

UNITED WISDOM

Generational Experience and an Individual Biography

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-09-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Generational Experience and an Individual Biography

Epigraph

> *“to allow that you do not know it”*

— Confucius, Analects II.17. Exact fragment of instruction about knowledge, from James Legge’s English translation.

What this article is about

“Our generation was used to something different” can open a conversation about life or bring it to an end. It may name circumstances a younger listener has never encountered, yet it can also make one person the representative of an established type. A birth date then supposedly explains their character, relation to work, and even entitlement to decide what they want. This article distinguishes a shared historical background, a family account, and an individual biography. We turn to a brief distinction from Karl Mannheim, alongside Confucius, Epictetus, and John Dewey, preserving their different foundations. Generational experience is a context to examine rather than an explanation of every action. Someone may understand a habit’s origins without making it compulsory, or reconsider an inherited rule without denying the lives of those who used it. The question is how to discuss differences and present agreements without replacing a person with a calendar category.

I. A particular account stands behind “we”

Imagine Natalya and her adult daughter Lena discussing Lena’s possible change of job. In this hypothetical example, Natalya says that her generation tried to hold on to a dependable position. Lena hears a prohibition, although her mother is primarily recalling her own circumstances: limited options, responsibility for a family, and fear of beginning again under unknown conditions. For the conversation to continue, memory needs separating from a proposal. Natalya can explain why stability mattered to her. This does not yet establish that Lena’s current work is dependable, that another job would be worse, or that their responsibilities are the same. Today’s opportunity needs information the family formula has not supplied.

“We” may mean peers, friends, colleagues, residents of one place, or a few close people. These circles overlap without being identical. If Natalya recalls a habit within her own team, it should not automatically become a rule for everyone of the same age. A more precise phrase

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

such as “where I worked” may explain more than a broad account of a generation. Precision does not deprive experience of value. It identifies where the experience arose and what it concerns. A listener can then ask about a particular choice rather than argue with an enormous collective character supposedly assigned to everyone involved.

Lena can use a sweeping formula too: “People of your generation understand nothing.” It shortens the explanation from the opposite side and makes another question seem unnecessary. Yet her mother may have noticed an important risk in the new offer while expressing it in familiar language. Both benefit from setting the label aside. Instead of evaluating a whole generation, they can name the assertion: which condition of the new work raises doubt, what information is needed, and who is responsible for what? Sometimes different values really are involved; sometimes information is missing; sometimes both want something similar but attach different requirements to “dependability.” A birth date determines none of these outcomes.

II. A shared background does not create an identical response

In The Problem of Generations, the discussion of generation units on pages304–307 of the English text distinguishes a shared historical context from differing responses within it. This brief distinction opens a question rather than describing an individual listener’s character.

The remaining work begins with a particular biography. Two peers may have lived in different places, learned different activities, had different resources, or encountered one event in different roles. Even within a family, a child and parent participate differently in a shared history. One makes a decision while another depends on it; one sees the whole conversation while another remembers a single episode. These differences do not decide who must be right. They do deserve attention before the claim that everyone experienced the same thing. Shared time does not ensure identical available actions. The detail of a role may therefore matter more than the period’s name when examining how a habit developed.

An influence of circumstances also differs from an inevitable response. If someone learned to approach spending cautiously when money was scarce, that connection explains how the attention developed. It does not establish that every current expense is dangerous or that everyone else must follow the same rule. The rule may remain useful, or its object may have changed. Checking it requires information about the present activity. Explaining origins should not automatically justify every action, yet reconsidering an action does not require calling the earlier method foolish. This precision allows a person to acknowledge learning within their circumstances while deciding differently how to use that knowledge now.

Interest in a generational background does not oblige someone to disclose every personal detail. A speaker can say enough to illuminate the current question and leave the rest outside

the conversation. Shared membership confers no right to interrogate family history or demand an explanation of every action. If an agreement needs particular information, that information should be identified. A question asked merely to confirm an established age type may add no understanding. A biography becomes audible when someone can clarify the account, decline an assigned role, and decide which circumstances they are willing to discuss.

III. Memory, explanation, and a present-day rule

A family account often contains three layers. The first recalls an event: searching for work, moving, or allocating limited funds. The second explains why a particular method seemed necessary. The third supplies a rule for the listener: therefore you must act that way too. The transitions can go unnoticed. Lena listens to her mother’s account, then discovers that agreeing to listen has become agreement to repeat the decision. It helps to identify the level of conversation. A memory can be respected without automatically accepting its rule. A rule can be challenged without denying that the earlier decision helped its narrator in a particular situation.

