

UNITED WISDOM

The Right to Stop Seeking a Final Answer

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-06-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Right to Stop Seeking a Final Answer

Epigraph

> *Be a philosopher; but, amidst all your philosophy, be still a man.*

David Hume, An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, I, paragraph 4, final sentence. Exact 12-word original English sentence; subsequent paragraphs 5–10 retain a defence of accurate inquiry. Historical “man” is rendered as “человек” in the Russian translation.

What this article is about

A right to stop seeking a final answer concerns participation rather than declaring the unknown resolved. Close a book or leave a dispute without claiming no answer exists or all investigation is useless. This article distinguishes an open worldview question, bounded action, and checking material information for a decision. Hume retains difficult thought alongside ordinary life; Buddhist MN 63 distinguishes undeclared positions from religious instruction’s aim; Peirce helps name doubt and inquiry. Their answers form no single system and become no compulsory reader position. The imagined evening books and concluding practice are original editorial work with no demonstrated efficacy. They propose naming a search’s boundary while preserving unknowns, particular promises’ responsibility, and possible return. Suspension should require no correct feeling, replacement worldview, or public justification of a right to live.

I. Stopping a Search Does Not Declare an Answer Found

Sometimes searching for a final answer becomes a condition that prevents the next step. First one must understand life’s ultimate meaning, prove a chosen route, or establish why action is warranted at all; only afterwards may work, friendship, or an activity begin. Imagine a woman collecting books each evening about which occupation deserves an entire life. The question interests her, but she no longer knows what the next book is supposed to establish. This article does not announce that the answer is absent. It considers another right: discontinuing an unbounded search while accurately retaining what remains unresolved, and living without falsely declaring a final victory over the question.

Distinguish stopping an activity from concluding something about its subject. “I am no longer pursuing this answer now” does not mean that no answer exists, all answers are equally good, or the question is meaningless. Each claim requires separate grounds. Close a book without

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

closing its question; leave a discussion without declaring another person’s thought false. A search can cease to be life’s main occupation while remaining an occasional interest. Precision should not become another exhausting examination. An available statement about participation’s limit is enough. It identifies what ends without assigning knowledge that is not yet possessed, and it requires no permanent prediction about every future encounter with the subject.

Our imagined reader may stop the former evening search because no definite next step is visible. She need not turn this decision into a doctrine about the limits of all knowledge. Another reader’s wish to continue remains separate. A right to stop forbids no investigation and appoints no common depth for everyone. Another person’s interest likewise creates no endless debt for her. Both possible inquiry’s value and a particular person’s freedom not to assign it all available time should remain visible. The question concerns participation rather than competition over whose life deserves greater respect. Neither continuation nor suspension supplies that respect as a prize for the correct intellectual performance.

II. Naming the Work a Question Actually Performs

Ask what an available answer would change. Is it needed for a particular choice, understanding a text, religious reflection, or a promise never to doubt again? These tasks have different conditions. Checking a class schedule allows a definite result; finding an ultimate ground for every activity may not finish in the same way. One book should not be expected to provide both a bibliographical fact and permanent confidence in an entire life. Our reader recognizes that she wants more than an argument about a profession. She wants assurance that her chosen work will never be wasted. Naming that expectation avoids assigning the next source a promise it never made.

Then identify what has been considered and what is missing. Is there an unread argument, an unknown condition of choice, or a specialist able to answer within a particular field? If so, the search gains a subject. If there is only a demand to continue until every unknown disappears, a boundary is harder to identify. This is neither diagnosis nor proof that reading is useless. It describes an available next action. Another book may be interesting without completing a worldview. Read for that interest without presenting enjoyment or study as a compulsory procedure for acquiring permission to live. Different grounds for reading need not hide beneath one solemn name of searching.

