

UNITED WISDOM

Naming your need without telling another person what to feel

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R22 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Naming your need without telling another person what to feel

Epigraph

> *“perfect equality”*

John Stuart Mill, The Subjection of Women, Chapter I, 1869; an excerpt from the opening principle. A historical demand for equal rights, not a psychological formula.

What this article is about

Imagine wanting more time together but opening a conversation by declaring that your partner no longer cares about the family. The relationship may indeed have changed. Yet an explanation of another's inner world has been spoken while your own wish remains hidden. The listener receives an accusation to contest rather than an intelligible question about shared time. A need can be expressed differently: identify a particular event, its significance to you, and an action you want to propose. This clarity does not guarantee agreement but requires no mind reading.

The article distinguishes observation, interpretation, personal significance and request. Need here means what someone considers important in their life: rest, participation, predictability, connection or another condition. This is a working description, not a universal scientific classification. Every wish is not made another's obligation, nor accurate speech a means to obtain the desired answer. Everyday scenes are fictional. Threats and coercion require no joint exercise; accessible local help and safety have separate priority. For a calm conversation, the question is simpler: how can we communicate about ourselves while leaving the other person room for their own answer?

I. Observation and explanation are different messages

Observation concerns what happened and what can be described specifically enough. Explanation links an event to an assumed cause or significance. A partner returning late three times can be discussed as an event. Saying they do not value the relationship adds a conclusion. That conclusion may seem convincing while remaining another level of the message. Distinguishing levels does not forbid opinions. It avoids presenting an opinion about someone's motive as the very fact they must acknowledge before a discussion begins.

In our fictional scene, Olga tells Timur that they barely spoke after work on the last two evenings. That describes a limited period which can be checked. Adding that he has nothing left to discuss with her introduces an assumption about his state. He may be busy, tired, dissatisfied or thinking about something else. The article chooses no interpretation for him. Olga can name her concern and interpretation while retaining the distinction: I observed this, gave it this significance, and do not yet know your explanation.

People sometimes disagree at the event-description stage. Timur recalls a lengthy discussion on Tuesday; Olga means an absence of time without phones. The subject then needs clarifying rather than immediately deciding whose feeling is correct. Ten minutes of attention differs from saying people never communicate. Specificity does not cancel experience; it helps identify its object. The word conversation may describe different forms of contact. That small discrepancy deserves preserving rather than becoming a general conclusion that two people are incompatible.

Observation does not require keeping a permanent account of a partner's behaviour. A significant event can be recalled while acknowledging memory's limits. An uncertain date need not be invented for persuasiveness. No access to correspondence or secret evidence collection is required. Clarity is not purchased through controlling someone else. Choose a known example without enlarging it through always or never when repetition is unestablished. Conversation remains a personal exchange rather than an investigation in which everyone must prove good faith.

II. Significance belongs to the speaker

After an event, we can name what matters to us about it. One person worries about an unknown return time, another misses conversation, and a third cannot distribute household tasks. The outward scene is similar while significance differs. Saying I miss time together is more accurate than declaring that another must feel the same absence. We communicate our position rather than assign a correct internal state. A partner can respect what was heard while retaining their own experience and a different desire to talk today.

Olga notices that evenings without shared conversation mean losing contact to her. This meaning need not coincide with Timur's. Being in the same room may already feel close to him. Deciding immediately whose form of connection is genuine is unnecessary. Describing what helps Olga experience connection is more useful: sharing news, walking together or attention without another screen. An abstract need becomes clearer without obliging Timur to experience closeness in the sole correct way at an appointed time.

This specificity has limits: someone may not yet be able to name what matters. They need not choose a word from a ready-made list to deserve conversation. An incomplete description can

be a beginning revisited later. Evenings may have become difficult without clarity about tiredness or insufficient conversation. Uncertainty does not make the experience unreal. It limits what can currently be proposed. Naming too quickly sometimes conceals a question rather than answering it, particularly when a term comes from an attractive framework but does not fit one's experience.

Nor must the other participant guess the missing part on the speaker's behalf. They can ask one question or report not understanding the subject. This is not necessarily a lack of empathy. Personal significance becomes accessible through communication rather than compulsory interpretation of hints. Responsibility for the conversation nevertheless belongs to more than one person: willing participants can clarify words together. This article leaves room for that exchange without allocating blame by who first finds a precise term. Clarity arises through interaction rather than an examination in correctly expressing needs.

III. A need differs from the chosen method

A need for connection can concern several actions: conversation, a walk, shared work or another available option. A particular action is a method rather than the whole need. Merging them makes refusal of one option sound like rejection of the entire relationship. Distinguishing them does not make methods automatically interchangeable. One may hold special significance. That meaning can be named separately rather than asserting that genuine connection exists only at the proposed time, place and predetermined format.

