

UNITED WISDOM

A Personal Map of Questions and the Limits of One Conversation

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-25-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A Personal Map of Questions and the Limits of One Conversation

Epigraph

> *its location and definition*

John Dewey, chapter VI: exact four-word fragment referring to the difficulty among reflection’s distinctions. It does not express his whole educational account.

What this article is about

Several expectations can sit behind a single question. Someone may want to understand an event, choose an action, preserve a relationship, and be sure they will make no mistake. One conversation can help with part of that, without covering an entire life. This article proposes a personal map of questions: distinguish what is known, conjectured, desired, and still open. Dewey considers how a difficulty becomes a definite subject for reflection; Plato examines gathering and distinguishing concepts; the Analects connects learning with thought and acknowledges the limits of knowledge. These are different historical works, not one method for assessing people. Our examples and short exercise are voluntary United Wisdom reflection. A map may support a bounded conversation that allows clarification, postponement, and an honest ending without a final answer. It establishes no diagnosis and promises neither relief nor a correct decision.

I. One question can contain several requests

Imagine someone considering a shared project. They write, “Why am I uncertain again?” That sentence might ask for a listener, information about participation, reflection on an earlier experience, or permission to decline. Its meaning cannot be established from the wording alone. A map begins by opening out the requests the person themselves recognises in their words. Ask what kind of response they want and what they might do after the conversation. Sometimes one fact is needed; sometimes room for an account; sometimes an agreement about the next step. Separating requests makes a meeting’s subject selectable without declaring other expectations false or unimportant. It does not require a hidden cause behind every uncertainty.

A personal map differs from a list of everything that has ever troubled someone. Start with a particular situation and a few connected questions. Here they might concern deadlines, available time, the possibility of changing participation, and the meaning of an earlier

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

disappointment. These belong to different planes: information, terms of agreement, and the person's own relationship to the matter. Joined in one sentence, an answer about scheduling could appear to answer a question about personal worth. Separate entries show where the organiser's information is needed and where reflection remains. They prove neither that the attitude arose from the timetable nor that limited time explains a whole personal history. The connection still needs consideration.

The wording might provisionally change from "What is wrong with me?" to "Which part of participating can I discuss now?" This is an editorial suggestion, not a requirement always to think narrowly. A broad question has its place when someone wants to explore it and understands the meeting's limits. A definite request nevertheless makes an agreement about the outcome easier. A listener might reflect what they heard, help compare alternatives, or identify missing information. None amounts to a final explanation of the person. A modest frame is justified by its connection to the present intention, not by a promise that small questions inevitably assemble into complete knowledge about an entire life.

Some questions should not become demands upon a conversation partner. If a decision belongs to another participant, their agreement cannot be entered in advance as the expected result of one's own reflection. You can clarify a proposal and prepare a request; consent arises only in a separate, actual agreement. Considering willingness to participate does not establish that an organiser will accept a revised deadline. This boundary keeps other people real. A map distinguishes an action someone can choose from a response they may request but cannot appoint. Sometimes that distinction makes a next step clearer, while the uncertainty they feel and the eventual outcome of the shared undertaking remain open.

II. A difficulty needs definition, not merely a name

Chapter VI of How We Think examines three episodes of reflection: choosing a route to an appointment, asking about a boat's fitting, and explaining bubbles' movement. Dewey distinguishes a difficulty, its definition, a possible explanation, reasoning through implications, and further testing. The transition from vague trouble to a question one can actually investigate matters. He does not demand mechanical passage through identical stages: the first moments may merge, and the extent of inquiry depends on the situation. We approach the chapter as historical educational philosophy. Its examples are not present professional instructions, and they do not turn a human conversation into an experiment upon its participant. Dewey, chapter VI.

For a personal map, take the modest distinction between naming a difficulty and describing it. "Too many commitments" names an experienced situation but does not say which obligations exist, what is being chosen now, or where change is possible. Someone could add, "Two meetings are already agreed for this week; a third invitation has not been accepted." This does

not cancel the feeling of overload. It identifies a bounded subject: whether to accept the third meeting and which conditions to clarify. No complete calendar, by itself, answers what kind of person one should be. Description places the question beside actual conditions while keeping judgments about one's wishes distinct and available for discussion.

