

UNITED WISDOM

A letter to a future generation as a way to name what matters

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-18-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A letter to a future generation as a way to name what matters

Epigraph

> *when thy son asketh thee in time to come*

— Deuteronomy 6:20, exact fragment; King James Version.

What this article is about

A letter to a future generation can begin with a modest question: what do I consider important now, and why? It need not predict the recipient's world, assemble a flawless biography, or provide rules for every case. Experience, mistakes, hopes, and the difference between wishes and commitments can be named. Future readers have conditions of their own. They may understand differently, question, disagree, or never read the letter. That does not make the present address meaningless, but it limits the writer's claims. This article considers a letter as a way to make one's understanding available without declaring the last word about another life. A fictional example will distinguish witness, advice, and demands, then examine how importance can be conveyed without a ceremonial portrait or predetermined gratitude. The letter looks forward but is written from a particular present.

I. A letter does not know the whole future life

The recipient is not fully known to the writer. They may be someone familiar many years later, a child who will grow up, or an unknown reader in another era. Their circumstances cannot be filled in with the writer's habits beforehand. Even a known name leaves future work, relationships, and difficulties open. Choosing a letter does not turn an address into an accurate forecast. A writer can speak honestly from what is available now: what they saw, participated in, did not understand, and valued. This limit does not disqualify them from speaking. It prevents present experience from taking the place of complete knowledge about someone who will read later.

A writer may want to define the future conclusively: the world will worsen, technology will solve everything, or people must repeat old mistakes. Such statements can express fear, hope, or conviction. Naming reasons helps a reader recognize their status instead of receiving tone as evidence. A letter can identify a concern and the information the writer lacks. A forecast may even be acknowledged as uncertain. The future reader then receives a conclusion together with its temporal setting. They do not have to validate someone else's prediction

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

through their life. A different experience does not make the letter dishonest where the writer never claimed knowledge they did not possess.

A date and circumstances can belong to the substance. A lengthy historical report is unnecessary; the conditions of an important choice may be enough. What seemed available, who depended on a decision, and which possibilities were unknown can be explained. That prevents a former situation from being mistaken for an eternal rule. Future readers can consider similarities and differences without choosing between total obedience and contempt for the past. The letter remains one person’s witness. Its value does not require that person to have been right about everything in advance. An honestly named limit can make a judgment clearer than a confident instruction stripped of the conditions from which it arose.

II. A fictional letter begins with an ordinary event

Imagine Vera leaving a letter to unknown future readers in her family. The example is fictional. She first lists large words: honesty, education, care, freedom. Each matters, but the list does not yet reveal what she means. Then she recalls an ordinary evening: an acquaintance asked for help, she agreed too quickly, and could not fulfil the promise. Instead of proclaiming unfailing kindness, she describes why she said yes, what happened, and what she understood later. A distinct experience becomes available. Readers need not accept the author as a model for an entire life to notice a question about promises, available help, and a clear refusal.

Vera may say she now tries to clarify a request before agreeing. This is advice, but not yet a universal rule. Time can be short, information incomplete, or action impossible to postpone. She cannot know every future case. The thought can retain both reason and limit: in the described situation a hasty promise complicated someone’s day; another situation may raise another question. Specificity need not become a demand to copy an event. A reader may recognize a similar difficulty or may not. Both responses remain possible. The letter offers material for understanding instead of announcing that every apparently similar situation has already been decided for its recipient.

An ordinary event need not be dramatic to matter. A question that helped learning, attention to someone’s words, or a decision whose reasons are now doubtful can be described. Accuracy should not be replaced by ornament. Forgotten details can remain unknown. Another participant may have understood the event differently, and that can be acknowledged. Fictional Vera acquires no right to speak for her acquaintance merely because the letter will be read later. Temporal distance does not make another life unrestricted material for an attractive self-portrait. The account can preserve the boundary of its witness while still conveying why the writer found the experience important.

III. Importance needs reasons

“This matters most” does not explain why it matters to the writer. A difficulty, faith, encounter, argument, or prolonged participation may lie behind it. A letter can choose and clearly name several reasons. Every conviction need not be proved like a mathematical theorem. What was witnessed, trusted, and desired can be distinguished. Readers then have room to understand without immediate agreement. A religious ground should not be hidden behind a supposedly neutral conclusion binding everyone. A thought drawn from a personal event need not become a law of human nature. Accuracy preserves the dignity of conviction while limiting claims beyond its actual basis.

