

UNITED WISDOM

Arguing in circles: which question do we keep leaving out

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R23 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Arguing in circles: which question do we keep leaving out

Epigraph

> *The essence of society is difference*

Mary Parker Follett, The New State, chapter III; excerpt.

What this article is about

In this fictional scene, Masha and Denis argue again about the Friday deadline for a shared project. Masha says the task cannot be changed on the evening before submission. Denis replies that the work will be weak without revisions. She recalls last week; he lists today's errors. Twenty minutes later, they reach a familiar conclusion: one supposedly does not understand quality, while the other supposedly does not respect someone else's time. Yet the question of who may change priorities, and how much extra work each agrees to take on, has once again gone unasked. They discuss a file as though the entire arrangement of their collaboration were hidden inside it.

This article proposes looking for an omitted question in a recurring argument. Repetition does not always hide a deep meaning; people may simply keep encountering an unresolved practical problem. We need not assign someone a secret need they do not recognize. Instead, reconstruct the sequence, distinguish the subjects, and test one possible formulation. The outcome remains open: the question may be wrong, disagreement may persist, or collaboration may need limits. The aim is to see what remains unagreed while preserving everyone's right to decline a humiliating or unsafe exchange.

I. Is the topic repeating, or the sequence

Saying that we always argue about the same thing does not yet identify what repeats. Sometimes it is the subject: the same unpaid bill. Sometimes subjects change while the sequence remains: one requests a change, the other explains why they cannot, the first intensifies the demand, and the second stops responding. Sometimes only the feeling at the end repeats, though the conversations differ. These distinctions matter because each calls for another step. An unpaid bill needs a concrete decision; a recurring sequence needs examination of its transitions; a similar feeling needs careful clarification of its connection with events.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Masha and Denis can choose one recent episode instead of the whole history. What was the first message? When did a file become a discussion of character? After which remark did someone stop answering the actual subject? This requires neither recording every word nor conducting an interrogation. If they remember details differently, the difference can remain visible. The work begins with agreement to examine a small part, rather than one shared version of the past. Another person need not accept our entire account before being allowed to describe theirs.

For Masha, the argument begins with an evening demand to revise the text. For Denis, it begins with a daytime message saying comments could be sent later. That correction matters: they may have understood promised availability differently. It does not automatically decide who must work that evening. Permission to send comments can coexist with no agreement to act on them immediately. Unless those actions are distinguished, the argument again becomes a search for the person remembering incorrectly. An omitted question sometimes sits between two accurate facts participants mistakenly treat as one event.

Repetition does not prove equal responsibility. One person may consistently change the terms while the other defends the original arrangement. One may request a safe form of discussion while the other responds with a threat. Describing every pair of actions as a symmetrical dance can erase responsibility. Reconstructing a sequence should reveal concrete actions and available alternatives rather than divide blame evenly. Where there is no freedom to object or end the exchange, this practice has limits: safety and boundaries come before jointly investigating an attractive pattern of relationships.

II. Separate the file from the terms of collaboration

Recurring arguments often mix scales. Denis sees a weakness in one text; Masha sees the arrangement of the entire week. Correcting the file leaves the question of available time. Stopping evening messages may leave the quality issue. Name several subjects separately: what is wrong with the current work, how changes are accepted, and who carries the extra load. This does not require a ceremonial conversation for each subject. But when they sound like one question, any answer will appear evasive to the other person.

Check which answer would change the immediate situation. Would an exact list of three necessary revisions help Masha know what to do? Would Denis’s concern about weak work disappear if priorities were changed only by agreement? A negative answer does not necessarily indicate stubbornness. The offer may address only part of the problem. This question reveals what remains without accusing someone of never being satisfied. Do not demand immediate proof of satisfaction. A participant may say they do not yet know what solution would be enough or how to assess its consequences.

Distinguish a practical question from an assessment of the relationship. A deadline may concern hours yet gradually become a question about whether one matters as a collaborator. That meaning is possible, but cannot be declared for someone else. Masha may really be talking only about time; Denis may hear doubts about his competence in her refusal. Offer a hypothesis and allow rejection rather than confidently uncover hidden feelings. Otherwise, looking for an omitted question becomes another form of pressure: factual disagreement is explained through someone's inner problem, and their own words no longer count as sufficient.

Distinguishing subjects permits a sequence: finish the file today, discuss rules for changes tomorrow. That is acceptable only by actual agreement, rather than a deadline being used to obtain another unpaid evening. Masha may decline extra work even if quality suffers. Denis may decline responsibility for a result when a necessary correction is impossible. Such boundaries sometimes reveal incompatible terms. Joint exploration should not conceal that with a promise that the right wording will let everyone obtain what they want. Clarity may instead mean recognizing the cost of each available option.