Dewey stresses that the first explanation can remain a conjecture. In our imagined situation, the person believes they resist the meeting because of an earlier disappointment. That may matter, but the record need not immediately assert a causal connection. Other available explanations can be noted: an unsuitable time, an unclear task, or a wish to spend the day differently. A map retains several accounts without declaring them equally likely. Ask what known circumstance supports each and what is missing. There is no requirement to test oneself or another person to prove an interpretation. Clarifying the invitation may provide useful information; one's relationship to it may remain open to careful description rather than verification.

A definite question need not end in a quick answer. Dewey connects the extent of effort to a case's importance and context; sometimes action is prompt, sometimes judgment is postponed. On our map, the conversation's end and the decision's deadline can therefore differ. A meeting may finish by identifying missing information, with a decision later if actual circumstances permit. The word "reflection" grants no right to break a promise or move someone else's deadline. Place existing agreements beside the question, along with whatever still needs negotiation. Recognising an information gap is a limited outcome: neither thought's defeat nor evidence that a choice can never become possible. It tells us where the discussion currently stands.

III. Gather what belongs together and distinguish its parts

In Phaedrus 265d–266b, Socrates discusses gathering scattered particulars into one concept and dividing without arbitrarily breaking parts. The passage follows speeches about love, distinctions among kinds of madness, and questions about the art of reasoning. Its image of natural joints concerns conceptual work within the dialogue. We do not turn it into a way to sort people into correct categories or call our map the sole natural form of personal life. Another consideration helps here: before joining questions, ask what joins them; when separating them, retain each part's meaning. The historical image helps pose that question, but supplies no guaranteed classification for a particular situation today. Plato, Phaedrus.

Suppose "My relationship with the team" contains three questions. Who will confirm the meeting time? Do I want to continue? How should I understand yesterday's abrupt reply? One situation joins them, but they need different grounds. The responsible participant can be asked for the time. Continued participation concerns intentions and agreed conditions. The meaning of another person's sentence may require asking its author; recalling a tone does not disclose

their motives completely. A map does not forbid discussing the questions' connections. It prevents an unnoticed substitution in which a scheduling answer becomes proof of friendship, or one interpreted remark becomes a sufficient basis for explaining the team's entire history from beginning to end.

Excessively fine division can also obstruct. If every nuance becomes an entry, the initial request may disappear among details. Our editorial suggestion is to assess division by its usefulness for this conversation. Does a separate entry change the subject, the source of an answer, or the obligation being considered? If not, details can remain together. This calculates no ideal number of questions. One person may discuss a complex subject clearly; another may prefer to pause at a simpler formulation. Consider agreed time and both participants' willingness, rather than assessing a person by the list's size. The map serves the meeting's subject and may be changed when it no longer serves that purpose.

Take particular care with labels that describe a whole person. "I always avoid responsibility" joins many episodes in one strong assertion. A bounded conversation can return to an occasion: which commitment was accepted, what happened, and what explanation is currently proposed? This does not prove the opposite, that responsibility was always honoured. It reduces the assertion's reach to available material. If the general question still matters, retain it separately and mark its insufficient grounds. Plato's image grants no permission to declare one event a natural part of a preselected personality type. Distinguishing questions helps precisely when it leaves room to correct an excessive initial description rather than merely organise it.

IV. Knowledge, conjecture, and desire occupy different places

Analects II.15 relates learning and thought; II.17 includes acknowledging what is known and unknown in its account of knowledge. We read these brief sayings through James Legge's translation, without reducing the whole Confucian path to filling in notes. Between them, II.16 judges other teachings; we do not adopt that historical position as a prohibition on inquiry today. Here the useful distinction is between reflection and information: thought without material should not masquerade as evidence, while accumulating quotations should not replace thinking. Admitting uncertainty preserves a question's honest status. It does not yet show where an answer can be found or establish that every gap will eventually be filled. Analects, book II.

Three sentences can be marked differently. "I was invited to meet on Tuesday" reports a known condition, if the invitation actually says that. "The organiser will be offended if I decline" remains a conjecture about another person's response. "I want the option of declining" expresses a wish concerning a future agreement. They can influence one choice without corroborating each other. A wish does not make the organiser's response known; receiving an invitation does not establish an obligation to accept. This does not require unfeeling language.