In Deuteronomy 6:20–25, a future son’s question receives an answer through the account of deliverance and God’s commandments. The passage retains a covenantal religious foundation; it cannot be turned into a secular claim that every instruction is merely private opinion. Our comparison is narrower: an explanation makes the origin of a requirement visible rather than only repeating “that is how it must be.” The writer of a personal letter gains no authority of commandment from this image. They can explain why something matters to them and the history to which it belongs. Readers see a reason as a reason instead of having to infer it from ceremonial tone.

A reason may remain disputed. Someone can respect the writer’s faith or experience without adopting it. Room for that answer can be left without abandoning the writer’s position. “You may see it differently” does not necessarily express indifference to truth. It acknowledges an address between people rather than within one mind. Nor must a letter qualify every sentence endlessly. Trust and established evidence should not be confused, and disagreement need not be assigned the meaning of ingratitude. What matters becomes available for discussion. A question does not erase it, but ancestral transmission does not exempt it from attention either.

IV. Witness differs from a ceremonial portrait

Future recipients may be unable to question the writer in person. A letter can therefore readily create a portrait in which every decision was wise, every motive noble, and every mistake quickly overcome. Such an account may sound orderly while leaving little room for understanding. A completed result appears instead of a person amid conditions. Difficulty can be named without exhaustive confession. Unclear matters may remain without making the letter an inventory of guilt. Honesty does not require disclosing everything. It requires not presenting a chosen image as a complete biography or replacing known events with a convenient explanation invented only afterward.

In Montaigne’s address To the Reader, an ordinary self is preferred to an adorned image seeking fame. We use that thought within the brief address, with the English edition’s

attribution limit stated in the sources. It does not prove that the writer actually represented himself without distortion. For a personal letter, the comparison asks whether understanding is being made available or a predetermined impression secured. The purposes may mix. Wanting to be understood need not be called vanity. But if every recollection serves only a flawless image, readers cannot see how someone learned, doubted, or answered for particular decisions.

Dignity can be retained while incompleteness is acknowledged. A writer may have overlooked something important, understood an encounter later, or become uncertain about an earlier judgment. This erases no good action and requires no final verdict from a reader. The letter can show thought changing without promising perfect self-knowledge. Future readers may encounter that movement as another person’s experience. They become neither appointed judges nor compulsory witnesses for the defence. Sometimes distinguishing an event from its present interpretation conveys more than a lengthy justification of a whole life. The writer remains a person and the reader an independent conversation partner.

V. Advice does not appoint the recipient’s life

Advice concerns action, but a recipient’s future does not belong to the adviser. Even a kindly letter can hide a condition: living rightly means repeating my decision. What the writer finds useful can be separated from demands for a profession, relationship, or prescribed happiness. Reasons matter more than a universal tone. A choice made under a particular need can retain that setting. Paths the writer never took mark limits to information too. Readers may consider advice in their own circumstances without surrendering their questions beforehand. Taking a different path is insufficient evidence of disrespect toward someone who left a letter.

Fictional Vera notices that she wants everyone to choose reliable employment. Her reason is a period when uncertain income complicated care for people close to her. That ground can be honestly described. A future reader may have other opportunities, constraints, and duties. The letter does not become individualized financial advice. A more precise account says that fulfilling accepted promises mattered to Vera and explains why a dependable arrangement helped her. Readers can recognize that value while choosing different work. What matters need not coincide with one form of realizing it. Experience can then be conveyed without assigning someone else’s destiny.

Future readers may have commitments the letter cannot know. Freedom to answer does not let them forget those duties for an attractive gesture of rejecting the past. Actual circumstances matter. Yet someone else’s wish becomes no accepted promise merely through being preserved on paper. Existing agreements should be distinguished from dreams, hopes, or requests. The article determines no legal status of wills or family documents. Its question is more modest: can the reader tell what kind of words they are receiving? Clarification prevents

an indefinite instruction from turning into debt, and independence from being mistaken for automatic release from particular responsibility.

