changes the relevant question. Without it, uncertainty remains rather than proving the worst because it has been experienced intensely. A gap can be acknowledged without being welcomed.

End clarification by asking about the next decision. Which information is needed to choose preparation or action? Not every unknown matters now. Knowing whether to bring documents may suffice while the outcome stays open. The topic may be clear but timing missing, or facts may be known while readiness is absent. More searching need not address the latter. Separating knowledge from readiness means fear need not disappear before the next choice becomes less indefinite. The unknown gains a subject instead of authority over the whole future.

II. Anticipating threat differs from immediate danger

Everyday fear and anxiety have varied meanings, so a person's word cannot assign a scientific category. For an episode, ask whether danger is immediate or a possible event is anticipated. This does not rank seriousness: prolonged uncertainty can be difficult, and quiet behaviour amid risk does not establish safety. Subject and timing matter. Someone may see definite danger while not knowing its continuation, creating several tasks for which simply waiting for information is insufficient.

Grupe and Nitschke's 2013 review examines anticipation of uncertain threats through psychological and neural processes using human and animal research. It is an integrative review, not a new single-sample experiment or a reader diagnostic tool. The authors distinguish adaptive processes from disturbances in pathological anxiety without identifying a sole cause from an everyday account. Our limited use is that uncertain future threats deserve examination. We assign no clinical status and prescribe no treatment from the proposed model.

Awaiting a work decision may concern income loss next month. Facing a threatening speaker concerns present conduct and whether contact can safely end. Both may involve fear while requiring different immediate choices. In the second, a perfect account of motives must not precede protection. In the first, preparing options may serve better than constant phone checking. These hypothetical examples do not establish readers' available actions. They show

why timing, risk and capacity matter without declaring all feelings equally mistaken or accurate.

Strong feeling establishes experience, not the full forecast; weak feeling does not disprove threatening facts. Assessment requires events, consequences, repetition and resources. Earlier threats or coercion are substantial evidence not cancelled by inward uncertainty. Where such information is absent, an unknown outcome does not automatically become dangerous. Caution can coexist with an open forecast. Scientific distinctions clarify questions without persuading people that fear is always unfounded or that every frightening possibility must occur.

III. Facts, likelihood and costs address different questions

A possible outcome, its likelihood and its cost differ. An unlikely event can matter through serious consequences; a likely one can be manageable; frequency can remain unknown while consequences are partly understood. No unsupported percentages are required. Where evidence is absent, avoid false precision. Calling something almost certain needs more than emotional force, and calling risk small also needs support, especially when asking another to bear its cost.

Someone hypothetically addressing a small group may not know whether they will make a mistake but can anticipate losing a thought and consulting notes. The cost may be limited. Elsewhere, an error may concern an irreversible action affecting property or safety. Uncertainty matters more even if fear is weaker. Professional decisions have their own procedures, which this article does not replace. The comparison shows why a generic instruction to accept uncertainty is inadequate: some gaps can remain, while others require stopping to check because consequences differ in scale.

Confucian acknowledgement of limits in II.17 preserves an ethical question of honesty without supplying risk statistics. Our practice adds asking what is known and from where. Relevant data, comparable experience and participant accounts can help with limits recorded. One case does not establish frequency. The absence of previous damage does not guarantee that damage is impossible. Changed conditions may require revised forecasts. Honesty includes declining convenient numbers that look more convincing than their grounds.

Costs depend on resources. The same financial loss can inconvenience one person and threaten another's housing. Refusal can mean disappointment or losing the only support available. An event's external name cannot measure fear's reasonableness. Ask what is affected and which possibilities remain. This does not make every frightening hypothesis true. It requires examining consequences for this participant, making uncertainty a concrete choice under incomplete information and unequal capacity rather than an abstract courage test.

IV. More searching does not close every gap

Information helps when it answers a consequential question and can change a decision. Searching may reduce a gap or repeat knowledge while briefly sustaining confidence. Frequency alone cannot distinguish these. Repeated searches may address unreliable or conflicting evidence, or revisit one answer without new grounds. Ask which information is needed and what would be done differently if obtained. If no answer changes choice, the task may no longer concern a discoverable fact.