This distinction does not guarantee a memory’s accuracy. People can recall one episode differently, and a family account can acquire a settled form over time. In a current conversation, saying “this is how I remember it” may sometimes be sufficient. If a public event or checkable fact is involved, personal recollection may not be enough; relevant documents and sources are needed. The article does not propose investigating every family discrepancy. What matters is the information required for the decision. Doubt about one detail does not make a narrator’s whole life fictional, just as sincerity does not establish every external assertion in the account. Different kinds of information need different means of checking.

In Analects II.17, acknowledging ignorance belongs to the relation to knowledge itself. In a family conversation, the passage permits an unknown to remain unknown. Natalya may know her earlier circumstances well while not yet knowing the conditions of Lena’s new job. Lena may understand the current offer without knowing what dependability meant to her mother. Neither gap has to be filled with a ready-made portrait of a generation. Asking what remains unknown here is more precise than declaring that such people always think that way. It allows missing information to be discussed without requiring either speaker to abandon personal experience or accept the other’s evaluation in advance.

IV. Inheritance can involve change

An inherited rule is often presented as a choice between loyalty and betrayal. If Lena does not remain in her previous job, she supposedly disrespects her mother’s life. If Natalya doubts a new form of work, she supposedly refuses to understand the present. Both evaluations turn a particular question into a verdict on belonging too quickly. A rule may preserve an important concern, such as honouring commitments, while also fixing one way of carrying it out. Those parts can be distinguished. Concern about consequences remains, while the method is examined under new conditions. Reconsideration need be neither rejection of an entire family history nor its exact repetition.

Analects II.23 discusses following earlier dynasties’ regulations and what was removed or added. The passage concerns ritual and political inheritance within a particular world. Its confidence about knowing later ages is not being accepted as a contemporary method of historical prediction. Yet continuity within the passage already includes differences: following is not described as the complete absence of change. This limited possibility of considering preservation and reconsideration together is useful here. A family agreement has a different object and foundation, but it too may need clarification about what is retained and what belongs to an earlier way of acting.

Natalya may name her concern more precisely: she wants her daughter to understand the offer and avoid promising money to a shared budget before that money exists. Lena can address this through information and a clear agreement without accepting a universal demand never to change jobs. If keeping one position matters to her mother in itself, the difference in values becomes visible. It does not necessarily have to disappear. Adults can disagree in evaluation while retaining specific commitments and respect. Once the object is named, family history has less reason to become an endless argument about whose way of living belongs to the correct era.

V. A habit’s origins and responsibility for an action

Understanding a habit’s origins can help, but an explanation does not cancel its present consequences. Someone may connect sharp speech with the way people around them spoke, or caution with earlier restrictions. This is a possible context they can describe. The listener still has to respond to particular words and actions. “That is how we do things” does not require another person to accept every manner of communication. Naming a boundary likewise does not require diagnosing an entire generation. Someone can identify what is unacceptable in this conversation and which form would allow it to continue. Responsibility concerns the current action, while the historical background remains background.

Precision also matters when assessing one’s own decisions. If Lena chooses a risky option, invoking a new generation does not examine its conditions. If Natalya prevents discussion, invoking past experience does not show that her information concerns the current offer. Both can consider history and still ask what is known about the activity now. Explanation differs from justification. Understanding why someone acted does not mean agreeing with every consequence. Disagreeing about a consequence does not require denying their circumstances. Both levels can remain present without reducing the conversation to a choice between accusation and complete exemption.

It helps to name an action in the present and identify whom it affects. What was promised? Who will need money, time, or assistance? Who can make the decision, and whose agreement is required for its shared part? A ready-made table of generations cannot answer these questions. They arise from actual relationships. Reconsidering an existing agreement requires conversation rather than a unilateral declaration of a new era. Where no agreement existed, a family habit does not necessarily create one automatically. Clarification may expose an uncomfortable difference, but it is more honest than assuming that an age group’s character has already allocated all responsibility. The article offers language for discussion rather than a current legal determination of an obligation.

VI. Others’ achievements and a biography of one’s own

A generational account can become a source of pride or shame. Someone speaks about peers’ achievements as though they established a personal quality, or about others’ errors as though sharing a birth period made them responsible. A shared history may matter for belonging, but personal participation needs its own description. Who did what? Which actions were available to this person? What did they actually participate in, and what did they learn about later? These questions do not remove respect for a collective event. They prevent an image of the group from becoming the ready-made biography of everyone within one calendar category.