III. A question no one has answered

An omitted question is best made narrow enough to answer through an action or explanation. Here it may concern who has authority to assign evening overtime. That is more concrete than a general demand for mutual respect. Respect matters, but people may mean opposite things by it: Denis expects a professional comment to be accepted; Masha expects recognition that her working day has ended. Repeating the word adds little while it combines different expectations. A small question reveals the practical part of a larger disagreement over values without denying values or replacing them with a schedule.

A hypothesis should be tested rather than delivered as a diagnosis. Masha suggests they may repeatedly be arguing over the right to change the amount of work. Denis says his question is different: who defines the minimum level of readiness? Two questions are now visible. They can be placed beside one another to examine their relationship. If Masha insists she knows his real motive better than he does, the inquiry ends in another argument over understanding. A check remains useful while a hypothesis may be wrong and correction is not treated as sabotage or evidence of unwillingness to change.

Sometimes what is missing is not emotional meaning but straightforward information. Masha has another deadline for a parallel project; Denis did not know. Denis promised a client a version Masha considered a draft. Those facts do not automatically explain all behavior, but they change available decisions. Check which message should arrive earlier and who has access to the necessary information. Repetition does not always require a deep examination of personality. A shared list of commitments or a clear distinction between draft and finished

work may be needed. Consider a modest explanation before constructing a theory of someone else's unconscious intention.

There may also be no omitted question. Both know the terms, state their demands openly, and genuinely disagree. Masha does not want evening work; Denis considers evening availability necessary for the project. Another clarification will not make that difference vanish. They must decide whether work can be organized differently, reduced, or ended. That outcome needs to remain permissible. Otherwise clarification becomes an endless delay before acknowledging incompatibility, while one person must explain a boundary ever better to someone who hears it but is unwilling to take it into account.

IV. What keeps the familiar circle going

The circle may be maintained by quick relief. Denis withdraws after a sharp response; Masha gains a free evening, but the rules remain unchanged. Or Masha agrees to revise the file; Denis gets the result, while her willingness to join the next project declines. In both cases, immediate tension ends while the broader problem remains. This is not a universal theory of motive or a claim that people consciously choose conflict. We examine only a possible distinction between ending one episode and changing conditions that may lead to another. Test it against a concrete history without assigning each person a hidden benefit.

Another possible support for the circle is an overly broad conclusion. After one evening revision, Denis decides Masha is always available late. After one sharp reply, Masha decides quality cannot be discussed at all. The next conversation begins with those conclusions, fitting new information into an existing account. Exceptions can clarify: when was a change agreed calmly, a refusal accepted, or a comment helpful? This is not a duty to find bright spots for the sake of preserving a relationship. An exception prevents an overgeneralization from posing as an accurate account of every case and reveals circumstances that actually differed.

Notice the arrangement of power too. If Denis leads the project, his suggestion to revise a file may be heard as an assignment, though he considers it open discussion. Masha may be unable to decline without consequences. Formal equality of words then says little about freedom of choice. Examine authority, workload, and conditions of refusal rather than politeness alone. An argument may recur because the actual decision-making arrangement remains unnamed. Demanding that a subordinate listen even more carefully cannot fix it. Unequal permission to act should become a visible subject if it is safe to discuss.

Once maintaining conditions are visible, choose one small change. For example, changes after a certain point require separate agreement on scope and deadline. This is a trial rule, not a guaranteed solution to every argument. It checks one question: does the sequence change when an evening task no longer appears as an obvious obligation? If the rule is not followed,

observe actions instead of repeating it more loudly. If it is followed but arguments continue, the quality question may remain unresolved. One useful check does not remove the need for further distinctions, but offers better information than a general argument over mutual respect.

V. Do not turn a pattern into a label

Christensen and Heavey's 1990 study, described in the primary abstract available, examined thirty-one couples discussing conflict topics. Demand and withdrawal were considered in relation to who wanted change. This is a limited historical sample, not a rule about the nature of men and women. Our cautious comparison is that a role in a sequence may depend on the subject and a person's position. We do not use the abstract to diagnose Masha and Denis or transfer marital findings to a work project as an established general rule.