A hypothetical employee rereads the meeting message every ten minutes without new information. Perhaps the topic must come from the manager; perhaps work records need preparing; perhaps resources for an unwelcome outcome matter. These tasks have different addresses. Punctuation cannot reliably reveal another's future choice. Asking directly may also be unavailable or unsafe. The choice then concerns limited preparation rather than extracting an answer at any cost. The gap remains visible alongside what is possible without it.

In Enchiridion §1, Epictetus distinguishes one's actions from what lies outside one's power. The Stoic formula is more radical than a contemporary resources account; its promise of unhindered freedom is not transferred as a guarantee. Our narrower application concerns a limit: searching may reveal another's action without making it ours. Absolute knowledge of another's future choice may be unattainable. Acknowledging that does not require abandoning available questions or ignoring actual consequences.

Searching can have a sufficiency condition. A task may need a confirmed deadline and materials, another a reliable procedure and accountable person, another several options instead of one forecast. This is no universal checklist or command to conserve attention at all costs. Serious risk may require further checks. Verification should nevertheless differ from guaranteed protection. Information may justify a limited reversible step while remaining insufficient for an irreversible one. Naming that distinction helps more than demanding certainty or blaming oneself because the next fact did not remove all fear.

V. Resources and confidence do not substitute for each other

Someone may understand a situation accurately without resources to act, possess skills while fearing an unknown response, or feel confident without grounds. Asking how to stop fearing may therefore be too broad. A fact, a skill, time, funds or support may be needed. Neither knowledge nor confidence automatically creates these. A practical map retains material and social conditions rather than making inward state the sole explanation of available choice.

A hypothetical person wants another job because current conditions do not fit. Offers, savings and family reactions are uncertain. Some questions permit evidence gathering, some resource

assessment, some conversation if available. Strong fear can accompany reasonable caution; calm action can be poorly prepared. This scene offers neither career nor financial advice. It separates wanting to leave from being able to leave today. Preparation between them is not lack of courage when it actually changes the step's availability.

Bhagavad Gita 2.47 distinguishes action from possession of its fruits while rejecting attachment to inaction. Its religious setting is Krishna's conversation with Arjuna, discipline and duty; commentaries connect it with liberation. It does not instruct people to perform every task unprepared. Our limited comparison suggests that no guaranteed outcome need not mean no available action. Consequences still require assessment, resources are not cancelled by nonattachment, and an assigned role does not automatically become ethically justified.

Small actions can sometimes increase resources, though not invariably. Describing experience, clarifying a condition or arranging support may help without guaranteeing an option. Continuing external limits must remain on the map. Assess preparation by actual changes: a contact, confirmed timing, clarified skill or reduced cost of refusal. If it repeats familiar information, reconsider its task. This distinguishes careful preparation from indefinite waiting for certainty without attributing every delay to fear or calling every rapid action inward freedom.

VI. Spiritual support does not promise a safe outcome

Faith or philosophy can affect how someone participates in uncertainty, but meaningful support is not evidence that an event will end safely. Confusing these turns religious trust into a forecast its source never established. Prayer may support one person, Stoic distinctions another, and a third may choose no spiritual framework. We prescribe none universally. Ask what each actually addresses and where its application ends regarding facts and resources.

In Matthew 6:25–34, tomorrow belongs to Jesus' teaching about care, trust in the Father and seeking God's kingdom. This Christian theological framework does not promise no future loss. Gita 2.47 situates action's fruits in another spiritual discipline. Shared interest in participation without possessing the future does not make teachings identical. Neither passage should establish an obligation to abandon preparation, protection or serious consequence assessment.

A hypothetical person awaiting a difficult conversation turns to a religious text and finds an orientation against surrendering all attention to tomorrow's forecast. They also check documents, choose a role and consider previous threats. These actions need not conflict. If someone uses scripture to prohibit mentioning risk, support becomes pressure. Who determines its application and whether the framework is freely accepted matter. Consolation

must not require denying facts, and its absence proves neither deficient faith nor moral weakness.