Some questions matter without determining a forthcoming action. Reflecting on consciousness can coexist with arranging a meeting through ordinary available grounds. Other questions materially alter decisions: work conditions, a claim’s reliability, or another participant’s consent. Suspending a larger search does not erase these subjects. Distinction prevents asking too much of philosophy while leaving too little for factual examination. In our scene, calling

remains unresolved, but study conditions can be obtained. They supply no final answer about a profession. They may support a bounded next step if chosen, rather than ordering the woman to start work before she is ready. The grounds belong to that step and retain their limited scale.

III. Hume Keeps Inquiry Alongside Ordinary Life

In section I of An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, David Hume considers different kinds of philosophy and a mixed life of thought, society, and action. Our epigraph ends paragraph four. Later he defends accurate, difficult investigation; the short sentence should not become a prohibition on depth. Paragraphs five through ten retain careful reasoning's value and warn against rash abandonment. Both sides matter here. Ordinary life need not disappear before a philosophical question, and difficult inquiry loses no value merely because it is demanding. Choosing one's participation requires neither contempt for thought nor proof that a simple answer is always superior to a complicated investigation.

Section XII, Part III, paragraphs 129–130 discuss mitigated scepticism, caution, and inquiry's limits. Hume's own account has a historical philosophical form. It supplies no conclusively demonstrated map of every modern science or belief. Our limited comparison asks whether demanding a complete foundation obstructs every definite judgment. Caution need not command acceptance of nothing; philosophical work need not promise elimination of every future unknown. A reader's pause is our contemporary conclusion about participation, rather than a direct instruction from Hume to everyone. It requires no assent to his entire system. His argument remains distinct from our scene and establishes no measured effect of the exercise proposed later in this article.

Our imagined reader can choose an evening without research reading while still valuing its question. She meets a friend without proving friendship's ultimate cosmic foundation. Lacking that proof differs from lacking every ground: wanting conversation, agreed time, and mutual participation remain available. She can also decline an unwanted meeting. The example prescribes no replacement of books by social activity. It shows that distinct actions can have distinct grounds. Intellectual honesty does not require every activity to wait upon the largest question's resolution. A retained boundary makes today's choice examinable with the precision relevant to its actual conditions, while the separate philosophical inquiry stays open rather than being settled by the meeting.

IV. A Buddhist Text Distinguishes Subjects of an Answer

MN 63, the shorter discourse with Māluṅkyaputta, is read here in Lord Chalmers's 1926 translation. A disciple makes definite answers about the cosmos, body, and post-death existence a condition of continuing religious life. The Buddha distinguishes undeclared positions from his teaching about suffering, origin, cessation, and a path. The refusal concerns this religious practice's aim, including nirvana. It does not declare every question equally meaningless or truth irrelevant everywhere. Its distinction exposes the risk of making an answer about one subject a prerequisite for another action. Our application remains limited; a contemporary reader need not accept the Buddhist aim or a monastic form of participation.

The poisoned-arrow parable depicts how demanding every detail can delay needed assistance. It remains part of ancient instruction, rather than a contemporary medical procedure. Philosophical reading does not necessarily resemble dangerous delay, and an open question does not necessarily indicate an urgent threat. The parable especially justifies no concealment of material information from someone making a decision. Distinguish facts needed for action from a demand to complete the picture of everything first. In our scene, activity conditions and consent remain material. The universe's ultimate meaning does not automatically become one of those conditions. Precise distinction matters more than a general slogan urging everyone to ask fewer questions. No modern urgency or treatment is inferred from the ancient story.

The teaching also grants no modern teacher permission to refuse every question about their own conduct. Its distinction concerns named positions and a religious aim; transparency about contemporary participation has another subject. Ask what is offered, which requirements apply, and whether participation can stop. Calling a question a sign of immaturity proves no irrelevance. A right to suspend one's search includes the reader's own decision, rather than another person's authority to forbid checking. This difference matters where suspension is used to preserve unexamined authority, presenting an unknown material condition as spiritual depth that supposedly deserves trust alone. An open ultimate question should conceal no practical demand that participants are entitled to understand.