A label seems convenient because it gives a short answer: one always presses, the other always escapes. It may nevertheless hide changing circumstances. Masha seeks discussion of evening availability while Denis stops replying; next week Denis seeks a quality check while Masha closes the conversation. Responsibility need not be equal in those cases. Examine what was requested, what had already been agreed, and whether a safe alternative was available. A role name helps only as a temporary description of a concrete action. It neither replaces the person nor explains everything they will do next.

Not every exit from a conversation is destructive withdrawal. It may be a necessary boundary in response to humiliation, fatigue, or danger. A promised pause followed by disappearance also has consequences for the other person. Distinguish ending unsafe contact, a temporary break with a return, and refusing to discuss a shared task. One word about silence cannot cover every case. Someone leaving danger need not promise another meeting. During an ordinary shared discussion, a return can be agreed without creating an obligation to endure any later exchange.

A pattern should help a participant choose their own action. Masha notices when she starts proving every past case and proposes returning to one question. Denis notices he is explaining quality without answering about time and addresses that subject. Used only to judge the other person, the pattern becomes another weapon in the same circle. Instead of the file, people argue over who communicates badly. The practical check is simple in meaning, though not always in action: has it created more clarity and freedom to respond, or merely a more persuasive name for someone else's error?

VI. A difference that can be connected

In The New State, Mary Parker Follett considers difference as material for social interaction rather than only an obstacle. This is early twentieth-century political and social thought; its optimism about group processes is not a guarantee for two people today. Our limited comparison is that differing demands can first be placed beside one another without declaring one an obstacle by definition. Masha cares about time and Denis about the result. Both subjects may be real, but that does not yet establish equal consequences or necessary compatibility.

Differences can be connected through a concrete shared question: what result is achievable within the agreed time? An argument over who disrespects quality or the person becomes a comparison of scope, criteria, and available hours. Part of the text may need removing, the deadline moving, or the project declining under its current terms. A new question does not guarantee a new option, but lets people investigate conditions rather than repeat demands indefinitely. Both must be able to name an unacceptable cost. A common aim has no right to absorb a participant’s boundary merely because it is declared important to everyone.

A solution may involve separating responsibility. Denis performs the extra revision himself if he considers it necessary, while Masha completes the agreed part. That can be reasonable when workload and authority are clear. It should not be called a fair distribution if one person continually compensates for another’s lack of coordination. Repetition and voluntary participation matter. A shared task need not require identical actions, but different actions must be visible. Otherwise, a temporary way out again becomes the presumed natural arrangement, and the next evening begins with the old assumption that someone else’s work is available.

Comparing Follett with a study of conflict sequences does not establish a single method. One text offers a social-philosophical view; the other examines limited interactions in a particular sample. Our question about an omitted subject is an editorial practical proposal. It connects observations only within this narrow space: can demands be distinguished and what remains undiscussed be checked? We claim no identical prescription across traditions, and integration creates no duty to continue a relationship. Difference may become material for a solution, or reveal why one is currently impossible.

VII. Check a change in the next episode

After a useful discussion, it is easy to announce that the circle is broken. A new formulation does not yet show changed behavior. Masha and Denis choose a trial condition: extra evening tasks are first checked against their scope and available time. Next time, Denis sends a comment and asks when it can be addressed rather than assigning an immediate revision. Masha answers with a specific time rather than a list of earlier cases. These are limited observations. They prove no complete change in the relationship, but show that one transition in the old sequence actually became different.

If another episode goes in circles, examine where the rule failed. Was the extra scope named? Was there a real choice of timing? Did the external task change? The check may show that the formulation was too general, or that one participant simply did not follow the agreement. Those explanations require different action. Do not automatically blame communication quality when an agreed condition was not met. Name the breach and decide which boundary to set. Good words about a new collaboration should not replace observation of how actual decisions are made.

Leave room for an ordinary mistake too. Denis habitually assigns an evening revision, notices, and changes the proposal before the argument begins. Masha initially responds sharply, then clarifies her available time. Correction can indicate change even when the beginning is familiar. But repeated harm followed by an explanation does not become dependable merely because participants can describe it more thoroughly. Does coercion lessen, are boundaries honored, and does refusal remain possible? An assessment should be concrete enough to recognize both a small change and a continuing breach without dissolving one into the other.

An open outcome means collaboration may end. Masha finds the available arrangement incompatible with her time; Denis finds the required work unattainable under the proposed conditions. Leaving a project need not mean losing the argument. It may stop a person promising what they are unwilling to give. Significant contractual decisions need separate information; this article does not determine the parties’ obligations. It simply preserves permission to recognize that a shared answer is absent. Clarification can help end repetition by leaving the old format rather than finding a formula for permanent agreement.