In Enchiridion 6, Epictetus distinguishes another’s excellence from what belongs to one’s own action, using pride in a horse’s beauty. The passage belongs to a Stoic discussion of judgment rather than an account of contemporary societies or historical responsibility. Only the distinction between another’s achievement and one’s own participation is useful here. Membership in a circle does not automatically show that someone performed the same action. Complete separation from history does not follow either. A relation to shared events may include memory, gratitude, disagreement, and acknowledgment of actual participation. Those relations need naming rather than being compressed into personal merit or personal guilt.

If Natalya is proud of people’s efforts during her lifetime, Lena can ask which particular activities matter to her. The account gains faces, decisions, and circumstances. If the daughter discusses an earlier error, her mother need not defend every action by every peer before

responding. She may not know, may dispute a fact, or may acknowledge a mistaken action without renouncing her own life. This room to respond matters when a conversation quietly establishes two camps: an ideal past and an enlightened present. People lose the detail of experience in either camp. A particular biography allows belonging and difference to remain without a compulsory collective portrait.

VII. Sharing experience is more than repeating a conclusion

In the first chapter of Democracy and Education, Dewey connects the continuation of social life with communication and the transmission of experience. In the section on communication, he explains that thoughts and purposes cannot be passed on like physical objects. Experience needs expression that lets another person see its relation to their own life. This is educational philosophy rather than a tested technique for family agreement. It does help reveal why a finished conclusion sometimes fails to reach a listener. Natalya says to value stability without naming what makes it important. Lena says everything is different now without identifying the condition that changed. Both transmit a formula while the object remains unseen.

Someone can try describing one episode and the decision that was possible then. Rather than the whole history of an era, it can be an event with enough detail for the question. A listener may then restate their understanding and ask whether they identified the meaning accurately. This is a conversational proposal, not a compulsory ritual or a promise to remove tension. The narrator may correct the account or stop. The listener may disagree with the general conclusion even after understanding the story. Understanding and accepting a rule remain different outcomes. Their distinction allows experience to be heard without making listening a hidden signature beneath every future demand.

Dewey also distinguishes a shared interest from merely receiving orders. Here the question is whether both speakers understand the activity being discussed. If it is Lena’s job decision, Natalya can offer information and name a concern without obtaining agreement with her whole picture of an era. Lena can discuss the shared financial part while keeping her professional intention distinct. When these levels merge, disagreement can look like rejection of closeness. Naming the levels permits a relationship to continue despite different decisions. That continuation is not guaranteed by an exercise, however: relationships have their own history and actual limits.

VIII. An inherited rule can be examined through its object

Consider another family rule: “You must do everything yourself.” It may once have meant competence in a particular task, avoiding an unavailable service, or not depending on uncertain assistance. In a present conversation, the same phrase may prohibit asking for collaboration. Examining it requires identifying the object: which task must a person perform alone, and why? Independent work may be needed for learning. A shared task may instead call for dividing the labour. Assistance may also have an unaffordable cost. The general formula does not distinguish these cases. Respect for a rule’s historical origins can coexist with asking what the rule does in the current situation.

Three questions help: which concern does the rule retain, which method does it propose, and what consequences does it have now? Suppose the concern is fulfilling a promise. The method is asking nobody for assistance. The consequence is failing to finish shared work while hiding the difficulty. Reconsidering the method may then preserve the original concern better than following it literally. This is a hypothetical example, not proof that assistance is always correct. Assistance has conditions and limits too. The point is that rules can be assessed through their relation to an activity rather than solely the age of those who first voiced them. An older method may fit and a newer one may not, or the reverse.

In Nicomachean Ethics II.2, Aristotle relates judgment about action to circumstances that a general formula cannot fully settle. His entire ethical framework is not being transferred into a family decision. This particular passage leaves room for considering the case. Asking who owns a rule can then be supplemented by asking what the rule enables here. If it fits, it can be retained without proving that it is modern. If it does not, the reason for changing it can be explained without accusing an earlier generation generally. Someone can be accurate about the activity and grateful for experience when gratitude is present, without making gratitude a duty to repeat every method.

IX. Different values and an actual agreement

Some disagreements remain after the facts are clarified. Natalya may value staying in one position, while Lena values changing direction. Both may understand an offer and still choose differently. Their disagreement should not be portrayed as a missing explanation that one more generational account will remove. It is more useful to identify the decision’s scope. Who makes the professional choice? Is there a shared part affecting others? What was previously promised? Adults may evaluate things differently, and clear commitments sometimes permit living with that difference. The article does not determine the legal status of their financial relationship; that requires actual conditions and the appropriate expertise.

