


UNITED WISDOM

# Information Saturation Without Understanding

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-25-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Information Saturation Without Understanding

## Epigraph

“Bare titles of books.” — John Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, III.X.26; a short fragment from the English original.

## What this article is about

After several articles, a subject feels familiar. Someone recognises the main words, remembers a disagreement between authors and can name a popular explanation. But when asked why a particular event happens, their account stops. They remember the beginning and the conclusion, while the connection between them needs finding again. This does not necessarily mean the reading was wasted. They may have gained orientation in a subject without examining the question that has now arisen. The distinction becomes visible when recognising material gives way to a task of their own. The amount of available information then ceases to be a sufficient answer: what matters is what can already be done with it and where help is needed.

Consider a fictional Denis, preparing a small neighbours’ meeting. He has read several pieces about organising discussions and speaks confidently of agendas, feedback and participation. But when asked why people should know the order of topics beforehand, he answers with the same words: to have a good agenda and effective participation. A concrete explanation of the connection is missing. This is an editorial example, not a client story or an author’s recollection. Denis may acquire the understanding he needs by discussing the task with others and considering alternatives. For now, it helps to distinguish a familiar label from the content he can explain in this situation.

The article concerns this transition: from acquiring information to explaining and cautiously applying it to a changed case. It does not ask readers to mistrust every moment of confidence, examine themselves after each text or abandon reference materials. External aids may form part of sensible work, particularly where memory must not replace verification. Scientific sources describe limited research tasks; philosophical and religious texts raise their own questions. A personal trial remains editorial and voluntary. Its possible outcome is one precise question that can be checked, rather than proof of competence or a final verdict on someone’s ability to understand the world. A suitable subject is one where a small mistake creates no risk to oneself or others.

## I. First Identify the Open Question

Information becomes abundant for different reasons. Someone may read for pleasure, general orientation, a work decision or a conversation. These intentions do not require identical depth. An introduction to a subject may need only its main distinctions and a place to look next. Explaining a particular case requires different work. Before the next search, it helps to name the question: what exactly remains unclear? It may be a term’s meaning, a connection between events or a rule’s scope. Material can then be sought for that gap, instead of increasing the total amount of reading in the hope that everything will eventually join together by itself.

Denis need not read another ten meeting guides. He needs an answer to a limited question: what changes for participants if the topics are known beforehand? He might propose several possibilities, such as preparing information or knowing when to raise their own subject. These possibilities need considering against the conditions of this meeting. If discussion is open-ended and participants want no rigid order, another format may fit better. The question does not amount to proving every agenda useful. Understanding involves seeing the task a chosen method performs and the circumstances in which it fails to supply the expected result.

Sometimes uncertainty appears in the question itself. Words such as depth, effectiveness or awareness can refer to different desired changes. Before seeking an answer, clarify what would count as change in this example. For a meeting, it might concern time, everyone’s participation, reaching an agreement or getting to know one another. One method need not improve all these aspects simultaneously. Clarification need not become a complicated measurement system. A simple description suffices: I want to know whether this action will help with this task. New material can then be read with a particular intention, making it easier to notice whether it answers the question at all.

## II. Recognition Is a Distinct Result

A familiar phrase readily gives the impression that its content is already available. Someone has heard a word many times and can recognise it among others. This is a real outcome of acquaintance that need not be discounted. Recognition nevertheless differs from explaining a relationship, providing an example and noticing an exception. The current position can be named honestly: the term is familiar; I remember part of the explanation; I have not checked its application. Such a description is more precise than either extreme: I understand everything, or I know nothing. It identifies the work already accessible and the next part that could sensibly be examined in a safe episode.

Recognition may suffice in an ordinary conversation. Not every mention of a subject requires a detailed account of knowledge. When listening to a new lecture or reading an overview, familiar landmarks help someone follow the author. A move towards an independent decision,

however, calls for a different standard of sufficiency. Can the relevant step be explained without merely repeating the conclusion? What information is needed to check it? Who can be asked? This change does not oppose confidence. It relates confidence to a task where mistakes have different consequences and preserves the right to seek help instead of demonstrating independence from every external source.