VIII. Where the next question leads

In the United Wisdom map, this subject lies between observing one's response and arranging shared action. It differs from R24 on substantive disagreement: that article centers on honest work with a claim and objection; this one examines a recurring sequence and an unanswered subject. It differs from R-09-N04 on choosing a time to begin: a suitable moment may already exist while participants repeatedly return to mismatched questions. Unlike R28 on a broken promise, its starting point is not checking dependability after a breach but discovering terms that were never agreed at all.

Links to B01, A10, and A11 offer further questions about habitual action, reaction, and boundaries. They indicate directions in the topic map rather than readiness of related articles. A reader may choose one useful branch: clarify the subject, change the sequence, or acknowledge incompatible terms? A clear task does not require reinterpreting the whole conversation as deep conflict. If the subject repeatedly disappears behind judgments of a person, return to one episode and name the transition. Choosing further reading matters when it helps action rather than creates another duty to understand oneself completely.

There is a risk of making the search one participant's permanent job. Masha keeps analyzing the circle while Denis waits for her to find words that finally make him responsive. That is no longer a joint check. A person may limit attempts without proving every possible formulation has been tried. Another person's responsibility does not depend on our ability to explain a problem perfectly. When a fact is clear and a boundary named, another circle may require a decision about participation rather than a subtler hypothesis. This limit keeps the practice human instead of turning it into endless editing of someone else's attitude.

A small new question can still change the work available. Instead of arguing again about Friday's file, Masha and Denis may finally discuss who accepts changes after a deadline is agreed. Their answer may be uncomfortable and incomplete. The project may need another arrangement; they may not agree. Something previously hidden within the recurring episode nevertheless becomes visible. Describe that result accurately. It promises neither closeness, calm, nor trust. It only makes it possible to respond to a shared subject, if one has actually been found, and freely choose further participation.

What this means in practice

For one voluntary experiment, choose a recent, safe episode rather than the most painful conversation of your life. Note three transitions for yourself: how it began, when the subject changed, and how the exchange ended. Separate observable action from an assumed motive. Then try naming a question left unanswered. Make it narrow enough: who changes a deadline, what scope was agreed, or what information is needed? Do not declare it the true hidden meaning. If discussion is safe and appropriate, offer to test the hypothesis and allow correction or rejection.

If a clear subject appears, choose one small, observable step. It may clarify a rule, distribute a task, or decline extra work. Name the action that would indicate change, then observe the next suitable episode. A hypothesis that does not help provides information rather than proof that someone is beyond change. Choose another question or stop. An exit is available immediately in response to threats or humiliation; this practice requires no joint analysis with someone denying you freedom to respond. Declining further investigation needs neither an accusation nor a complete theory of the relationship.

Later, check the limited result. Did we discuss a new subject or merely give the old argument another name? Did both have a choice? Was the agreed action taken? The answer may be mixed: one part became clearer, another remains disputed. That is permissible. The aim is not never to revisit a difficult subject. Some tasks require renewed discussion as circumstances change. The aim is narrower: distinguish a necessary return from a circle concealing the same unspoken question. Seeing that difference may be enough to choose a next step without proving the entire history again.

Key quotation

> *related difference*

Mary Parker Follett, The New State, chapter III; excerpt.

Connections between traditions

Source	Limited comparison	Difference
Follett, chapterIII	Differences can first be related	Social philosophy, not a guarantee of a joint solution
Christensen and Heavey, abstract	A role in a sequence relates to the subject of change	Limited marital sample, not a diagnosis of a work project
This article’s proposal	Test an omitted question in one episode	Voluntary editorial synthesis; leaving collaboration remains possible

Sources

1. Mary Parker Follett — The New State. 1918 work; Project Gutenberg digital English edition. ChapterIII, The Group Process: The Collective Idea (Continued). Political/social philosophy; historical group-process optimism is not a modern efficacy guarantee.

2. Andrew Christensen and Christopher L. Heavey — Gender and social structure in the demand/withdraw pattern of marital conflict. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology59 (1990),73–81; DOI10.1037//0022-3514.59.1.73. Primary abstract and bibliographic metadata. Limited historical marital sample; no universal gender roles, causal certainty, diagnosis, or automatic transfer to work collaboration.

Tags

circular argument, omitted question, repetition, sequence, subject, collaboration, responsibility, boundaries, change, hypothesis, observation, motive, disagreement, workload, timing, quality, rules, freedom to respond, power, refusal, safety, Follett, Christensen, Heavey, United Wisdom, B01, A10, A11, R24, R28

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 everyday relationships between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.