VI. Being understandable is not reducing everything to a slogan

Brevity differs from emptiness. A short letter may clearly name experience and reasons while a long one offers only ceremonial words. Care can be linked to the action the writer means; freedom to the demand they wanted to escape and the participation they valued. Every possible case need not be analysed. A few precise connections can make an object visible. A word then retains depth through an understandable action rather than sheer volume. A difficult question may remain unfinished if its incompleteness is also named. The letter need not become a collection of ready conclusions for immediate use. Clarity can include uncertainty instead of removing it for a cleaner appearance.

In Democracy and Education I.2, Dewey connects communicating experience with formulating it through contact points in another person’s life. This provides philosophical support for asking whether a letter is understandable. It does not show that correct wording secures a future response. A writer can make reasons more available: explain an unfamiliar object, add context, or remove an expression intelligible only to them. Not knowing a present family joke does not make a future reader less capable. Different times and experiences call for explanation rather than an examination of whether someone deserves the message. Trying to explain can itself reveal uncertainty within the writer’s thought.

Understandability does not require imagining an identical recipient. Their words, reading experience, or questions may differ in ways the writer never considered. Every difference cannot be listed beforehand, but complete coincidence need not be a silent condition. A word with a particular personal meaning can be explained as such. The recipient may still answer differently. Clarity does not guarantee assent; disagreement does not always indicate misunderstanding. Sometimes someone understands well enough to reach another conclusion. The letter has then conveyed substance without producing its preferred outcome. That possibility belongs to communication between people rather than to a defect that wording must always eliminate.

VII. A mistake can offer a lesson without requiring the same path

A writer may describe what they now consider a mistake. The account should not hide a rule that future readers must undergo the same difficulty to understand life’s seriousness. Another experience supplies material without creating a duty to repeat it. What was known, which choice was made, and how present understanding changed can be explained. Unclear consequences belong to accuracy too. Readers may recognize a situation or identify an important difference. They can learn through an account without participating in every described ordeal. The writer’s suffering does not by itself make advice infallible or require a recipient to treat a painful history as proof of every conclusion attached to it.

Vera’s mistake concerns a promise she did not fulfil. She can acknowledge her choice without making herself the sole cause of everything that followed. Difficult conditions should not erase her own part either. A letter can retain both distinctions: where the writer acted and where other conditions affected the outcome. This is neither a trial nor a means of securing forgiveness. Future readers are not appointed to remove the past’s weight. An account can be honest and unfinished. Where a possible correction concerns a living person now, an attractive address to the future does not replace separate attention to that possibility.

Not every admission belongs in the letter. Detail can be limited, particularly where another person’s private life is involved. Declining to disclose everything is not automatically deception. A problem arises when a convenient part is presented as a complete picture or an absent person is blamed without clear grounds. The account can state that it concerns the writer’s experience and withholds some details. Readers then understand the material’s limits. They need not reconstruct another biography to judge the author. Importance can survive through an honestly named question rather than an accumulation of disclosures. A letter may be definite enough without turning other people into characters in a final defence.

VIII. Faith and hope retain their own voice

A letter may convey hope as well as knowledge. A writer can wish for a kind of relationship, available help, or a ground to which they turn in difficulty. Hope need not counterfeit a guarantee. Friends, assistance, and room for questions can be wished for without promising that they will exist. Faith can be named without being presented as a measured outcome. Clear status does not weaken such words. Readers can distinguish a wish, trust, and a factual claim. Their future need not reproduce the hope exactly for it to have been sincere when written. A different life can remain real without retrospectively cancelling the author’s goodwill.

A religious letter may speak confidently from its tradition. Preserving readers’ freedom need not force writers to abandon conviction or replace God with a psychological resource. Deuteronomy’s account and commandments have their own covenantal ground; we do not

erase it for a shared vocabulary. Yet a private writer does not become a prophet of another person’s future merely by invoking that text. A personal letter can clearly state what they believe and why it matters. Recipients then encounter an actual voice rather than a concealed spiritual judgment supposedly fixing their worth in advance. Understanding and adopting a conviction remain distinct events.