V. Incompleteness Does Not Devalue Available Understanding

Sections II–IV of Charles Peirce's The Fixation of Belief distinguish doubt, belief, and inquiry, linking belief with readiness to act and doubt with investigation's beginning. This 1877 philosophical account diagnoses no unpleasant experience and requires no complete conviction on every subject. Retain a distinction between an actual obstacle to judgment and the general possibility of imagining another doubt. Our contemporary conclusion is bounded: name available understanding accurately without claiming completeness. Stopping one search then erases no real learning and makes no action automatically arbitrary. Peirce's historical description of inquiry remains distinct from our present decision about its duration and provides no clinically validated rule for when a reader should stop.

You can know how to check a particular claim while not knowing which way of life is ultimately best. The states are compatible. Comparing two courses' conditions proves no entire philosophy of education but remains a real capacity. Acknowledging it secretly settles no larger task. Our reader records professional requirements she has established and the general question still open. Such a note may serve precision without being obliged to provide relief. Its value is not graded through the correct feeling afterwards. What is known should not disappear with an unavailable final answer, while the unknown should not receive attractive certainty merely because suspending inquiry seems to demand a convincing public justification.

Further examination sometimes is needed. Contradictory information, a material omission, or a decision affecting another can require a revised boundary. A right to stop promises no permanent immunity from checking. It concerns a particular search, rather than freedom to circulate unsupported claims. Our woman may stop collecting books about calling while checking changed course conditions before paying. These are distinct activities. Neither must be ranked as a higher or lower question. Identify which decision an unknown bears upon and whose participation depends on its actual examination. Keeping that connection visible preserves both a bounded intellectual pause and responsibility for assertions or actions that still need their own grounds.

VI. A Pause Can Have a Boundary Without a Deadline for Truth

Describe suspension through an activity no longer performed: seeking new books, joining a dispute, or assigning every free evening to inquiry. No date must be appointed for truth finally to appear. Where an agreement needs timing, it concerns participation rather than a duty to become certain. Our reader tells an acquaintance that weekly discussion will stop; she does not promise a final conclusion a month later. A new argument, changed task, or renewed interest can mark a possible return. Even this condition is optional. It serves orientation if useful, rather than becoming another agreement with an unknown future that must supply a particular inner result on demand.

A boundary can vary in form while remaining real. You may decline discussion today but accept a letter containing a definite objection, or stop reading entirely while retaining notes for a possible return. Choose through actual conditions rather than the appearance of sufficient seriousness. A pause requires no dramatic separation. Yet gentle wording should conceal no continued demand when participation really should stop. Leaving a channel available promises no endless replies. Receiving a message does not oblige renewed examination of the whole question each time. The chosen form then corresponds to a limit you can actually sustain in contact, and another person can understand what remains available without treating it as unlimited access.

Retain a right to revise the decision without being accused of inconsistency. Returning may indicate new interest or conditions rather than a false earlier pause. Continuing suspension proves no victory over a question. In either case, describe what changed. Without a new ground, reconsideration may reproduce a former result; that possibility is not asserted for every reader. Another return should not be obliged to produce a discovery. Free inquiry includes continuation, and independence includes refusal. They need not become rival identities chosen forever and defended in every conversation. A person can change a bounded activity without supplying a final theory of why that activity must remain suitable at every stage of life.

VII. A Listener Cannot Appoint an Endless Search

Someone may offer an argument, book, or conversation. An offer creates no automatic duty to accept. Communicate a changed agreement accurately; where none exists, refusal requires no completion of another person’s reading programme. Our acquaintance believes a new book will supply the missing ground. The reader can appreciate the offer without reading it now or thereby judging an author’s entire work. The listener retains their interest; the reader retains time and a chosen participation. Disagreement about inquiry’s value gives neither unlimited access to the other. Refusing one proposal establishes no intellectual dishonesty, and respect for another person’s work requires no promise to undertake every investigation that person recommends.