Epictetus' distinction also limits contemporary transfer. His school gives externals a particular ethical status; we do not treat harm as physically disappearing. Available action can be noticed without promising independence from housing, income or others. A meaningful reference helps when it clarifies choice and preserves facts instead of replacing them. One outcome is knowing one's experiential support separately from what remains unknown about an event. This respects faith, philosophy and empirical grounds without substituting them or claiming universal agreement.

VII. Danger may be known while a way out remains unknown

Uncertainty need not concern whether a situation is dangerous. Someone may know of coercion, threats or repeated harm while lacking a step that reduces risk. Debating whether likelihood is exaggerated can then divert attention from established circumstances. Feeling alone does not prove danger; the event and its history matter. When those exist, ask which options are available, their consequences and needed information or resources. Inward clarity does not automatically create safety, and no available route does not falsify knowledge of harm.

Consider dependence on someone who has threatened loss of housing after objections. Their next response remains uncertain, but the earlier threat is substantial evidence. Directly stating expectations may increase risk. Reflection helps distinguish options and costs rather than promise brave disclosure. Is a safe channel, support or preparation possible? This article supplies no individual protection plan and does not replace appropriate services or professional assistance. It preserves the principle that safety and external power belong in the picture rather than disappearing behind inward fear.

Elsewhere, someone is responsible for an outcome without authority over resources and fears mistakes and punishment. Searching may clarify requirements without resolving conflicting authority. Safer action may require identifying who actually decides and how constraints can be reported. Conversation may be unavailable, an honest limit rather than automatic passivity. Distinguish personal action from the environment: an execution error, incomplete information and unsuitable responsibility arrangements have different grounds and consequences.

Final proof of malicious intention need not precede every protective limit. An intelligible risk and appropriate role may justify reduced contact or declining participation. Yet actions with serious consequences for others also need sufficient grounds. Measure survives recognition of danger. Our approach avoids both turning real constraints into psychological defects and making fear unconditional permission for any response. A small step may leave the larger

situation unresolved. Assess whether it reduces a particular risk or expands an option, not whether it proves complete courage before the unknown.

VIII. Decisions under incomplete knowledge include revision

A choice under uncertainty becomes clearer when reasons for revision are identified beforehand. This acknowledges new evidence without promising infallibility. A conversation may change when its topic is clarified, preparation when timing changes, participation after a threat or new support. Be as specific as circumstances permit. If every event confirms the original forecast, revision disappears; if every detail cancels a decision, participation becomes unstable. Distinguish consequential information from interesting details that leave the current choice intact.

A hypothetical employee prepares work records, confirms timing and postpones a final conclusion until the meeting, also identifying where to obtain information after an unwelcome outcome. Fear need not disappear. Some tasks are nevertheless completed: evidence, preparation and conditions for the next decision exist. A different topic changes the forecast; a new demand creates a question. There is no obligation to preserve an explanation for narrative consistency. Correcting the picture is knowledge gained, not defeat because yesterday's feeling was strong.

Confucian honesty, Stoic distinctions and the spiritual relation to the future in Gita and Matthew offer different grounds. They neither confirm a universal algorithm nor remove constraints. Our practice turns them into questions about knowledge, participation, support and what cannot be guaranteed. The uncertainty review reveals complex anticipatory processes without supplying an individual's map. That requires their information and corrections. Shared acknowledgement of limited possession of the future remains partial and does not turn religious hope into empirical likelihood.

Revision may lead to action, further checking or maintaining a pause; each can fit different conditions. Complete calm is unnecessary. Someone may identify the gap more accurately, choose manageable preparation and stop treating the worst scenario as already accomplished. They may also recognise real risk and needed resources. This is less reassuring than declaring nothing wrong, but more reliable in its subject. It permits updating when life provides information rather than requiring events to enact present fears or consolations.