An agreement differs from matching opinions. People can agree on the timing of a shared expense without declaring one lifestyle permanently superior. They can agree how changes will be reported without demanding a full account of every professional intention. Yet something the other person has not accepted cannot be called a shared agreement. Refusal belongs in the conversation too. If a joint action requires agreement and it is absent, that absence needs acknowledgment rather than an explanation through the wrong generation. Difference can remain without disguising an actual condition involving shared money, time, or labour. A particular decision may therefore be unavailable at present.

Some conversations can stop at a clear description of disagreement. “I understand why this matters to you, but I am choosing differently” may be more accurate than promising shared understanding soon. It guarantees no calm response. Its value lies in not presenting understanding of an origin as acceptance of a demand. If the conversation cannot continue, someone need not endlessly prove that their biography is sufficiently exceptional. The question may be revisited later, approached in another format, or left undiscussed under these conditions. These options depend on the actual relationship too. Neither distance nor continuation is declared universally correct; the distinction between a present choice and a general battle of generations remains.

X. Belonging without a ready-made character

A person belongs to many circles at once. They may share age with some people, a profession with others, and language or local history with others again. Shared memory matters in one situation, knowledge of an activity in another, and the actual relationship between two people in a third. No circle has to explain everything. Generational belonging may be a significant part of an account without automatically occupying every other place. Understanding a biography involves identifying which circumstances actually matter for the current question. Sometimes the generation’s name helps begin that inquiry; sometimes it obstructs it by suggesting that no further detail is needed.

This does not mean people choose every historical condition. They did not choose their birthplace, many initial opportunities, or others’ actions. An account can nevertheless distinguish what was received, experienced, done, and still unclear. That distinction promises no complete freedom from the past. It prevents assigning the past more explanatory force than it actually has in the case being considered. Natalya may name experience that matters to her; Lena may identify different conditions in her life. Neither has to become an exception to a generation to be heard. It is enough to stop treating the calendar’s name as a final answer to a question only just being discussed.

Generational experience is useful as an invitation to ask what happened, which role someone occupied, what they learned, and how they understand it now. An individual biography permits

an answer more detailed than a ready-made type allows. There is no need to choose one permanently over the other. Shared history can remain without becoming an immutable character. A family rule can be understood while its present object is examined. Differences in values can be acknowledged while a particular shared part is agreed. The conversation then concerns living people and an actual activity. Their ability to decide does not depend on proving their generation’s superiority or becoming entirely free of every past circumstance.

What this means in practice

Choose one statement about a generation that you often hear or use. Identify the activity you are explaining through it: work, spending, a manner of speaking, or asking for assistance? Then clarify “we” or “they.” Does it really mean all peers, a family, a familiar team, or one person? An ideal classification is unnecessary; noticing whether the circle exceeds the available information is enough.

Separate a memory, its explanation, and the current proposal. What does the person remember? Why did the earlier action seem reasonable? What is being proposed now? You can ask yourself or another person if the conversation is appropriate and they are willing to continue. Understanding the account does not mean accepting its rule. Doubting the rule does not require declaring a lived life wrong.

To examine the rule, name its concern, method, and consequences in the present activity. Concern for fulfilling a promise may remain while the work’s form or allocation changes. Obtain information about current conditions rather than substituting a calendar portrait. A checkable public fact may require a source; a family memory should be identified as recollection. Personal details need not be disclosed solely to justify a choice.

Identify the shared part separately. Whose money, time, labour, or earlier promises are affected? What requires actual agreement, and what remains a personal intention? Where agreement is absent, do not portray it as an established arrangement. Different values can be acknowledged without declaring one generation correct.

A short note can conclude the reflection: “These conditions are known; this is what I assume; this needs clarification for the decision.” There is no requirement to prove the uniqueness of an entire biography or obtain family agreement. This is a proposal for describing the question more precisely, rather than a tested psychological method or an obligation to continue every difficult conversation.

Key quotation

> *“Consensus demands communication.”*

— John Dewey, Democracy and Education I.2. Exact English sentence.

Dewey discusses participation in a common activity through understanding purposes and communicating one’s own actions. This is a philosophical argument about communication, not a guarantee that conversation resolves every disagreement between generations.

