

UNITED WISDOM

The body as home, instrument, and object of assessment

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-15-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The body as home, instrument, and object of assessment

Epigraph

> *“your body is the temple”*
>
> *First Corinthians, 6:19, King James Version; short excerpt. The image's religious foundation is considered below; this is no general formula of bodily autonomy.*

What this article is about

In the morning you choose a shirt for a meeting. In the mirror, how it fits matters. On the way, freedom of movement matters. After a long day, being able to relax your shoulders and exist without presenting yourself externally matters. One body participates in three different questions: how I look, what I can do, and how I can live here. Each question deserves a place. Difficulty begins when one receives authority to answer for all the others and declares someone either successful or insufficient.

We examine three languages for relating to the body: home, instrument, and object of assessment. These are editorial images, rather than a scientific classification of people. Home points to lived experience and care; instrument to participation in a chosen action; assessment to a particular view and its criteria. Images can help and limit us. Nobody should be required to love their body, demonstrate special productivity, or abandon interest in appearance. The question is who sets the task, how well assessment fits it, and what happens to the person beyond the property being measured.

I. At home, no continuous examination is needed

Calling the body home usually emphasises inhabiting your own life rather than constantly presenting it to an audience. You can notice comfort, hunger, wanting to change position, and the pleasure of a warm shower. Home here is neither an architectural object nor a separate shell for the real person. It images closeness to lived experience. It can support care if it leaves room for actual needs rather than demanding immediate unconditional acceptance of every property currently difficult to bear.

The image has a limit. A home can also be uncomfortable, need repair, and evoke contradictory feelings. “Live in your body as at home” should therefore not accuse someone who finds bodily life difficult. Sometimes medical help, accessible conditions, rest, different

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

clothing, or assistance is needed. This article cannot establish what a particular reader needs. It simply does not make inward love a compulsory prerequisite for care. A need can be taken seriously even if a pleasant feeling toward yourself has not appeared.

In an ordinary episode, a home-like relationship may look modest: after meeting, remove tight shoes, choose a comfortable place, and refrain from photographing yourself at that moment. This proves no profound transformation. The action meets a current need. Its value does not depend on eloquently describing respect for the body. Sometimes care precedes agreement with your image. Complete reconciliation need not be awaited before an available step makes the evening more liveable without adding a new demand to an already difficult day.

Home language does not cancel external life either. Someone may want beautiful clothing, public speaking, sport, or a change of habitual form. No desire automatically betrays the body. The image of home needs to preserve returning to your own needs. After assessment you can remain a person rather than its final result. After effort you can rest rather than prove your right to rest. After a disappointing photograph you can continue a life larger than a single frame.

II. An instrument has a task and a limit to its load

Instrumental language recalls action. Hands help write, legs support an accessible route, a voice addresses someone. A particular task may involve precision, endurance, skill, or position. Such attention is not necessarily hostile to the body. A musician considers what their fingers can do, a traveller the journey's length, a person with limited mobility an available means of moving. The task nevertheless needs naming. Otherwise improvement easily becomes an endless demand with neither a sufficient result nor permission to finish.

Every action has conditions. A meeting may take place in an accessible room or somewhere difficult to enter. Work may allow pauses or require prolonged stillness. Assessing a body separately from such conditions transfers all responsibility to the person. Sometimes the method, equipment, schedule, or surroundings need changing. Performing a task differently need not be a concession to inadequacy. It can reasonably coordinate the goal and means. The person is not reducible to one method of achieving a result.

An instrument can be used carefully, but a person is no object deserving preservation solely for usefulness. The image helps calculate effort; it stops helping when rest seems permissible only after sufficient productivity. You can end a day without victory, stop because of limitations, or receive help. Participation and respect are not inferred from the number of actions. This is the article's ethical position rather than a measured effect of a particular study. It keeps practical language about capacities from becoming an overall judgment of human dignity.

