

UNITED WISDOM

The Information Environment: What I Let into My Inner World Each Day

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I47 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Information Environment: What I Let into My Inner World Each Day

Epigraph

> *“Think about these things”.*

Philippians 4:8, World English Bible; initial capitalisation is editorial. The context is a Christian moral exhortation connected with prayer and community life, not an instruction to choose only pleasant news.

What this article is about

Imagine Elena, a fictional character through whom an ordinary day can be examined. In the morning, she reads a colleague’s message; on the way to work, she encounters several news items; at lunch, she hears a conversation about someone else’s success; in the evening, she opens an article and receives a family video. By night, she feels that the day was troubling. Yet she cannot immediately say which message changed her plans, which provided useful knowledge, and which merely accompanied other activities. There was plenty of information, but its origins and consequences merged into one impression. Examining this day does not yet identify the cause of her unease.

We will use “information environment” for the messages, conversations, texts, and images available to a person, together with their habitual ways of approaching them. Personal choice matters here: which subjects receive space, whom we trust, what we check, and what attitude we carry forward. This article does not explain platform algorithms or propose an ideal phone configuration. Nor does it establish a particular material’s medical effects. Its question is more accessible to observation: what can I describe in my own daily flow before calling it beneficial, harmful, or inevitable?

Several sources support that question. Seneca considers reading and assimilation in Stoic philosophy; Bacon distinguishes purposes of study and judgment; a Christian letter addresses moral attention. Contemporary news-sharing research concerns accuracy under particular experimental conditions. These sources do not assert the same theory of an information environment. Our observation journal is an editorial suggestion, not a method belonging to any of these authors. It separates a message’s content, the grounds for trusting it, our response, and our subsequent action, while preserving the possibility of not knowing what connects them in a particular episode.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Start with What Actually Came In

An evening impression is easily described with one word: heavy, interesting, empty, busy. But that word does not reveal the day's composition. In our fictional scene, Elena may remember five different incoming items and notice that only one concerned a decision she faced that day. The others were not necessarily superfluous: the family video maintained contact, the lunchtime conversation belonged to social life, and the article may have satisfied an interest. Observation is not about accusing each message of stealing time. It reveals different functions that disappear when every item is placed under one heading, "information consumption."

An initial description needs only a small list, rather than a complete account of every minute. You can record the subject, channel, and circumstance: a work request at the beginning of the day, news of an event during a journey, or a conversation over a meal. A channel is not yet the source of a claim. A chat may contain a summary of a publication; the publication, a participant's comment; the comment, someone else's guess. If you remember only where you encountered the message, that is a useful beginning. Do not reconstruct the chain from memory and present it as verified. "Original source unknown" keeps the question open more accurately than confidently naming a familiar channel.

Such a list has a privacy boundary. It requires neither saving other people's personal messages nor copying private conversations or turning loved ones into research material. You can note "family conversation" without its contents. If information is confidential work material, observation must likewise remain within permitted access conditions. The practice addresses your own way of choosing and responding; it provides no right to collect everything others have said. Completeness is not the journal's main virtue. A few episodes are enough to examine the question without expanding access or disclosure beyond what is needed.

II. A Message Contains Different Parts

Suppose a forwarded note describes a new institutional decision and adds, "Now everything will change for good." A verifiable event, an interpretation of consequences, and an emotional assessment may coexist here. Readers may be interested in all three. But when preparing to act, it helps to identify which part supports the decision. A document's adoption date is checked differently from a prediction about people's behaviour. An expressive assessment replaces neither. Even when we share that assessment, it remains an assessment; this does not diminish its value but clarifies which question can be asked of it.

Elena might restate the message in her own words: "A decision is reported; the author anticipates these consequences; I felt worried." This is neither an official fact-checking procedure nor proof of neutrality. The description can also be mistaken, so an important action requires checking the document itself and the relevant conditions. Still, it is already apparent

that worry followed the entire message's construction, rather than necessarily one verified fact. There is no need to draw the reverse conclusion that an anxious response proves the note false. A real event can also be troubling; distinguishing parts does not settle their truth in advance.