An experience can be named too: someone feels worried about the discussion. Worry need not count as proof to be acknowledged as experience and a legitimate subject of attention.

Some information will be incomplete. A person remembers a spoken invitation but is unsure about its deadline. Instead of reconstructing it confidently, note that the condition needs confirmation. Another entry may concern a changing intention: there is interest now, but no decision yet. These are different kinds of uncertainty. One lacks clarification of a message; the other lacks a final choice. A map should not present a changing wish as a memory error or prescribe collecting facts instead of deciding. Ask which next step matches the gap’s character. A deadline can be confirmed through a separate request; willingness to participate can be discussed while retaining the possibility of ending without immediate assent.

An entry’s status can also change. A conjecture with suitable corroboration becomes better grounded; a confident entry whose grounds prove weak needs correction. A date and brief provenance note can make the change understandable without rewriting the earlier conversation as though doubt never existed. Here the map supports a question’s history, not its author’s image of infallibility. No one needs to preserve every detail of someone else’s life or make personal notes publicly accessible. Retain what the person voluntarily finds useful for a later meeting. A tidy document does not make its contents true: entries remain assertions with particular grounds, boundaries, and the possibility of subsequent clarification.

V. The meeting’s frame belongs to its participants

A question’s map can be personal, but a conversation involves at least two people. One person’s intention does not establish the other’s willingness, time, or ability to help. Start with a brief proposal: I want to discuss participation in the project and am not asking you to decide for me. The other person can agree, suggest a smaller frame, or decline. This does not assess the question’s worth. A meeting needs actual mutual willingness, not merely a well-prepared list. An agreement might include stopping and how notes will be handled. Its content depends on the situation; our exercise creates no professional confidentiality arrangement and establishes no legal duties for participants.

Name the kind of outcome sought. It might be a clearer formulation, missing information, comparison of two possible actions, or a request prepared for another participant. Keep the outcome inside the agreed frame. Seeking attentive listening does not automatically authorise investigating everyone’s motives. Discussing a timetable does not become a character examination. The topic can change by agreement, but both people’s willingness matters there too. A map should not silently expand the conversation whenever an interesting connection appears. Sometimes recording a new question separately is enough, preserving the existing meeting for the subject that led its participants to agree to give it time and attention in the first place.

One conversation need not produce a complete account of the situation. Connected questions may need different information and different interlocutors. In the project example, an organiser knows conditions, a close person may listen to one’s relationship with participation, and the person chooses their acceptable involvement. One individual may hold several functions, but trust’s intensity does not create that combination. Keep a heard opinion, a confirmed condition, and a personal decision distinct. A listener’s admission that they lack relevant information preserves accuracy. It does not diminish the support already offered or make seeking another source a betrayal of trust. It clarifies which part of the subject the present conversation can genuinely address.

The boundary matters especially when participants differ about what is central. One wants to explore a refusal’s meaning; the other immediately proposes a new schedule. Pause and name the difference without deciding whose approach is more mature. The conversation might need two parts; the scheduling suggestion may currently miss the request. A map helps return to the subject, rather than forcing a live exchange to obey a written plan. If the necessary willingness does not emerge, ending remains a permissible outcome. Courtesy and time already spent do not oblige someone to disclose more than intended or accept an imposed interpretation as a conclusively established explanation of their question.

VI. A postponed question remains a question

Other topics remain beside the chosen frame. Give one a brief entry: what arose, why it is not being considered now, and whether returning matters at all. This need not schedule another meeting. A question may lose importance, circumstances may change, or an appropriate interlocutor may become available. Postponement neither settles it nor declares it insignificant. Avoid calling the answer obtained sufficient for a topic that was never discussed. A conversation that clarified available time has not established an earlier conflict’s meaning. A map preserves that boundary plainly, so a partial outcome is not later retold as though participants had jointly considered every circumstance connected with it and reached a comprehensive conclusion.