Imagine two questions after a walk. First: does the selected route suit today's capacities? Second: am I a sufficiently good person if I walked little? The first can lead to changing the route or conditions. The second adds an assessment of the whole person to a limitation. Separating them preserves interest in movement without declaring distance a measure of your right to be among others. Sometimes the next step is another path, sometimes rest, sometimes help. An instrument's tasks change; a person's life between them does not disappear.

III. Appearance can be assessed for a particular occasion

Assessing appearance does not always humiliate. You check whether clothing suits the weather, an image fits a meeting, or a colour appeals to you. These questions have local meaning and allow personal preference. You can want a particular appearance without justifying it through spirituality or usefulness. Difficulty arises when a local question becomes universal: if a shirt does not fit, the entire person is unsuccessful; if a photograph disappoints, the meeting had no value. The conclusion's scale exceeds the observation's.

Precision allows correction without prohibiting mirrors. Instead of “Everything about me is wrong,” identify what does not suit: cut, size, light, frame, or today's personal preference. Sometimes changing an item is more reasonable than changing yourself. Sometimes you want to work on an image. Sometimes everything can remain as it is. The article selects no single correct path. It asks that an individual assessment not be presented as the complete picture or that changing appearance be required to resolve relationships, work's meaning, and every question of recognition simultaneously.

Distinguish your own desire from the conditions of someone else's gaze. You may dress for yourself, a particular audience, a work requirement, or someone close whose approval you want. These motives can coexist. Every external motive need not be declared false. It helps, however, to know who receives the right to assess and for what purpose. If a criterion cannot be met or constantly changes, wanting to conform may have no end. The question then concerns assessment's conditions, not only the bodily defects it supposedly discovered.

Sometimes limiting the procedure helps: choose one suitable outfit, take several photographs, check what is necessary, and finish. This is an editorial example of organising attention, rather than a promise to remove dissatisfaction. Feeling may remain while the decision about the meeting is already made. You can leave home without a final answer to whether you completely like yourself. External participation need not await an ideal image, just as care need not await love. Sufficiency concerns this particular occasion rather than the entire person.

IV. A historical image of the body retains its foundation

In Discourse on Method, Part V, translated by John Veitch, Descartes considers bodily arrangement and movement. He nevertheless also describes a union of soul and body closer than a pilot's position in a ship, necessary for sensations and appetites. This is historical philosophy, rather than contemporary physiology. The text cannot honestly yield only a simple slogan that humans are machines and thereby close every other question.

In First Corinthians, 6:12–20, KJV, the temple image concerns belonging to God and religious ethics. This differs substantially from a contemporary statement of personal autonomy. We can notice attention to embodied life's meaning without removing the theological foundation and saying the source simply confirms all our ideas of care. Our meeting of languages preserves disagreement over to whom a person belongs and where obligations originate.

Historical texts offer different ways of posing a question rather than an identical recipe. Mechanism allows discussion of functions; a religious image relates to the sacred and obligation; a contemporary personal image of home can concern comfort and accessibility. Their attention intersects, but aims differ. Using an image requires knowing which part we borrow and which we leave. Age, authority, and beauty do not make metaphor scientific fact or resolve an individual person's consent.

Our own language can therefore be used cautiously. Home does not compel religion; instrument does not compel historical metaphysics; object of assessment does not exhaust a person. Readers' tasks and convictions determine the choice of image. They can abandon these three words entirely and speak directly about the body. This article offers distinctions usable without a compulsory worldview transition. Unity of conversation arises through hearing different questions rather than declaring every author always taught the same thing.

V. An observer's gaze can be noticed inwardly

In Fredrickson and Roberts's 1997 abstract, objectification theory considers girls and women internalising an observer's view in a sexually objectifying culture. This is a theoretical framework with a defined scope rather than a diagnosis from one scene. The publisher's abstract was read; the complete text is not claimed as read. Neither every interest in appearance nor every gender's and culture's experience is reduced to this explanation here.