This distinction is particularly easy to lose in everyday conversation. "Everyone does that now" may reflect a few observed cases, an assessment of a norm, or an invitation to join in. You can ask which cases are meant if the question matters and the conversation allows it. Not every conversation needs to become an examination of evidence. Sometimes its purpose is to share an experience rather than provide a statistical picture. Precision also includes recognising the conversation's purpose. A friendly account should not become ready-made data for a sweeping conclusion about people; equally, the account need not be dismissed as a human encounter.

III. Trusting a Name and Checking a Claim

A familiar author can be a good guide to a topic. They reduce the effort of searching and offer intelligible language. Trusting them does not, however, make all their statements equally reliable. A specialist may speak within their field, retell news from another, or share a personal preference. Each statement has its own status. Elena can separately note in her journal that she accepted a message because she was accustomed to the author's name. That is no confession of stupidity or reason to abandon every familiar voice. It describes a basis for trust that, when necessary, can be supplemented by checking a particular claim.

When a message concerns an important choice, follow a bounded chain: who makes the claim, how do they know, and what is actually available to check? Sometimes the original material is found but concerns another group, period, or set of circumstances. A reference then exists, while transferring its conclusion still requires an explanation. Sometimes the source contains a hypothesis that becomes a confident fact in the retelling. Our example does not prove that this always happens. It illustrates a question worth asking in a particular important episode. The number of references alone reveals neither whether they support the relevant claim nor whether the relevant parts were read.

A check may end by acknowledging uncertainty. You can keep the material as a question, postpone a decision, or choose an action that does not require the disputed fact. Not finding confirmation should not be substituted for a definitive refutation. Nor is it necessary endlessly to investigate every minor detail of the day. Effort should be proportionate to the decision: personal taste is enough to choose an entertaining story, while an action with significant consequences needs suitable grounds. If reliability depends on professional knowledge you lack, acknowledge that boundary. A personal journal does not make its reader a universal expert or remove the need for competent advice.

IV. A Response and a Message’s Reliability

One item inspires, another irritates, and a third leaves a sense of inadequacy. These responses can be noted without making them proof of a source’s quality. Suppose an account of someone’s success prompts Elena to think, “I’m falling behind again.” She can separate the account from her comparison in the journal. The author may have said nothing about her life. Alternatively, the publication may indeed have proposed a rigid measure of success. Distinguishing those possibilities requires returning to the content instead of deciding everything from the intensity of an unpleasant feeling. A response deserves attention, but it does not automatically know another person’s intention or the whole cause of our own state.

Describe the emotional trace concretely enough: a wish to argue, a wish to buy immediately, a desire to contact someone, or difficulty finishing the current task. These are possible responses in the fictional scene, not established effects of the messages described. “Bad” often combines experiences that call for different decisions. Sometimes stopping reading is appropriate. Sometimes a question needs clarification. Sometimes an unpleasant item reports a reality that cannot be made pleasant simply by choosing another source. Observation need not resolve every response into calm; it helps name an available action and the limits of an explanation.

Sequence in time supplies no single cause. Feeling worse after an evening news selection is a meaningful episode, but fatigue, unresolved work, and a simultaneous conversation may also have been present. This article proposes no self-experiment involving deliberate repetition of an unpleasant exposure. You can begin with ordinary description and a voluntary change to a suitable condition without demanding causal proof. A noticeable, lasting deterioration in everyday life exceeds this editorial reminder’s scope. An appropriate professional conversation then matters more than a promise that a new list of channels will necessarily correct the condition.

V. The Subjects That Receive Space

After several entries, recurring subjects may become visible. They might include work, conflict, others’ achievements, shopping, or caring for family. Repetition does not automatically mean overload or imposition. Work information may genuinely be necessary during a project; family matters may reflect loved ones’ actual circumstances. The question concerns the relation between repetition and intention. Did you want to return to this subject daily? If so, which parts help? If not, how does it receive space? Personal choice can coexist with restrictions that one reading decision cannot remove.