A life can be blessed or wished well without claiming to know all its meaning. The writer may hope the recipient will not face difficulty alone. That prescribes no solution for every case and demands no particular emotional response. Readers may feel gratitude, sorrow, irritation, or nothing like the expected feeling. The letter does not diagnose those responses. What matters is whether it leaves room for an actual person or requires a predetermined role. Hope invites life under the recipient’s own conditions where it does not become control of the future disguised as indisputable love. The invitation can retain conviction and care without securing possession of the person addressed.

IX. Making something available is not transmitting everything

A letter may be small yet complete within its chosen subject. Every document, event, or family history need not be included. A few thoughts can clarify what matters to the writer. Where another object accompanies the letter, its significance can be explained without making an entire archive compulsory reading. This is no technical storage system. The question concerns access to meaning: who speaks, from what time, and why? Preserving text does not establish that its substance has already been received. A letter may remain an unused opportunity for encounter. That limits transmission without proving the writing worthless or requiring a reader to rescue it through a prescribed response.

The writer’s address differs from information about others. A useful detail may belong to more than their own history. A name can be omitted, the account’s limits clarified, or the writer’s action described instead of another person’s secret. Particular legal questions require separate assessment; a letter does not settle them automatically. Wanting to convey importance is not sufficient reason to disclose everything known. A future reader need not receive someone else’s vulnerability as the price of closeness to the writer. Accuracy includes choosing what the meaning requires, as well as considering whether each individual statement is true. Those questions concern the substance of the communication, not a demand for an exhaustive private record.

A letter may remain unsent, change later, or be offered only to particular people. Reflection does not compel immediate disclosure. Writing can reveal words not yet ready to become an address, without guaranteeing psychological benefit or requiring every message to be postponed. The particular object matters: an actual promise, intended recipients, and consequences of transmission. On returning later, a writer can retain the revision’s date and

explain a substantial change of thought. Future readers then need not guess why parts speak in different voices. Incompleteness becomes visible instead of being hidden inside an attractive final form. The letter may still be offered from that limited position without claiming a finished account of the writer’s entire life.

X. The future response does not belong to the writer

After completing a letter, a writer may hope for a particular response. Wanting understanding belongs to an address, but creates no entitlement to agreement. Readers may find one part important, another disputed, a third unnecessary. They may preserve the letter and live differently. Such responses cannot all be assigned betrayal or inattention beforehand. A text can be recognized as sufficiently honest within its available scope while further encounter depends on more than its author. This does not abandon the substance. It retains a boundary between one’s action and another person’s life. The letter offers conversation even where an answer may take a form impossible to imagine now.

Return to fictional Vera. Her letter now contains more than virtues: a hasty promise, reasons for a significant choice, and hope for available help. She names unknown future conditions separately. Some details about her acquaintance remain outside the account. Advice is advice, religious conviction her conviction, and unknown matters remain unknown. None of this guarantees a treasured family document. It makes the actual subject more accessible. A reader may ask what concerns their life. Vera does not secure the last word. She leaves a distinct voice that can be encountered without an obligation to become its continuation in every detail or to reproduce its emotional meaning exactly.

Montaigne, Dewey, and the biblical account retain different grounds: personal witness, a philosophy of communication, and covenantal transmission of meaning. Their comparison forms no common doctrine of future letters. It distinguishes questions about what the writer shows, which reasons are named, and whether the reader can understand the subject. An independent answer begins beyond that point. Importance may be conveyed without promises of eternal preservation, complete biography, or compulsory gratitude. Conviction can coexist with honesty about knowledge’s limits. The letter then looks toward the future without possessing it. It preserves a present attempt to speak clearly and allows another future to remain genuinely another: an encounter with people the writer’s text cannot exhaust beforehand.

What this means in practice

Name an intended reader or honestly leave them unknown. Choose a few thoughts that matter now and identify where their importance arose: experience, argument, faith, hope. Different grounds are not one kind of proof. An ordinary event can begin the letter without requiring a complete biography.

For each piece of advice, clarify what you know about its conditions and what you do not know about the future recipient. Separate wishes from accepted promises. Does the letter demand predetermined gratitude, a profession, or an emotional response? Another person’s private detail can be omitted where the meaning remains available without it.