An everyday scene permits our own question: whose eyes am I currently using? Alone at home, you arrange a pose as if an audience were assessing you. Perhaps it is enjoyable play with an image; perhaps a tiring obligation persisting without a spectator. One outward sign cannot distinguish them. Your task, ability to stop, and the place of your own experience

matter. We do not transfer a research term to everyone who looked in a mirror or wanted to appeal to someone.

An imagined spectator may be inaccurate too. You are sure everyone at a meeting will notice one feature although nobody said so. Attention is already organised around imagined assessment. Actual requirements can be checked while the rest remains a supposition. This promises no disappearance of concern. It simply prevents a guess simultaneously becoming someone else's voice, a general rule, and final knowledge. Sometimes knowing clothing is comfortable and the necessary work format is respected is enough without guaranteeing every person's approval.

Sometimes assessment is actually spoken and causes harm. The question is then not confined to an inward gaze. You can state a boundary concerning comments, change conditions of contact, or use an established support channel. Nobody should be told merely to stop viewing themselves from outside and the external problem will disappear. Circumstances, personal account, and someone else's action differ. A useful inward distinction does not replace necessary external change. Attention to ourselves and protection of respectful treatment can proceed together.

VI. Capacity does not measure dignity

Functional language seems liberating: what matters is what the body does rather than how it looks. For some people this helps. But requiring abundant action merely changes the examination's subject. Someone who finds movement difficult, is tired or ill, or needs help should receive no new criterion of inadequacy. Interest in capacities can persist without demanding productivity as confirmation of human worth. We discuss dignity as an ethical foundation for relationships rather than the result of competing in bodily efficiency.

Capacity also depends on available forms of participation. One person reads small text, another uses magnification, a third listens. One climbs stairs, another seeks an accessible entrance. These differences need no romanticisation or declaration of every difficulty as a gift. A method of performing is not the whole person. Shared tasks allow joint discussion of conditions. Help need not look like an exceptional favour to someone who failed a norm; sometimes the norm itself was chosen too narrowly for actual participants.

In personal life, ask where functional assessment is actually needed. It may be substantive for a route, tool, or work action. On its own, it is not substantive for the right to be loved, invited, or heard. Someone may fail one requirement while remaining a full participant in another meeting. Precision promises no removal of every limitation. It does not add a universal judgment to a particular limit or require someone to justify existence through a list of useful functions available this week.

The ethical boundary applies to ourselves too. Rest need not resemble investment in future productivity to be permissible. Pleasure need not produce measurable benefit. An evening can pass without a new improvement goal. This does not prohibit development; it preserves space in which development remains a choice. Home, instrument, and assessment can coexist if none receives authority to declare life meaningless when it currently produces no result or presents insufficient external perfection.

VII. Conditions for care also exist outside the person

It is easy to discuss the body as though personal attitude determines everything. An uncomfortable chair remains uncomfortable after an excellent inward decision. An overloaded schedule remains overloaded. An inaccessible entrance is not removed by self-acceptance. This article does not replace external conditions with psychological effort. Sometimes care means agreeing on timing, choosing an item, changing a room, or obtaining help. Personal choice participates but does not create every opportunity from nothing or bear sole responsibility for environmental constraints.

Questions to ourselves can therefore be supplemented with questions about conditions. What can change here without remaking my body? Perhaps table height, clothing size, meeting length, or the method of providing material. Perhaps currently nothing substantial. Name that limitation honestly rather than explaining it through insufficient self-love. External impossibility and inward attitude do not coincide. Someone can attend carefully to themselves while still needing support, resources, and others' agreement to changes in shared organisation.

Limits of authority exist too. A premises owner, meeting organiser, manager, and participant may make different decisions. Not every question is resolved through one personal request. A concrete request nevertheless often makes a problem more visible than a general declaration of inadequacy. A particular form of material or an opportunity to sit is needed, for example. The need does not have to be justified by a complete health history. Necessary information depends on circumstances and the available process. This article establishes no legal requirements or professional instruction from an everyday distinction.