Imagine Olga proposes dinner without phones every day. Timur agrees to two evenings, but work occupies the others. She may be disappointed and find the offer insufficient. His response nevertheless concerns frequency and timing rather than proven absence of a desire for togetherness. Other days' possible contact can be discussed if both want. A completely satisfying substitute need not be found. Sometimes no suitable method is available yet. That honest outcome should not immediately become an accusation that the other rejected the need itself.

In the CNVC description, needs and requests are separate elements of a communication model. This is an authorial professional reference, not empirical proof that everyone's needs are identical or that every action serves them. Our everyday distinction is limited: what matters to me and the option I propose now need not coincide fully. It helps prevent one method becoming a law someone must obey to demonstrate attentiveness or moral maturity.

The difference helps preserve personal agency too. When desired contact is unavailable, someone may seek other support or acknowledge that a particular relationship lacks an important condition. The article chooses no subsequent route and suggests no obligation to accept any substitute. It simply does not make one adult the sole permitted provider of all

another's needs. Intimacy involves mutual participation without absolute responsibility for someone's internal world. Deciding whether to continue a relationship and discussing one request concern different scales which should not merge prematurely.

IV. A request identifies an action rather than only dissatisfaction

After explaining significance, a particular next step can be proposed. It is optional: someone may simply share an experience and say they are not seeking a solution yet. If an answer is needed, identifying the requested action helps. A general be closer allows too many interpretations. Someone may try and still do something different from what was intended. Specificity concerns the proposed time, action or format, when an answer is needed and whether another option can be discussed. This is a proposal rather than an accepted plan.

Olga can ask whether Timur is willing to spend half an hour on Wednesday without work messages. The question can now be understood even if the answer is negative. An entire personality-change programme is unnecessary. If a half-hour conversation seems artificial, he can suggest a walk or another time. Olga may accept, object or leave her wish unresolved. The fictional scene only distinguishes a clear request from indefinite dissatisfaction. It does not establish that accurate wording will necessarily produce more attention or the desired behaviour.

Where subsequent action matters, separating a request from assumed consent is useful. An answer can be discussed but must still appear. Silence should not automatically count as accepting a new voluntary proposal. I will try may express intention without guarantee. Someone needing confirmation can ask when it will be possible or plan differently. They need not wait indefinitely, but their own departure from waiting does not become a shared agreement either. Clarity identifies which part actually received an answer and which remains open.

Specificity should not become permanent monitoring. A request for conversation time permits neither phone inspection, detailed reports on every movement nor penalties for schedule deviations. New conditions need separate assessment instead of following automatically from a need for closeness. The importance of one's experience does not remove another's boundaries. We can explain what suits us and choose our participation without making a wish for connection permission to manage someone else's everyday life. A clear action remains a voluntary proposal unless a genuine different basis of obligation is established.

V. Refusal need not rename the need

A listener's refusal does not make the speaker's need wrong. They can still want conversation, predictability or rest. Yet a significant need creates no right to obtain this particular action from this particular participant. These positions belong together. Without the first, refusal proves asking was inappropriate. Without the second, a personal wish becomes an obligatory instruction to another. Adult interaction allows a real need and a real refusal simultaneously, even when painful and requiring further decisions about available possibilities.

In a fictional scene, Timur will not discuss work in the evening because he wants the day to end without that subject. Olga wanted shared news, and this boundary changes the available conversation. If he wants to continue, suitable topics can be clarified. She can acknowledge that this is insufficient for her. But he cannot be declared obliged to experience her need as his own, nor Olga required to stop wanting contact immediately. Their difference has substance and does not disappear through accurate wording or kindly intent.

After refusal, alternatives may be sought without removing the right to end the exchange. Meeting every answer with another request until someone agrees makes voluntary participation merely formal. Notice whether both want to continue. Refusal should not be made proof of bad character or punished through humiliation. Actual consequences for one's own plans can be named without turning them into threats. I will arrange my evening differently reports a personal decision; you will regret not agreeing introduces a different means of influence which our practice does not propose.

Genuine earlier commitments also exist. Declining a new request and failing an agreed task are different events. They should remain separate rather than everything being labelled voluntary through the word need. A broken agreement calls for discussing its subject, consequences and future terms. This article cancels no obligations and determines no legal responsibility. It proposes precision: personal significance explains why something matters, while the grounds of a particular demand are established separately. Speaking about oneself should not silently replace checking what the other actually promised.