Denis’s familiar words already do some work: they help him find material and discuss the meeting with neighbours. A phrase about good organisation does not yet explain what needs preparing. He can retain the term while adding content: participants will receive a question list, be able to propose a topic and say beforehand if information is missing. The statement now permits checking and disagreement. Someone may point out that the meeting is intended as an informal introduction; another may propose only two required questions. A shared vocabulary remains useful, while ceasing to conceal distinctions needed for a joint choice of discussion format.

## III. An Explanation Needs a Connection

A summary answers what an author said. Explaining a particular task requires showing how its parts relate. Sometimes a sequence suffices: obtain information, compare alternatives and choose an action. Sometimes a condition matters more: a result is expected only under certain circumstances. Smooth speech may still contain no connection. It therefore helps to ask about an intermediate step as well as the conclusion: what is supposed to bring this about? If the answer repeats the original formula, a particular point for clarification has been found, rather than a final limit to someone’s capacity to understand.

For example, Denis says an agenda will improve participation because participants will participate better. The second part adds no content. He can try another approach: questions known beforehand let people decide what information to bring and what topic to propose. This is a proposed connection. It also needs conditions: people must receive the list in time, have an opportunity to prepare and want the discussion. If nobody saw the message or the format calls for no preparation, the result may differ. This examination guarantees no successful meeting. It reveals the expectation attached to each organisational action and what might change if the outcome does not match it.

An explanation need not be complete to be useful. One decision may require only the nearest connection; another needs a specialist and additional evidence. A dangerous mechanism must not be tested independently simply to establish confidence in having understood it. In a safe everyday task, words or a diagram may suffice without an intervention. An unknown transition can be identified plainly: here I rely on a rule from the source; why it works under these conditions remains unclear. Such a note leaves room for additional investigation, without

requiring a gap to be filled by an attractive guess that appears more persuasive than its basis warrants.

## IV. Felt Depth and an Available Explanation

Rozenblit and Keil investigated a mismatch between judged explanatory depth and performance on limited tasks. The publisher abstract read reports this distinction for the explanatory knowledge studied. We have not read the full paper, methods or data. The work therefore cannot assess an individual reader’s understanding or establish that people generally know nothing. Here it supports a limited question about confidence matching an available explanation. A personal editorial trial does not reproduce the study’s tasks or acquire established effectiveness from it. Difficulty expressing a thought requires consideration of conditions, language and task format, rather than declaring its cause in advance.

A familiar object may be easier to picture than to explain. An image in memory is not itself an error. It may help with orientation, recalling an example and asking questions. The difficulty arises when an image is used as a finished explanation where a particular transition is needed. Instead of requiring a complete mental mechanism, select one part: which condition determines the nearest result? What is already known from a reliable source? What remains a supposition? This distinction preserves useful elements of orientation without giving them more explanatory force than has been established for the task.

Confidence need not become an enemy either. Someone may know a great deal with good grounds and still fail to formulate an immediate answer in unfamiliar surroundings. Fatigue, another language, pressure from a questioner or an excessively broad question change the conditions of expression. One unsuccessful attempt does not reveal the extent of all knowledge. In a voluntary trial, a convenient format, time and reference material are allowed. Compare the particular question with the particular answer obtained. If a connection becomes clearer after rewording the question, that is also a result; if help was needed, name its contribution without calling understanding unreal merely because it emerged in conversation.

## V. Words Need Content

In III.X.26–27 of An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, Locke distinguishes possession of names from the content of thought, along with the reverse difficulty: content exists, but suitable words have not been found. This is historical philosophy, not a contemporary intelligence test. Both directions matter here. A familiar term can be examined through an example, while difficulty with a term does not prove a lack of understanding. A connection may be described in ordinary words, a drawing or an action sequence. The aim is to make content available for consideration, rather than establish a right to scientific-sounding vocabulary or one conversational participant’s superiority over another.