When conditions change, note the actual result: participation became easier, a task was completed, discomfort remains. This need not be declared a new identity. Environmental change can help without a complete change in self-assessment. Changed self-assessment may leave an environmental obstacle intact. Distinguishing processes avoids requiring one kind of care to prove another. It makes action proportionate: an item, agreement, or assistance meets its task without having to conclude a person's entire complicated conversation with their body immediately.

VIII. Care can be chosen without compulsory love

Advice to love the body sometimes helps and sometimes adds a demand. Someone already dislikes their appearance and now dislikes being unable to love correctly. Leave room for a more modest relationship: I may dislike myself today and still refrain from cruelty toward myself. I can choose comfortable clothing, support a necessary action, or ask for a pause. No step requires declaring complete acceptance beforehand. Care can be action even when emotional attitude is mixed or unclear.

Wanting change need not involve general self-rejection. A haircut, learning a new movement, and choosing another style are different goals. They may express interest, pleasure, necessity, or pressure. Distinguishing them requires concrete circumstances and personal consent. A general prohibition of change does not guarantee autonomy any more than a general obligation to improve. Someone can discuss a task at its own scale. One change need not mean the earlier body was an error to erase from history.

Once a goal is formulated, clarify a sufficient result and acceptable cost. For a shirt: comfortable size and the chosen look. For a route: being able to walk or travel the necessary distance. For a photograph: a frame fitting a particular purpose. If sufficiency moves endlessly, the task itself can be reconsidered. Refusal is not compulsory. Perhaps another measure is needed, or acknowledgment that one change was expected to do too much. The body should not pay for every uncertainty by promising to become finally correct.

Mixed motives can remain in choice. I want approval and comfort; a result without overload; change while valuing the familiar. Such combinations do not prove weakness of character. They reveal what needs coordination. Sometimes compromise is available, sometimes a priority must be chosen, sometimes the question left open. A living relationship differs from a slogan by allowing circumstances and correction. We need no single permanently correct body image to make today's limited decision.

IX. Bodily change need not erase a biography

Over time, some capacities, habits, and outward properties change. This need not make earlier life false or present life wholly worse. Someone may miss a familiar movement, enjoy a new one, experience loss, and continue participating. The article prescribes no gratitude for every change. It leaves room for complex feeling. Biography includes different states, rather than only successful periods that can be shown to others as confirmation of our right to remain ourselves.

A practical task may require updated conditions. Clothing, routes, schedules, and forms of communication cease fitting as they once did. They can be revised without a compulsory

conclusion that the person no longer fits life. Sometimes an earlier criterion no longer serves the present task. Comparison retains information about change without becoming daily judgment. The past has no automatic right to establish the sole permissible level of every property for the future, especially when circumstances, interests, and available means also changed.

In relationships, recognition should not be reduced to outward resemblance. Someone close may remember an earlier image and need time to see the present one. This gives them no right to demand its return for their convenience. New conditions of participation can be discussed while retaining shared history. Concrete obligations and needs can be difficult; one beautiful phrase cannot solve them. Language nevertheless allows change without disappearance of personhood. Someone exceeds a photograph, a particular capacity, and a selected period, even when change has real weight.

The image of home can thereby become movable: not an ideal place permanently arranged correctly, but life in which conditions are updated. Instrument becomes concrete: tasks and methods change. Assessment becomes limited: a criterion applies to a selected case. This is an editorial connection rather than a shared claim of the three sources. It preserves history without continual obligation to return to one bodily state and gives the present its own possibility of being lived rather than only compared with the past.

X. Three questions can inhabit one day

Return to the morning shirt. You checked appearance for the meeting, chose a comfortable route, and gave yourself an available evening pause. No winning body image needs identifying. Each answered its own task. If the shirt did not fit, an item changed. If the route proved difficult, conditions were reconsidered. If the evening was unpleasant, it did not cancel the whole day. Distinction avoids requiring one result to confirm every other's success or making a local difficulty an overall characteristic of someone.