VI. Your reaction does not establish another's motive

Saying I feel hurt can accurately describe personal experience. Adding because you want to punish me communicates an interpretation of another's purpose too. It may be correct without becoming established through the feeling's intensity alone. A person can describe pain while acknowledging an unknown reason for someone else's action. This is no abandonment of self. It preserves a boundary between accessible experience and a conjecture about another's mind, permitting consequences to be named without a compulsory accusation concerning an unverified intention.

Olga became upset when Timur left during a conversation. His leaving the room is known; whether he intended humiliation, needed a pause or failed to notice the discussion continuing is not. In calm circumstances, this can be asked without demanding a single permissible explanation. His answer does not cancel Olga's experience. He may have wanted a pause while she lacked a necessary indication of returning. The next question then concerns marking a stop. A malicious motive need not be proved to recognise a practical difficulty.

This distinction has a boundary. Specific threats and restrictions should not dissolve into endless benevolent interpretations. An explicit intention to harm or controlling action is serious; testing it through refusal or securing a calm joint conversation is unnecessary. Current danger prioritises accessible local emergency help; coercion calls for appropriate specialist support through a safe contact method. The article offers no individual plan. Accuracy about motives does not mean ignoring observed actions or transferring responsibility for them to the person experiencing pain.

In an ordinary dispute, a modest language of responsibility for one's interpretation helps: I saw this event; it meant this to me; I do not yet know what you intended. These are editorial examples rather than a researched harm-prevention script. They require neither denying repeated events nor avoiding conclusions. They make a conclusion visible and separate it from fact. An offered explanation may fail to convince, leaving genuine disagreement. Checking meaning obliges neither accepting every account nor considering the relationship safe.

VII. A formula does not replace your own voice

Distinguishing an event, significance and request is a useful orientation rather than a compulsory sentence sequence. People speak briefly, search for words, use familiar language and may not want to name a feeling. Accurate speech need not sound like a textbook example. Sometimes saying an hour of quiet is needed and asking about an option is enough; sometimes a longer account matters. The task and participants' willingness determine the choice. A framework identifies substitutions without certifying maturity for saying each part.

Imagine Timur wants rest and says he needs an hour without conversation, after which he can discuss the journey. He lists no values and explains no complete internal state. If the meaning is clear and discussion voluntary, this may suffice. Olga can ask whether an hour means a particular return time. She can also say the question is urgent and she must act sooner. Nobody need call a short utterance insufficiently deep. A specific exchange can be simpler than an extensive explanation without requiring moral assessment through its length.

The reverse mistake is a lengthy statement whose self-focused grammar conceals an accusation. I feel that you are always selfish does not become a feeling description through its first two words. It evaluates behaviour or character, which can be discussed separately.

Polishing form should not remove responsibility for content. A listener can identify hearing an accusation and ask about its subject. Our approach gives no protection from correction to a speaker. It permits explaining personal significance while acknowledging that chosen words may have conveyed something else and need clarifying.

Nor should a correct formula be demanded before paying someone attention. Awkward speech may still communicate a real difficulty. A listener can protect boundaries and refuse an insulting exchange, but that is a separate assessment. Lacking specialist vocabulary should not automatically be taken to mean that someone has no need or no right to receive help. Communication practice remains proportionate to life: it supplies a useful distinction while preserving people's own voices. Its value is checked through whether it clarifies this question without taking ownership of another's answer, rather than counting learned terms.

VIII. Three sources do not make one promise

In the opening chapter of The Subjection of Women, Mill challenges legal subordination of one sex to the other and argues for equality. This is historical normative reasoning, not a needs model. Our comparison concerns participants' agency; the text establishes neither a phrase's effectiveness nor a contemporary legal procedure. Equality need not require identical feelings, and a wish grants no authority to prescribe another's life. Those final distinctions are editorial applications assessed separately from Mill's position.

In Matthew 7:7–12, King James Version, asking concerns God, parental gifts and ethical treatment of people. Religious meaning cannot become a guarantee that an adult partner fulfils every wish. CNVC discusses requests within a practical communication model. Theology, equal-rights philosophy and a communication school have different foundations. Our common question concerns openly expressing what is wanted while preserving participants' dignity; it is an editorial connection, not established agreement among all traditions.

An ethical ideal also differs from an available action. Recognising equality's value does not immediately provide equal resources. Accepting religious instruction does not identify a safe way to conduct a particular discussion. Learning a model does not confer mastery of every complex situation. Sources support questions and broaden understanding while retaining limits on practical transfer. Without conditions for voluntary exchange, nobody should be required to repeat an exercise out of loyalty to an idea. Agency includes declining the form even when its authors or our favourite texts seem convincing.