Read the text as an address to someone who does not share every habit. Where is explanation or a date needed? What remains disputed? The letter may be kept privately, revisited, or offered under suitable conditions. This is an original way to examine content, not a tested method for transmitting values, therapy, or guaranteed mutual understanding.

Key quotation

> *All communication is like art.*

— John Dewey, Democracy and Education, I.2; original English.

Connections between traditions

1. **Making a voice visible and naming a requirement’s origins.** Montaigne’s To the Reader prefers ordinary personal witness to a ceremonial image; Deuteronomy 6:20–25 answers a future son through the account of deliverance and commandments. The comparison makes meaning more available where readers see the position from which someone speaks instead of receiving only a conclusion. Boundary: a self-portrait is not covenantal history, and a letter’s writer gains no authority of religious commandment by invoking that account. The English address is editorially marked as omitted by Cotton; its specific translator has not been established.

2. **Explanation addresses another person’s question.** Dewey, Democracy and Education I.2, connects communicating experience with contact points in recipients’ lives; Deuteronomy 6:20 begins transmission of meaning with the next generation’s question. The shared mechanism asks whether a letter explains reasons to someone for whom they are not obvious. Boundary: an educational argument and covenantal instruction are distinct. The biblical question is no modern doctrine of freely negotiated consent. Understandable wording guarantees no adoption, and a recipient’s question does not establish the writer’s error beforehand.

3. **Addressing a person rather than managing fame.** In Montaigne's To the Reader, a private recipient matters more than public adornment of the writer; Dewey I.2 allows association through a book or letter despite physical distance. The comparison distinguishes an opportunity to encounter a particular voice from a wish to secure its desired reputation. Boundary: personal self-description and a philosophy of social communication have different tasks. Preserved writing establishes no actual encounter or perfect sincerity. Readers do not owe the writer a response that maintains a preferred image.

4. **Reasons for a practice rather than a bare formula.** Dewey I.2 treats formulating experience as work on communicable meaning; Deuteronomy 6:21–25 connects commandments with a named history of God and the people. For a personal letter, the shared question concerns whether reasons for valuing an action become understandable or a formula alone remains to be repeated. Boundary: religious instruction retains its meaning rather than becoming a convenient human suggestion. A writer's history does not make advice universal, and explanation does not relieve recipients from examining present conditions.

5. **Writing clarifies a present witness.** Montaigne's To the Reader sets a limited subject of self-description; Dewey I.2 observes that formulating experience also affects the communicator. The shared mechanism is that writing understandably may reveal a limit or uncertainty in present understanding instead of producing a final portrait of an entire life. Boundary: these are philosophical and literary resources, not a proven therapeutic technique. Revising text guarantees no improvement in wellbeing. The letter need not become an exhaustive biography and acquires no knowledge of its future reader.

Primary sources

Michel de Montaigne, **To the Reader**, in Essays, William Carew Hazlitt's 1877 edition, Project Gutenberg ebook 3600: the complete address with editorial notes. The book names Charles Cotton as translator, but this address is marked "Omitted by Cotton." Its specific English translator has not been established. It is therefore used through brief paraphrase, with no displayed quotation or false Cotton attribution. The resource concerns ordinary personal witness, not proven objective self-knowledge. Historical assumptions about "primitive" peoples are not adopted, and variant dates are not resolved here. Source text.

John Dewey, **Democracy and Education**, original English, Project Gutenberg ebook 852, I.2, Education and Communication. The complete section is used for communicating experience, association through writing across distance, and formulating meaning through another's experience. The key sentence comes from I.2; the Russian rendering is ours. This philosophical argument does not establish effective legacy letters, therapy, or guaranteed agreement. Source text.

Deuteronomy 6:20–25, King James Version, the entire named passage: a future son's question, deliverance, God, and commandments in their covenantal context. The epigraph is an exact short fragment from 6:20; the Russian rendering is ours. Religious grounds remain distinct from secular advice. The account gives a personal letter's writer no prophetic knowledge and proves no successful transmission of convictions. Source text.

Tags

letter, future, generation, witness, experience, meaning, reasons, advice, wishes, promise, faith, hope, memory, reader, author, Montaigne, Dewey, Deuteronomy, communication, understanding, agreement, question, freedom, responsibility, biography, mistake, honesty, privacy, gratitude, personal path

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.