Take one word from the material and ask which distinctions it marks in this context. Denis chooses feedback. In his task, this may mean participants saying which topics they need and which format is inconvenient. Elsewhere, the term may have different, more specialised content. Professional words need not all be replaced with everyday ones: precise labels sometimes save time and prevent confusion. Still, it helps to say what is meant now. If two people use a term for different things, their disagreement may concern an unnoticed distinction of meanings rather than the event itself.

A formulation of one’s own also needs checking. An idea may be explained simply while losing an important condition in the source. After a brief account, return to the selected passage: what did I add, omit or change? Preserve the author’s limits in the available material, even where they hinder an attractive general conclusion. If a full source has not been read, do not claim acquaintance with every part of its basis. Name the boundary: this connection appears in the passage read; the details remain unchecked. Simple language helps when it clarifies a thought rather than removing what determines where it applies.

## VI. A Slightly Changed Case

Understanding may be easier to consider through differences between examples than by repeating one. In a voluntary safe trial, change a small condition and ask whether the earlier conclusion remains. This is an editorial way to clarify a question, not a scientific scale. Denis supposed an advance agenda would help people prepare. Now the meeting moves to today, leaving little preparation time. What survives? A list may still indicate the order of discussion, while its previous purpose partly changes. The variation reveals a condition the original phrase hid inside a general promise that the organisational method would be useful.

Another example: participants want to get acquainted rather than make a joint decision. A detailed agenda may then require a different assessment. There is no need to declare beforehand that it harms freedom or necessarily helps. Relate the format to the intention and available conditions. Changing a conclusion when conditions change demonstrates a particular

flexibility in the explanation. Failure to produce an immediate alternative, however, does not establish an inability to apply knowledge. Consult the original material, ask another participant or clarify the task. The trial makes room for that work instead of becoming a trap permitting only an instant independent answer without aids.

A changed case must not become a dangerous experiment. Medical prescriptions, financial decisions, equipment and safety conditions need appropriate checks and competent help. Personal interest in an explanation grants no authority to intervene. A verbal learning example can be considered while maintaining the boundary between reasoning and action. Even in an everyday case, consider the people affected by change. Denis can discuss two meeting options instead of unexpectedly changing rules and watching who copes. Examining his own understanding requires neither using others in an unagreed trial nor accessing their personal information.

## VII. An External Source Remains Useful

Fisher, Goddu and Keil’s 2015 paper investigates self-assessed knowledge after internet searching. The indexed author abstract read reports an increase under the studied conditions of searching for explanations. We have not read the full paper, methods or data. This establishes neither that the internet generally reduces knowledge nor that reference materials should be excluded. The useful distinction here is between a source being available and what someone can explain independently or with acknowledged help. This must not become a demand to remember everything. External verification is particularly appropriate where confident recall does not provide the precision required.

Several statements can be distinguished: I know where to find an answer; I found and read the relevant passage; I can explain the connection; I checked whether it fits this task. Each describes a separate result. Even the first is useful: a search need not start from nothing. A claim to know the subject, however, may conceal the remaining stages. Denis can retain a link and honestly tell the neighbours that the method’s conditions are still under discussion. This does not diminish the source’s value. It allows further work to be shared and identifies who can help with a particular uncertainty without assigning one person completed expertise.

When checking again, preserve the answer’s origin. If part of an explanation comes from material, part from another person and part from an inference of one’s own, distinguish those bases in plain words. A personal note need not become a scientific publication. Avoid presenting a guess as a verified fact or extending a source’s authority to a new statement without grounds. Questions to a source can also be specific: does it address the relevant condition, is there another option, how precisely is the conclusion stated? After finding an answer, return to the original task; otherwise another search may again increase information while leaving open the connection for which it began.