Open questions take different forms. One asks for a fact missing from the record; another concerns someone else’s intention; a third concerns choosing among acceptable possibilities. Moving them under one label, “unclear,” may be insufficient. The first can name an information source, the second the limit of available knowledge and a possible request for clarification, the third the place where a choice remains. None guarantees an answer. Another person may decline to discuss motives; information may remain unavailable; comparison may leave a decision difficult. The map does not promise to remove these limits. It helps distinguish them and avoid seeking facts where one’s own assent to a particular action is still needed.

Several meetings may repeat a question without new grounds. That alone proves neither that conversation is useless nor that it must continue in the same form. Ask what the latest meeting actually added. Was there a new distinction, a clearer request, or recognition that this interlocutor cannot answer a particular part? If nothing changed, acknowledge that without manufacturing an outcome through elegant wording. A later choice might be a pause, a different subject, or another information source. Each remains a separate decision dependent on actual conditions. We prescribe no universal number of permissible conversations and do not treat repetition as a sign of any particular personal condition requiring an interpretation or label.

A postponed topic should not become a debt to disclose it later. People can reconsider which personal material to discuss and with whom. An actual obligation to others needs separate attention: declining to recount a whole history does not erase a commitment concerning shared work. The record can distinguish an open personal question from an obligation to communicate a specific decision by an agreed deadline. This resists calling every expectation pressure or every silence freedom. Ask which obligation was actually accepted, by whom, and concerning what. Disputed conditions may require a separate clarification, rather than a confident interpretation of obligations from one’s feeling alone. Personal privacy and agreed participation can both deserve careful consideration.

VII. Record the outcome at its actual scale

At a meeting’s end, distinguish its subject from its outcome. “We discussed participation” names a topic but does not report what was established. “I want to request the exact deadline” describes a chosen next step. “The other person accepted a revised deadline” can be recorded only after the corresponding actual agreement. Sometimes the outcome is a corrected question: a general uncertainty has become participation conditions and a wish to preserve a free evening. This is more modest than an explanation of personality, but describes the work more accurately. It permits continuation without invented completion. Historical texts help consider these distinctions; none establishes that a particular conversation actually produced the outcome we claim for it.

An outcome can contain disagreement. Participants may understand the invitation alike while judging acceptance differently. Clarity need not eliminate the difference. Identify its subject and who makes the decision. When personal participation is at stake, a supportive listener may offer an opinion without making it a shared obligation. When shared work is affected, its participants may need to negotiate conditions further. A map grants no party the right to decide for everyone merely because their explanation sounds more coherent. Ordered thought can assist discussion, but authorises neither governing other people’s intentions nor claiming

consent that was never actually given. Understanding a disagreement and settling it are different outcomes with different requirements.

After a conversation, it can be tempting to call its result final for the sake of completion. Instead, distinguish what was clarified, what remains conjectural, and what action was chosen. This three-part arrangement is United Wisdom's suggestion, neither an ancient quotation nor a validated effectiveness scale. It serves a particular distinction rather than additional reporting for its own sake. If writing is inconvenient, the parts can be spoken. A clear form must not strengthen an assertion beyond its grounds. "For now, I choose not to participate" does not mean "I finally understand the cause of all my refusals." The first can sufficiently answer the present question while leaving the second one open.

Compare a saved outcome with what people actually said and accepted, especially if it will guide a later meeting. Retelling may accidentally strengthen a tentative interpretation or turn a proposal into a promise. A line concerning the other person can be shown for clarification if they agree to help check it. Silence does not confirm the record. If checking is unavailable, retain it honestly as one person's account with the corresponding limit. A dated personal map is no proof of somebody else's decision. Preserve the conversation's history together with the distinctions between what was heard, what was interpreted, and what participants actually agreed as an outcome. These distinctions remain meaningful even in a carefully organised record.

VIII. The map remains open to correction

A personal map helps while it relates a question to material, intention, and the conversation's frame. It may age when participation conditions change, information appears, or someone understands their request differently. Correcting a record does not make the previous meeting wasted. Its outcome may remain accurate for its time while no longer answering a new question. Mark the change instead of silently using an old map to ground a new inference. This matters especially for information concerning others: a previous condition establishes no present consent. A map supports continued reflection through its capacity for correction, rather than a claim to keep reality still and anticipate its every detail before the next conversation begins.