Connections between traditions

1. Shared background and distinguishable responses. In The Problem of Generations, pages304–307 of the English text, Mannheim distinguishes historical context from differing responses within it. Analects II.23 considers continuity in dynastic regulations alongside removal and addition. Here the connection separates belonging from literal repetition, leaving a question about the present rule open. Their subjects differ: a sociological distinction is not the Confucian discussion of ritual inheritance. The latter’s confidence about knowing later ages is not adopted as a way to predict modern history. Neither passage establishes Natalya’s or Lena’s character, compulsory agreement, or equal freedom of choice. The connection invites examination of circumstances and action; a historical label alone does not settle a family question.

2. Acknowledging ignorance and communicating experience. Analects II.17 connects knowing with recognising what is known and unknown. In Democracy and Education I.2, Dewey explains why experience needs expression in relation to another’s experience, rather than purposes being moved like objects. Both leave room for a question instead of a completed conclusion. In a conversation across ages, a mother can know her earlier circumstances while still asking about her daughter’s present offer. Their foundations differ: Confucius gives instruction about knowledge, while Dewey considers communication’s educational meaning. Neither promises that an accurate question will produce agreement. Understanding and accepting a rule remain separate outcomes, and personal details need not be disclosed when they are unnecessary or unwanted.

3. Another’s achievement and an action of one’s own. In Enchiridion 6, Epictetus uses a horse’s beauty to distinguish another’s excellence from one’s relation to an impression. In Nicomachean Ethics II.4, Aristotle distinguishes a successful product from the action of an agent who knows and chooses. Here the connection supports asking about personal participation when merit or blame is assigned to a whole generation. Membership and action need different descriptions. Their foundations differ: Stoic judgment is not identical to Aristotle’s conditions of virtuous action. The passages do not settle contemporary social or

legal responsibility or prohibit remembering collective events. They resist automatically substituting someone else's result for an individual biography; actual actions and commitments still require separate examination.

4. A retained concern and a changed method. Analects II.23 describes following earlier regulations with identifiable changes. In Nicomachean Ethics II.2, Aristotle points to circumstances of action that a general formula cannot fully determine. In a family question, this supports considering the concern retained by a rule and whether its method fits the present activity. Fulfilling a promise might require a different division of labour. This is an editorial application with limits: Confucius concerns a dynastic ritual order, Aristotle moral action, rather than contemporary family contracts. The connection establishes no superiority of newer over older methods and creates no duty of gratitude. It supports examining a method through its object and consequences while retaining the need to agree on shared work.

5. A shared activity and more than one form of participation. In Democracy and Education I.2, Dewey distinguishes communicated understanding of purposes from simply receiving orders. In Enchiridion 24, Epictetus considers benefit to a state without reducing it solely to office; fidelity and moral character remain his grounds. Here both passages resist defining participation through one predetermined status. A mother and daughter can discuss a decision's shared part without matching every opinion. Yet Dewey concerns communication in social life, while Epictetus discusses Stoic civic participation. A family relationship is not being equated with a state, nor is agreement guaranteed. Actual money, time, and labour require an actual arrangement; invoking a generation does not automatically create one.

Primary sources

1. Karl Mannheim. The Problem of Generations, selected generation-unit passages, English printed pages 304–307. Faculty-hosted UCSB PDF. Translator and precise print edition were not established; no direct quotations are used, and edition rights remain unknown.

2. Confucius. Analects II.17 and II.23, with actually read books I–II and the opening of III. James Legge's historical English translation, Project Gutenberg no. 3330. Text. The Russian epigraph is a United Wisdom translation of the exact English fragment. Chinese and the print edition were not collated.

3. Epictetus. Enchiridion 6 and 24, within the actually read sections 1–39. The Internet Classics Archive attributes its English text to Elizabeth Carter. Text. The precise print edition and modernisation of particular expressions were not established.

4. John Dewey. Democracy and Education (1916), I.1–2, with selected context in IV, XV, XVIII, and XXIII. Project Gutenberg no. 852. Text. The key quotation is an exact sentence from I.2; RU

is translated by United Wisdom from the original. The communication argument guarantees no family agreement.

5. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics II.2 and II.4, with II.1–5 and the opening of II.6 actually read. W. D. Ross's English translation, Internet Classics Archive. Book II. Greek and the precise print edition were not collated. Rights depend on each edition and jurisdiction; this package permits no raw-source import or vectorisation.

Tags

generations, generational experience, individual biography, history, memory, family accounts, continuity, change, social background, belonging, individuality, stereotypes, age, conversation, knowledge, ignorance, habit, rule, responsibility, commitments, agreement, work, choice, relationships, values, Confucius, Epictetus, Dewey, Mannheim, Aristotle

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.