## VIII. Different Kinds of Understanding Need Different Questions

Understanding a device, a story, a rule and an ethical address involves different tasks. One requires a mechanism, another a sequence of events, a third conditions of application and a fourth meaning and the addressee’s position. A universal demand to explain everything identically may lose the subject. Someone can understand a work without reducing it to a useful action and assess a rule without wanting to apply it personally. A trial should therefore fit the chosen kind of material. Where the question concerns a text’s meaning, an action example may be insufficient; where it concerns safe meeting organisation, an attractive interpretation alone may not suffice.

James 1:22–25 contrasts hearing the word with living it in a Christian religious context. This is neither an experiment about understanding nor a requirement to enact every idea read. An editorial comparison raises a question about acquaintance with an address differing from a response to it in life. That question differs from explaining a mechanism. A reader may consider the ethical meaning, agree, object or decline its religious basis. Informed disagreement may also require understanding. The comparison retains the text’s own context instead of turning it into general advice to improve learning efficiency or immediately apply every piece of knowledge.

Historical philosophy, religious instruction and contemporary research do not become evidence for one another. They can stand together to distinguish questions more clearly: what content fills a word, what explanatory depth am I judging, how does access to a source relate to confidence, what response does an ethical address invite? Differences remain alongside the possibility of dialogue. For a particular task, a reader selects a suitable question without having to reduce everything to one universal method. A shared conversation does not require every participant to accept the same foundations. Understanding may grow through recognising an approach’s boundaries and specifying the subject it helps examine under the chosen conditions.

## IX. A Small Trial of Understanding

Choose one safe question from material that already feels familiar. It should permit verbal consideration without interfering with health, money, equipment or other people’s decisions. First name an intention if useful: explain one connection, distinguish meanings or understand a rule’s condition. Then try a brief answer in a convenient format. Reference materials, notes, translation and a conversational partner are allowed; simply name their participation. The trial neither assesses personal worth nor requires comparison with others. If concentrating is difficult today or the format is inconvenient, another time can be chosen or the question left without an additional exercise.

Three parts may help make an answer visible: what is being considered, which connection is proposed and under what condition. A missing part suggests a possible next question rather than a reason to reread the entire subject immediately. For Denis: discussion order; an opportunity to prepare information; receipt of a list beforehand. He then considers one changed case and identifies the part needing clarification. This format remains an editorial example. It establishes no universal structure of understanding or promise that every complex subject fits three lines. The description should answer the chosen question without replacing a check of factual grounds when one is needed.

Return to one available source or ask a suitable person about the gap noticed. Check that particular point, retaining the answer's origin and the limits of reading. If new material does not answer, refine the request. Ending the trial requires no complete mastery. Name what became clearer and what remains unknown. A personal note should contain no other people's data or compulsory transfer to a service. If the exercise becomes an endless examination or increases tension, it can stop. Self-inquiry retains its purpose when it helps choose further work, rather than requiring continuous proof of a right to call oneself a person who understands.

## X. Less Unknown in One Place

Information abundance does not necessarily obstruct understanding. Extensive material can supply a broad overview, introduce different positions and open new questions. Its volume and clarification of one connection nevertheless represent different results. Retain the information gathered while selecting a point needing a more precise answer. That choice does not renounce the world's complexity. It identifies available work: check a condition, clarify a concept, consider another example or find suitable help. A general promise to understand everything becomes a particular change: where I once repeated a word, I can now say what it means in this task and what it still does not explain.

For Denis, a result may be revising his meeting proposal. Instead of declaring an advance agenda useful, he explains the opportunity it creates, its conditions and another permissible format. Neighbours may disagree, suggest changes or choose an open conversation. This does not cancel the clarification. It enables discussion of the subject instead of competition over how many guides have been read. Understanding here does not equal one idea's final victory. It permits a more precise joint choice and identifies the information needed next, preserving the participation of those affected and everyone's right to see the task differently.