Absent subjects are also interesting, but caution is needed. If the journal contains no nature, art, or history, that does not prove a poor inner life. You may have encountered them outside

the recorded time or may not consider them a current concern at all. Ask whether something personally desired is missing: a subject you wanted to return to but for which no space appeared. The answer comes from your own interest rather than a compulsory cultural menu. The journal should not become a test of being well-rounded. It makes a choice visible, after which you may retain or revise it.

In our scene, Elena notices that she has long wanted to understand a professional problem but has read only discussions of other people's assessments of it. Those are different activities. She can allocate time to primary material without declaring the discussions useless. Alternatively, she may discover that her real interest concerned the community's reaction. That outcome is legitimate too. Precision helps us avoid demanding one type of information perform another's task. An account of people, a review of opinions, and an investigation of how something works can each be valuable, but they do not automatically replace one another. Change begins with a clear purpose rather than an accusation against the entire familiar environment.

VI. What Am I Reading For?

In the short essay Of Studies, Bacon distinguishes purposes of reading and emphasises personal judgment. The entire essay was read, but this is historical thought rather than a contemporary experiment; its medical analogies are not transferred into health recommendations. In our editorial situation, the distinction becomes a question for one item: do I want a fact, an argument understood, pleasure, a conversation maintained, or a decision prepared? Several aims may coexist. There is no need to select the only correct one. A clear purpose does, however, reveal when material answers one request while the reader continues to demand another.

A popular account, for example, may introduce a subject well without providing sufficient grounds for a practical conclusion. That is not necessarily a defect if no such conclusion was promised. Elena can finish it with a new question and then consult an appropriate document or professional. The reverse situation is a detailed study expected to provide easy evening entertainment. You can decline to read it now while retaining respect for it. A reading purpose does not establish a text's truth, but it explains why a good publication may be unsuitable for the chosen moment. Not every mismatch needs to be experienced as personal intellectual inadequacy.

Sometimes we read to make an impression on someone else: we want to seem informed, have an argument, or avoid being excluded from company. These are human intentions that can be noticed without immediate shame. The important distinction is not to present them as understanding already achieved. "Learned a formulation" differs from "examined its grounds." If a substantive conversation is ahead, the gap suggests a next question. If only light

conversation is needed, extensive investigation may be unnecessary. Self-inquiry here does not mean purifying ourselves of every social motive. It reveals which motive directs a particular encounter with information and which result was actually obtained.

VII. Familiar Voices and an Open Question

In the selected paragraphs of his second letter, Seneca urges staying with authors and assimilating a thought. This is Stoic exhortation rather than empirical proof that source diversity is harmful. He is not directly quoted here, and his medical comparisons are not transferred into treatment. This source raises a question about depth of reading but does not authorise closing the information circle. In our editorial scene, we can return to one argument and check what became clear. Another source may nevertheless be necessary, especially when a familiar author omits an objection or speaks beyond their competence.

Sustained reading and diversity need not compete as slogans. They address different tasks. Understanding a position requires giving it enough space; evaluating a disputed question may require comparing grounds. Rapidly changing names guarantees no diversity of perspectives: different channels sometimes repeat the same claim. Conversely, one author may fairly present several strong objections. A personal journal allows a more precise question: which grounds were encountered, rather than how many names passed before our eyes? The answer requires content, not merely a subscription list or an attractive self-assessment of open-mindedness.

An unfamiliar voice does not automatically deserve trust either. Seeking disagreement may lead to material that misrepresents the subject. Openness means an opportunity to examine grounds, rather than an obligation to accept all versions as equally valid. Elena might write, “This contradicts the familiar view; I do not yet know what supports it.” Such an entry preserves both interest and checking. It requires neither defending the old position at any cost nor declaring the new one true because it is bold. Source choice remains revisable, but revision follows a question and evidence rather than only pleasure in intellectual novelty.