Name a boundary without debating who understands life more deeply. “I will not continue this conversation” concerns an action; “I am not ready to discuss the grounds” preserves privacy. Material conditions still need communication where a conclusion affects shared work. Ending a research role, for example, requires clarity about material, timing, and possible handover. Suspending private inquiry does not permit performing continued involvement for people relying upon it. Practical clarity also requires no disclosure of every inner experience. Distinction identifies what belongs to shared work without turning conversation into judgment of the whole person or a compulsory demonstration that independence has been earned through a sufficiently profound explanation.

Respect for the unknown requires no continuation where assent is obtained through humiliation or pressure. Stop that form and consider another available route if the subject remains important. One unpleasant remark does not reveal every intention; examine actual requirements and the possibility of refusal. Words about depth, truth, or care cancel none of those conditions. An unaccepted boundary becomes a separate relationship question. No endless philosophical dispute must resume merely to secure permission to leave it. A subject can remain valuable while a particular form is unsuitable. This distinction preserves thought beyond a circle attempting to make it an exclusive possession, without assuming that every disagreement indicates such an attempt.

VIII. Checking a Decision Retains Its Own Subject

Refusing an unbounded answer differs materially from stopping a check needed for a decision. Someone offering a course, product, or professional service needs grounds for particular claims within their role. An unresolved meaning of life cancels no such task. This philosophical article supplies no specialized competence. Our reader can consider a class without complete certainty about calling while still needing participation’s conditions. Postponement remains possible where information is unavailable. Suspending a larger search orders no faster action. It restores checking’s actual subject rather than demanding simultaneous resolution of every possible life question. A smaller decision remains allowed to require its own evidence, and that requirement must not be dismissed as another endless philosophical demand.

Do not use a right to stop against someone bearing a choice’s consequences. Their questions may concern actual grounds: additional work, agreed conditions, or a promise they can rely upon. “I stopped seeking final truth” identifies none of these. Name the unknown and available participation accurately. A promise no longer supportable needs clarification rather than protection of an attractive independent identity. Autonomy remains alongside responsibility for definite action. That responsibility restarts no larger inquiry; it concerns what is offered or withdrawn. The distinct subjects should conceal neither each other nor an unavailable contribution. A person can keep an ultimate question open while allowing others enough practical clarity to make their own choices.

Particular checking also has limits. Obtaining cost, schedule, and course contents guarantees no perfect lifelong choice. Do not silently restore the unbounded demand inside a smaller task. Our reader can find sufficient conditions for trial participation or decline unsuitable terms. Either result remains bounded. It proves no final worldview and makes no later revision a defeat. An accurate promise and actual capacity matter. Materially changed conditions can be reconsidered. Revising that decision need not command another search for an answer excluding every future uncertainty. Checking retains its relation to an actual action rather than becoming an unlimited requirement to establish that no other possible course of life could ever be better.

IX. The Unknown Should Not Become a Punishment

An open question can begin to sound like a verdict: lacking an answer supposedly proves insufficient honesty or an unearned ordinary life. The cause of that demand is unknown here, and no diagnosis is offered. We reject an inference from an absent final conclusion to dignity's rank. A person may make reasoning errors, need information, or revise views while retaining respectful participation. Recognizing that right requires no proof that every judgment is correct. Our woman may not explain calling while accurately arranging a meeting. One unresolved subject establishes neither every action's falsehood nor the cancellation of actual understanding. It also supplies no grounds to declare the entire future closed or participation permanently unavailable.

Relief need not arrive immediately after stopping. Interest, regret, irritation, or an unnamed experience may remain. No correct feeling proves success. A possible result concerns form: the former endless activity ends while the question is honestly retained as open. A difficult interference with ordinary life has its own subject; a new philosophical phrase explains no entire condition. Appropriate assistance can have a separate route. Significant health or safety concerns require timely competent participation beyond literary practice. A right to suspend inquiry orders no solitary endurance and forbids no request for a particular contribution. Assistance should be sought for an actual need rather than made conditional upon completing the exercise or producing the correct worldview.