The difference between saturation and understanding appears in a small transition: from a familiar conclusion to a connection that has been examined. Sometimes this needs another source; sometimes accessible language, time, an example or a conversation. Sometimes the original question proves too broad. All these outcomes can help without a verdict on ability. There is no need to close every tab or prove independence from external knowledge. Name

what is actually available now and ask the next question about the gap found. Information then acquires a direction: it helps examine a selected subject instead of merely confirming the feeling that the topic is familiar and therefore complete.

## What this means in practice

Take one safe question from familiar material and name the result sought: explain a connection, distinguish meanings or clarify a condition. Choose a convenient answer format; reference material, translation, a diagram, notes and a partner’s help are permitted. Acknowledge their participation plainly. Do not turn the trial into a memory test when precision requires consulting a source. For health, financial, technical and personal-safety matters, the exercise replaces neither professional checks nor necessary help. A verbal learning example can be considered without changing real conditions to demonstrate understanding or involving others in an unagreed experiment.

Briefly describe the subject, proposed connection and important condition, if that format fits. Change one small condition in the example and ask whether the answer remains. If the explanation stops, identify the particular gap. It proves no absence of all knowledge: consider language, fatigue, breadth of the question and format. Find one available source or person able to help with that point. After reading further, compare the answer with the original question and preserve its boundary: what was checked, what is only proposed and what remains unknown. Do not call an entire source read if only a passage or abstract was seen.

End after one question. A note may contain only the clarified connection and next step; other people’s information, personal data and compulsory sharing are unnecessary. If the task remains broad, a narrower question is allowed. Understanding clarified with someone’s help is no less real; name how it was obtained. The trial is neither a scientific scale, therapy nor an established way to increase knowledge. It can stop if tension grows. A sufficient outcome is a slightly clearer view of the selected subject and further work available, without an obligation to turn everything read into immediate action or a finished answer about everything.

## Key quotation

“Be doers.” — James 1:22, a short fragment from the World English Bible. This Christian address concerns living according to the word; it does not require enacting every idea read.

## Connections between traditions

• Locke, III.X.26–27: a philosophical distinction between a name, content and the ability to express it. Difficulty with a professional term does not equal an absence of thought.

• James 1:22–25: a Christian comparison of hearing and living according to the word. Its religious meaning remains and is not reduced to learning efficiency.

• Rozenblit and Keil; Fisher, Goddu and Keil: limited scientific questions about judging explanations and knowledge. Their findings neither assess an individual reader nor prove historical teachings.

• Editorial comparison: clarify what counts as understanding the chosen subject. Explanation, interpretation and ethical decisions need different questions.

## Sources

1. Locke J. An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, III.X.26–27. Selected paragraphs within III.X.23–33 and metadata for the electronic text based on the second edition were read. Not the whole treatise; the particular printed edition date was not established.

2. James 1:22–25, World English Bible. The selected address, surrounding 1:19–27 and public-domain notice were read. The Russian fragment is an editorial rendering, not a separate WEB edition.

3. Rozenblit L., Keil F. The misunderstood limits of folk science: an illusion of explanatory depth. Cognitive Science, 2002, 26(5):521–562. The abstract and metadata in publisher search results were read; direct opening failed. The full paper, methods and data were not read. Free Access does not establish a reuse licence.

4. Fisher M., Goddu M. K., Keil F. C. Searching for explanations: How the Internet inflates estimates of internal knowledge. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 2015, 144(3):674–687, DOI 10.1037/xge0000070. The complete short indexed author abstract and metadata were read; the full paper, methods and data were not. The APA all-rights-reserved notice remains; source text is neither imported nor vectorised.

## Tags

understanding, information, knowledge, explanation, recognition, confidence, question, reading, learning, concepts, language, Locke, philosophy, James, Christianity, traditions, research limits, self-assessed knowledge, internet, sources, external aids, help, example, conditions, application, personal note, privacy, self-inquiry, dialogue, 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.