What this means in practice

Start with one sentence identifying what is unknown: the conversation's topic, timing, consequences of refusing or capacity to perform. If too general, choose the nearest event. Place known facts and their sources alongside it: a message, observation, participant account or memory. Do not present a report as externally verified. Separately identify the forecast and why it seems possible. Unclear grounds remain a gap. Feeling can be acknowledged without becoming evidence, and threatening facts can be recognised even when feeling is weak.

Distinguish four questions: the missing fact, what cannot yet be predicted, the needed resource and the available action. Not all answers come from the internet or another person; some concern participation and actual conditions. A work episode might require timing, materials and responsibility. An unsafe relationship may require support and reduced risk before direct presentation. This provides neither individual treatment nor a protection plan. It prevents external constraints from becoming demands for confidence and avoids requiring complete knowledge of motives before every careful step.

Identify a sufficiency condition for searching. What information changes the next decision, who can provide it, and what reliability does the potential error require? Irreversible steps or substantial safety consequences can require appropriate procedures and roles beyond ordinary advice. Limited reversible actions may sometimes leave gaps open, but this cannot be prescribed universally. Pausing, declining discussion and acknowledging absent resources remain possible without turning uncertainty into personal malfunction.

Choose a reason to return: a message, deadline, new circumstances or changed support. Then identify what became known and what remains. Prepared materials, a completed conversation, revised decisions and less fear are distinct results. None proves the others. A more accurate unknown and one manageable action may be the outcome. That does not promise complete calm, but can ground a step in distinguishable facts, limits and values. The future stays open while participation need not await a lifetime guarantee.

Key quotation

> *“Some things are in our control and others not”.*

Epictetus, Enchiridion §1, opening sentence, translated by Elizabeth Carter. Text. Our contemporary application concerns available action; strong Stoic promises are not offered as guarantees.

Connections between traditions

The table preserves forms of knowledge. Scientific review, ethical instruction and religious support address different questions even when all discuss the future.

Comparison	Similarity	Limit
Confucius II.17 ↔ naming unknowns	Information's limits matter	Ethical learning is not anxiety treatment
Grupe/Nitschke ↔ possible threats	Anticipation and uncertainty deserve distinction	A human and animal review does not diagnose readers
Epictetus §1 ↔ Gita 2.47	Action does not give full possession of outcomes	Stoic control and spiritual nonattachment have different grounds
Matthew 6:25–34 ↔ Gita 2.47	Participation need not possess the future	Trust in the Father differs from discipline concerning action's fruits
Confucius ↔ empirical checking	Claims should not conceal gaps	Honesty about knowledge does not supply risk statistics

Primary sources and research

• Confucius; translated by James Legge. Analects, II.17 — II.17, James Legge translation, Project Gutenberg 3330; acknowledging limits of knowledge.

• Dan W. Grupe; Jack B. Nitschke. Uncertainty and anticipation in anxiety: an integrated neurobiological and psychological perspective (2013) — Nature Reviews Neuroscience 14, 488–501; DOI 10.1038/nrn3524; review introduction and uncertainty framework, not a new trial.

• Epictetus. Enchiridion, §§1, 5, 20 — §§1, 5, 20, Elizabeth Carter translation; control, judgement and delay.

• Bhagavad Gita; translations and commentary on Gita Supersite. Bhagavad Gita 2.47 — 2.47, Gita Supersite; action, fruits and inaction; accessible indexed verse and commentary read, not the whole chapter.

• New Testament, Gospel of Matthew. Matthew 6:25–34, King James Version — 6:25–34, KJV; care, heavenly Father, kingdom and righteousness, and tomorrow.

Tags

inner navigation, human experience, emotions, distinctions, life episode, interpretation, responsibility, consent, dignity, safety, boundaries, relationships, dialogue, choice, consequences, uncertainty, attention, ethical judgement, hypothetical example, philosophy, religion, research, United Wisdom, practical reflection, facts, Fear and uncertainty, preparation

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 coauthor 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.