A listener need not infer the needed contribution from talk of a final answer. Request time without dispute, assistance with a task, or permission to leave a subject alone. Their response reveals available participation rather than measuring your worth. One unavailable contribution proves no impossibility of another route. Our example is original and promises no guaranteed response to a precise request. Its purpose is to keep distinct needs visible instead of hiding them inside an unlimited search. Discussing a book, resting, and professional assistance have different conditions. They can coexist with a philosophical question without proving that question either finally resolved or permanently cancelled. No person must supply every kind of contribution simply because they can offer one.

X. An Open Question Can Remain Part of Life

A right to stop allows a question to remain in life without continual performance of inquiry. Reading, an encounter, or experience may bring it back; it may also lose its former place. No route is predicted here. Our woman sets aside mandatory evening reading and keeps notes about considered grounds. This is no ritual of final abandonment of thought. The notes may become useful or remain untouched. A pause's value is not measured by a future return. Today's participation is chosen honestly enough: no final truth is promised, no concealed obligation to continue remains, and others are not ordered to stop merely to make her decision appear more convincing.

Keep three statements separate: what remains unresolved, what no longer happens, and the grounds for a forthcoming action. They need form no complete doctrine. An action has its subject and limit, a question its open state, and suspension its participation form. The note requires no permanent system of life; decline it if unsuitable and revise a relevant part when conditions change. We propose no ideal person managing every question faultlessly. An ordinary possible result is noticing where knowledge is absent without giving that absence authority over every meeting, permissible pause, and future action. That distinction remains available even if larger uncertainty continues and no attractive account of the whole path can yet be offered.

Honesty towards thought includes accuracy about answers and participation. Present no pause as demonstrated truth, another person's interest as an endless debt, or an attractive unknown as cover for an omitted material check. These boundaries resolve no entire philosophical dispute. They preserve one decision's human scale: this search is not continuing now, its question is not declared settled, and available action is examined separately. Continuation, later return, or a less central place for inquiry remain possible. Dignity is no prize in competition for a final answer. Life retains particular participation alongside the unknown, while thought remains possible without promising finally to release someone from every question they could ever encounter.

What this means in practice

If you wish, name one search you no longer want to continue in its former form. Write the question separately from the activity: new books, weekly dispute, or repeated examination. This voluntary editorial practice is no maturity test or guaranteed way to change a condition.

Name what is known and what remains unresolved. Suspending the search does not establish that no answer exists. Fill no unknown with an attractive conclusion merely to finish writing. A short statement of available understanding's limits need grade no entire person's worth.

Identify participation’s boundary: which activity ends and what others relying on it need to know. Preserve private grounds where disclosure is unnecessary for shared work. Name a possible return condition if useful, without appointing a compulsory deadline for truth.

Choose one forthcoming action on bounded grounds. Separately check information and consent actually relevant to it. A larger pause cancels no material unknown condition and orders no faster action. Refusal or postponement may also be appropriate within the actual circumstances.

Leave the question open if that is its state. The exercise owes no relief or new answer. Substantial interference with life, health, or safety calls for suitable assistance through its own route, without waiting for finished writing. A possible result is ending one activity clearly without falsely finishing thought.

Key quotation

> *Take therefore what I have not taught as being left untaught by me, and take as my teaching what I have specifically taught.*

MN 63, concluding distinction, PTS M I 431; Further Dialogues of the Buddha, Volume I, p. 306, translated by Lord Chalmers, 1926. Exact 23-word sentence as displayed. Buddhist aim includes nirvana; Pali not collated.

Connections between traditions

1. **Acting with a question unresolved: Hume and MN63.** In I.4, Hume places inquiry in a mixed life that includes company and practical activity; in its poisoned-arrow parable and the discussion that follows (pp.305–306), MN63 does not make its named religious practice depend on answers to the listed cosmological questions. The limited resemblance is that lacking such an answer does not remove an existing subject of activity. The difference is that Hume discusses human occupations, while the Buddhist teaching concerns suffering and liberation on a particular religious path. This supplies no general prohibition of abstract questions, medical instruction or ground for concealing conditions another person's participation requires.