VIII. Unpleasant Content and Moral Attention

Philippians 4:8–9 connects subjects of thought with the moral life of a Christian community. Those verses and the nearby prayer context were read; this is religious exhortation, not a demonstrated way to improve mood. It yields no rule to read only good and pleasant things. In an editorial comparison, the moral question must be separated from emotional comfort. A report about difficult reality may deserve attention even when unpleasant. A beautiful, reassuring account may require checking if it contains a significant claim. Religious value, factual accuracy, and personal response remain different dimensions.

Personal choice also concerns how we look at people. We can read about conflict to understand participants' circumstances, seek a solution, or obtain another confirmation that "they're all like that." In the latter case, notice your own generalisation rather than attributing it to the source without checking. Elena can ask whether she learned something about a particular situation or merely reinforced a convenient image of a group. This demands neither immediate reconciliation with everyone nor the abandonment of judgments about actions. An action can be condemned while preserving accuracy and avoiding turning one instance into a final portrait of every similar person.

Moral attention does not mean an obligation to endure an unlimited flow of suffering. You can limit involvement when unable to continue and separately decide whether help is available. Stopping reading does not prove indifference; continuous reading does not prove effective care. Nor should limiting material be promised to remove every consequence of an experience. Our practical question is: what do I know, what can I do, and where is my boundary now? Sometimes the answer is a particular action, and sometimes an acknowledgment that none is available. A journal should not substitute a count of troubling messages viewed for actual help.

IX. What I Pass On

The publisher's abstract of Pennycook and colleagues' 2021 paper describes survey experiments and a Twitter field experiment: attention to accuracy improved news-sharing quality under the studied conditions. Sharing intentions also need not indicate belief. The full paper, methods, and data were not read here. The result therefore becomes no guarantee of personal protection from mistakes. It supports a limited question about where attention is directed before sharing. Our editorial reminder does not replicate an experimental protocol; it asks what we are prepared to tell another person and with what degree of confidence.

Suppose Elena wants to forward an arresting headline. She can pause over three questions: has she read the item, is the source of its important claim clear, and why is she sending it to this person? "Interesting to discuss, but reliability unchecked" differs from "This happened; act." Not every interesting hypothesis is forbidden to discuss. Its status should be preserved, however, without assigning the recipient an urgent decision based on our own unverified impression. If a message contains another person's private information, the appropriateness of sharing arises independently of truth. A verified fact does not automatically grant a right to disclose it to any recipient.

If a mistake is discovered after sharing, the particular claim can be corrected in the available conversation. Neither concealing the mistake nor declaring yourself unreliable in everything is necessary. Say clearly what was wrong and what is now known; identify the unknown part as such. The journal may reveal a recurring situation in which material was sent for a reaction before being understood. That is an observation about several episodes, not a final diagnosis

of character. The next change should address that moment of sharing. A grand promise never to make mistakes is less available to checking than a particular rule against presenting unread material as established fact.

X. One Revision Instead of an Ideal Diet

Observation can tempt us to design an ideal information diet. Yet a personal environment changes with work, loved ones, interests, and external circumstances. It need not maintain a permanent ratio of useful, pleasant, and difficult material. Begin with one revision related to the discovered question: return to an original document, make room for a desired subject, avoid forwarding an unclear headline, or end reading that does not meet the current intention. These are editorial options rather than guaranteed ways to improve a condition. The choice can be discussed and altered if actual consequences differ from expectations.

In our scene, Elena notices that a professional question remains hidden behind discussion of other people’s impressions. She chooses to read one relevant primary item. Afterwards, the question may turn out to have been poorly formulated or to require professional help. That is no failure of the choice: a next precise step has appeared. If no clarity was gained, record that too. An absent result need not be concealed behind a polished account of discipline. Observation is useful insofar as it helps address the actual question, rather than through strict compliance with an intended reading regime.