Readers can use only part of the comparison. They might distinguish a need from a method without adopting the whole NVC school, or consider equality without accepting all Mill's historical propositions. Different foundations need not combine into a doctrine. An editorial map serves comparison rather than prescribing a worldview. It preserves open questions:

which action is available, which answer was given, and what real conditions constrain choice? A particular exchange and subsequent verification answer those questions rather than the number of names in a bibliography.

IX. Incompleteness can be named clearly too

After a conversation, someone may understand their wish better without receiving the needed answer. A substantial result and an unresolved practical task coexist. Neither calling everything successful nor dismissing it as useless is necessary. Personal clarity, the other's understanding, an accepted agreement and a completed action differ. One does not prove the others. A need can be named accurately and refused; consent can be given and later unfulfilled. Further assessment needs its own evidence rather than certainty that correct wording finished the work.

In our imagined scene, Olga clarifies that she wants regular news-sharing without parallel work rather than dinner every evening. Timur understands and offers two evenings. That may suffice or Olga may need more. Either way, the disagreement's location is clearer: available frequency and the importance of contact, rather than proven absence of family in someone else's mind. This distinction requires neither preserving a relationship nor denying pain, and promises no harmony. It permits assessing a real issue without first accepting an accusatory personality interpretation.

Without a suitable answer, someone can identify their next choice: return later, seek another method or acknowledge a significant mismatch. This is no universal recommendation to accept less. A person can consider a condition essential. Its importance and control over another nevertheless differ. A relationship format can be judged unsuitable without authority over each partner's decision. The article appoints no outcome and makes no choice for its reader. Independent assessment retains room which a ready-made statement about needs cannot replace.

A small check asks which part is actually known now. An event was named, significance explained, action proposed, answer heard. A missing part can be identified as missing. Unconfirmed understanding should not be attributed to another. An unaccepted request creates no agreement. This precision avoids overstating results or turning later disappointment into a hidden history of promises. Personal needs remain significant, another's answer independent, and the next action requires a separate voluntary decision and actual verification.

What this means in practice

In a calm situation, select one small question you want to discuss. Reflection need not be recorded. Avoid the exercise under threats, coercion or danger from disagreement. Describe a known event specifically enough and separate your conclusion about motive. Ask what matters personally: time, participation, rest, predictability or another condition. The right term need not come from a list. If significance remains unclear, preserve that and avoid composing a request before knowing its subject.

If an answer is wanted and discussion voluntary, propose one action with an intelligible condition. Leave room to decline, alter part or defer an answer. Avoid making the request proof of love or requiring the other to experience your need identically. Distinguish the response: acceptance, conditional intention, refusal or incompleteness. Your own reaction also has a place without automatically establishing an intention to hurt. Specific threats end the exercise; the article does not replace suitable local help.

Finally, name the limited result: a wish clearer, a request's subject identified, an answer obtained or a question left open. Agreement and performance are checked separately. Continuing, finding another option or stopping remain possible without any being presented as universally right. Clear speech about yourself expresses significance and preserves your voice. Its boundary leaves another their own experience and actual answer, even when that answer differs from your wish.

Key quotation

> *“freedom and impartiality”*

John Stuart Mill, The Subjection of Women, Chapter I, 1869; an excerpt concerning the presumption of freedom and equal treatment. Historical normative reasoning, not guaranteed fulfilment of a request.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Difference
Mill and CNVC	Preserving participants' agency	Legal equality is not a needs-expression model
Matthew 7 and everyday requests	Approaching what is wanted	Asking God is not an adult partner's obligation
CNVC and editorial practice	Separating significance from method	A professional model is not a proven universal law
Mill and editorial distinction	Who determines personal significance	A historical equality argument does not measure feelings
Religious ethics and independent response	Considering another person	Ethical instruction is not automatic consent

This map is editorial. Different foundations remain without establishing consensus or a single technique's effectiveness.

Sources

• John Stuart Mill — The Subjection of Women, 1869, Chapter I. Selected opening equality/freedom paragraphs read, not the complete work. Historical normative reference.

• Center for Nonviolent Communication — The Purpose of NVC. Model, needs and requests description read; no proof of a universal classification or effect.

• Matthew 7:7–12 — King James Version. Named passage read in religious context, without transferring its promise to personal agreements.

Tags

need, request, observation, interpretation, significance, feeling, motive, clarity, agency, equal rights, connection, rest, predictability, participation, refusal, agreement, method, strategy, boundaries, voluntary participation, conversation, responsibility, uncertainty, John Stuart Mill, CNVC, Matthew, right to answer, relationships

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 coauthor 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.