Some days the tasks conflict. A beautiful image is uncomfortable; desired action needs more energy than available; an external requirement conflicts with personal consent. Name the conflict directly. Perhaps a method can change, help is needed, or refusal is the decision. No option becomes incorrect merely because someone prefers another body language. Coordination concerns an actual person's life rather than metaphor's victory. Participants can change priorities with circumstances without promising identical choices forever.

A similar distinction is needed when speaking with someone else. They may ask you to assess clothing, help perform an action, or simply hear an experience. Not every request opens all three areas. A question about colour does not invite judging dignity; help with a route need not include appearance comments; a difficult self-relationship need not immediately prompt an

improvement programme. Clarifying the task preserves connection and boundary. It shows in which sense your participation is invited and where the decision remains with the person.

Nobody must be an impeccably arranged home, highly productive instrument, or successful object of someone's gaze to have a right to their own life. They can care, act, appear, keep part of experience private, request, and refuse. Three languages become useful when they serve these possibilities and retain limits. At day's end, the shirt can be hung up, the task completed or postponed, and the assessment left within its case. Life continues beyond each individual answer. Here bodily relationship ceases to be a continuous examination.

What this means in practice

For one episode, clarify the question: comfort in living, capacity for action, or appearance for a particular occasion. Name multiple questions separately. Record who sets the criterion, what counts as sufficient, and which cost is acceptable. Check whether the item, conditions, or method can change before declaring the entire body a problem. A concrete limitation should not automatically become a conclusion about dignity.

Choose one available step and note its actual result. A new shirt can resolve clothing; assistance, participation; a pause, today's schedule. They need not simultaneously produce love for the body and universal recognition. If the task expands, restore its limit or revise it. Care is possible without a ready pleasant feeling, and wanting change need not declare your earlier self an error.

In conversation, clarify which help someone invites. Do not turn a local assessment request into permission to judge their entire image. Do not propose productivity as a condition of worth. Preserve distinctions between religious foundations, philosophical images, research frameworks, and your ethical choice. These questions concern ordinary navigation of attention and agreements, rather than diagnosis, treatment, or a compulsory programme of bodily acceptance.

Key quotation

> *“ye are not your own”*
>
> *First Corinthians, 6:19, KJV; excerpt. Its theological foundation of belonging to God is preserved; the quotation is not used to cancel a reader's consent.*

Connections between traditions

Lines	Similar attention	Substantive difference
Descartes ↔ instrument	Arrangement and action	Historical metaphysics is not contemporary physiology
First Corinthians 6 ↔ home/care	Embodied life has meaning	Temple and belonging to God differ from secular autonomy
Fredrickson/Roberts ↔ assessment	An external gaze can become an inward frame	The theory has a particular scope and gives no everyday diagnosis
Capacity ↔ dignity	Both are discussed in participation	Usefulness does not measure human worth
Personal care ↔ environment	Both may support action	Inward attitude does not remove every external obstacle

Primary sources

• René Descartes. A Discourse on Method, Part V, John Veitch translation, PG59. Passages on mechanism and soul–body union with adjacent context were read; historical physiological explanations are not transferred into contemporary recommendations.

• First Corinthians 6:12–20, King James Version, Bible Gateway. The named passage was read, including sexual ethics and belonging to God. Russian excerpts are editorial translations from KJV rather than the Synodal translation.

• Barbara L. Fredrickson, Tomi-Ann Roberts. Objectification Theory, Psychology of Women Quarterly 21(2), 173–206, 1997, DOI 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x. The publisher's abstract was read in web.run's search presentation; full access is restricted and the complete article is not claimed as read. Rights UNKNOWN; no full republication.

Tags

body, home, instrument, assessment, appearance, care, capacity, dignity, clothing, mirror, participation, accessibility, environment, Descartes, KJV, Corinthians, Fredrickson, Roberts, objectification, observer, autonomy, consent, change, biography, choice

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.