The inner world is not an empty room that information fills in the same way for everyone. A person already has experience, obligations, relationships, and their own questions. It is therefore more precise to ask not only “What came in?” but also “How did I approach it?” One message can be checked, another discussed, a third retained as an impression, and a fourth not pursued. Sometimes the relation between content and response remains unknown. That is a legitimate outcome. A personal information environment becomes more open to choice when these actions are distinguished and each item is no longer required simultaneously to entertain, explain life, prove truth, and support a decision.

What this means in practice

Take one ordinary day or several recent episodes. Record three to five items you actually remember: their subject, where you encountered them, and the original source if known. Do not reconstruct everything by guessing. Note private conversations without disclosing others’ contents. If the exercise requires unwanted data access, reduce it. This is a personal editorial note, not a measurement of environmental effects on health or a collection of material about other people.

For one item, separate four lines: what is claimed; what supports the part important to you; which response arose; and what you did afterwards. Do not use the response as evidence of truth or falsehood. If the link between message and action is unclear, write “I don’t know.” Scores and norms are unnecessary, as is a conclusion about the entire information day from one case. Choose a question that concerns your actual intention rather than promising to explain every experience.

Consider your purpose: learning, understanding, entertainment, maintaining contact, or preparing a decision. Then choose one appropriate change. For example, read a primary document instead of discussion, or retain a question for a conversation without forwarding the material as established fact. An action should account for real obligations, safety, and access. Rejecting necessary work information is no compulsory sign of awareness. Do not require the chosen step immediately to change your mood or prove that your entire environment is right.

After the step, describe the outcome and remaining question. The choice can remain unchanged if observation provides no reason to alter it. Stop if the exercise becomes coercive control of every impression or intensifies an unpleasant state. Daily recording is optional. Do not use it to assess another person’s maturity or impose your reading list. Its purpose is to help you choose the next action more precisely while preserving privacy, the right to rest, and the possibility of appropriate support.

Key quotation

> *“Weigh and consider”.*

Francis Bacon, Of Studies; initial capitalisation is editorial. This short fragment on reading’s purpose emphasises personal judgment. The essay’s historical health claims are not this article’s recommendations.

Connections between traditions

• **Seneca’s Stoic letter:** a question about assimilating reading. Neither proof that diversity is harmful nor a requirement to close the circle of sources.

• **Bacon’s early modern thought:** a question about reading’s purpose and personal judgment. A historical text without transferring medical analogies.

• **Christian Philippians:** moral exhortation within prayer and community life. Neither a filter for pleasant messages nor a psychological guarantee.

• **Experimental news-sharing psychology:** Pennycook and colleagues, only the publisher’s abstract read and a limited accuracy question before sharing. Not the entirety of a person’s information life.

• **Editorial connection:** content, grounds for trust, response, and action differ. The sources are not declared to agree on one nature of the inner world.

Sources

1. Francis Bacon. *The Essays or Counsels, Civil and Moral*, Of Studies. Project Gutenberg 575. The short essay and electronic metadata were read in full; the print edition date was not established. Text.

2. Seneca. *Moral Letters to Lucilius*, Letter 2, §§1–5. Richard M. Gummere translation, collection 1917–1925. Selected paragraphs were read, not the whole corpus; no direct quotation here. Text.

3. *Philippians* 4:8–9, World English Bible. The verses and nearby 4:1–7 context were read; the publisher declares the text public domain. The Russian fragment rendering is editorial. Official text.

4. Gordon Pennycook, Ziv Epstein, Mohsen Mosleh, Antonio A. Arechar, Dean Eckles, David G. Rand. *Shifting attention to accuracy can reduce misinformation online*. Nature, 2021, 592:590–595. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-021-03344-2. The actual publisher's abstract was read; the subscription full text and data were not, and access restrictions were not bypassed. Publisher.

Tags

information environment, attention, reading, sources, trust, accuracy, fact, interpretation, assessment, response, choice, interest, subjects, communication, privacy, information sharing, checking, uncertainty, primary source, judgment, moral attention, boundaries, rest, observation, self-inquiry, Seneca, Bacon, Christianity, psychology, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.