2. **How inquiry's subject is defined: Hume and MN63.** In XII.III.130, Hume limits philosophical inquiry with regard to human capacities, ordinary life and experience; in its explanation of what is undeclared and what is taught (pp.306–307), MN63 names a religious aim: the cessation of suffering and the path towards it. The limited resemblance is that selecting a subject has an explicit ground rather than requiring answers to everything at once. The difference is that Hume's epistemic limits are not identical with the Buddhist orientation towards Nirvana. The

comparison establishes neither universal answerlessness nor equal truth of answers, and obliges no contemporary reader to adopt either aim.

3. **A question and actual work: Hume and Peirce.** In I.5–10, Hume defends the benefits of precise, sometimes difficult inquiry and opposes prematurely abandoning philosophy; in IV, Peirce distinguishes real and living doubt from merely uttering a question. The limited resemblance is that putting a question into words does not exhaust the work of inquiry. The difference is that Hume argues for the place of careful philosophical work, while Peirce describes inquiry arising from doubt. This requires neither uninterrupted searching nor treating another person's demand as sufficient grounds for one's own inquiry. Voluntary suspension in this essay remains a separate editorial distinction.

4. **Confidence and grounds: Hume and Peirce.** In XII.III.129, Hume connects mitigated scepticism with correcting dogmatic one-sidedness and exercising caution; in II, Peirce discusses the factual relationship between true premises and valid inference, while in IV he observes that firm belief can satisfy someone regardless of its truth. The limited resemblance is that satisfaction with one's opinion alone guarantees no truth. The difference is that Hume's sceptical caution differs from Peirce's account of belief through logic and activity. This comparison supplies no clinical scale of doubt and permits no unchecked fact to be declared true for reassurance.

5. **Inquiry among other activities: Hume and Peirce.** In I.4, Hume keeps reflection, company and action alongside one another; in III, Peirce considers belief as guiding desires and actions and doubt as prompting inquiry, then in IV connects inquiry's end with doubt ceasing. The limited resemblance is that thinking relates to the arrangement of activity rather than existing apart from it. The difference is that Hume describes a combination of human occupations, while Peirce distinguishes belief from doubt. The editorial pause with a question still open is not identical with the end of inquiry Peirce describes: it declares no doubt removed, promises no exercise efficacy and cancels no necessary factual checking.

NIMH is used separately to ground professional assistance and safety boundaries. Institutional medical information becomes no equivalent philosophical tradition in this map, determines no conviction's truth and establishes no efficacy of the editorial exercise.

Primary sources

1. David Hume. An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, I, paragraphs 1–10; XII, III, paragraphs 129–132. Original English; L. A. Selby-Bigge, 1902 edition based on 1777.

2. MN 63. Cūḷa Māluṅkya Sutta, Of the Irrelevant, Further Dialogues of the Buddha, I, pp. 304–307, Lord Chalmers, 1926. Sutta transcription read; Pali and printed scan not collated.

3. Charles S. Peirce. The Fixation of Belief (1877), II–IV; original English Wikisource transcription. Named sections only, periodical scan not collated.

4. NIMH. Caring for Your Mental Health, reviewed April 2026; professional help and safety boundary only.

Only the passages identified in the research notes were read. The edition and source language are identified for each text. Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations from the named English text; where that text is a translation, its translator is identified in the attribution. Original English texts are not described as translations. All contemporary scenes are hypothetical editorial examples.

Tags

search, answer, stopping, pause, question, unknown, meaning, philosophy, inquiry, doubt, belief, grounds, action, boundary, participation, choice, time, reading, conversation, consent, responsibility, autonomy, dignity, Hume, Peirce, Buddhism, Malunkyaputta, truth, checking, life

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.