Dewey, Plato, and the Analects remain different interlocutors here. Dewey examines reflection within an educational undertaking; Plato discusses concepts and speech's art in a dialogue; Confucian sayings concern learning and knowledge's honesty within their own path. They did not all teach one modern practice of personal maps. Their differences let us ask several questions about our exercise. Is the difficulty defined? Have divided parts kept their meaning? Is the unknown acknowledged? These concern the proposed reasoning's quality without guaranteeing its effect on an individual life. Application remains a present choice of our own,

to be described in our voice rather than attributed to historical authors as though they had endorsed this particular arrangement.

A perfect map is unnecessary for a next step. Sometimes one intelligible request and one stated limit suffice: “I want to compare two ways of participating; conditions still need clarification, and I am not promising to choose today.” A listener can judge their willingness to have that conversation. If a question requires particular expertise, separate it and seek an appropriate information source or specialist. This article sets no professional-care criteria and does not propose replacing qualified work with personal reflection. The map’s value lies in distinguishing a request from a meeting’s possibilities. It helps name the answer actually sought without assigning one person the authority or ability to answer for every area of experience at once.

One conversation can end honestly while several questions remain open. We may know what was discussed, what became clearer, what was not checked, and where a personal decision remains. That completion belongs to the meeting, not an entire life. It allows a relationship to continue without promising that every conversation must disclose more personal material and lead towards one correct explanation. The map remains a proposal to accept, alter, or leave unused. The person retains their own form of reflection; other participants retain their boundaries. A limited outcome deserves an accurate name precisely because it need not pretend to be the final answer to every question that arose beside it.

What this means in practice

1. Choose a situation. Take one voluntarily selected everyday question. State what is happening and which response you want. Do not try to include an entire personal history. If writing is inconvenient, simply name these two parts aloud in a form that suits you.

2. Distinguish entries. Mark a known condition, a conjecture, and your own wish separately. Do not invent a missing item to complete the form. Name the confirmation an unknown condition needs, without secretly testing another person. These are distinctions for reflection, not scores or an assessment of anyone’s character.

3. Propose a frame. Choose one part for discussion and ask for listening, information, or comparison of alternatives. Agree the listener’s willingness. Other questions can be kept separately without an obligation to return to every one or a promise that this meeting will settle them all.

4. Name the outcome. Afterwards, distinguish what became clearer, what remains conjectural, and the next step chosen. Do not record another person’s consent before actual agreement. If there was no new outcome, say so. This exercise measures no personal condition, guarantees no clarity, and may end at any stage.

Key quotation

> *Learning without thought is labour lost*

Analects II.15, exact six-word first clause in James Legge’s translation, clipped before its semicolon. The following clause concerns thought without learning. Historical interrelation, no assessment of an individual.

Connections between traditions

Source or approach	Consideration	Comparison boundary
Dewey VI: defining difficulty	Moving from trouble to an investigable subject	Historical educational undertaking, no diagnosis
Dewey VI: extent of testing	Effort responds to importance and context	No identical mandatory sequence for everyone
Plato, Phaedrus	Gathering a concept and distinguishing parts	No natural classification of people
Analects II.15 and 17	Learning, thought, and acknowledging the unknown	No modern clarity or effectiveness scale
United Wisdom proposal	Distinguish requests and agree a meeting’s frame	Voluntary application, no promise of a final answer

Primary sources

1. John Dewey. How We Think. D. C. Heath, 1910. Complete chapter VI, pages 68–79, read: three examples, five distinctions, and context-dependent effort. Historical educational philosophy, not a current professional procedure.

2. Plato. Phaedrus. Benjamin Jowett translation. Bounded exchange on collection/division, 265d–266b, read with preceding speeches’ context and the transition to rhetoric. Neither the entire dialogue nor a personality classification method.

3. Analects II.15–17. James Legge translation; 1893 edition context actually checked earlier in this task. Three complete sayings read; II.16 supplies no present prohibition on inquiry. RU fragments are United Wisdom’s own translation through English, without claiming philological validation of the Chinese original.

Tags

question, map, conversation, reflection, request, frame, boundary, knowledge, conjecture, wish, experience, decision, consent, agreement, source, clarification, division, concept, thought, learning, context, testing, outcome, record, history, openness, Dewey, Plato, Confucius, responsibility

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.