

UNITED WISDOM

Belonging: finding a circle while retaining independence

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R40 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Belonging: finding a circle while retaining independence

Epigraph

> *...are possessed of good intentions...*

Jane Addams, The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets, Chapter I, web133; a short fragment of her own prose. This historical judgement about city youth establishes no intentions of today's strangers.

What this article is about

Imagine Nina has moved and knows her new city through work, a shop, and the journey home. Old friends are far away; colleagues are friendly, but a familiar circle is absent. She would like occasional walks with someone, conversations about reading, and a familiar place she can visit without explaining her entire life. These wishes resemble one another without being identical. Seeking one group that immediately provides everything can make a first meeting seem insufficient. Treating any contact list as sufficient leaves actual forms of participation unknown. Between these extremes, available possibilities can be considered without declaring someone deficient for lacking a ready-made social environment.

The article concerns creating participation where a familiar circle is absent. We distinguish forms of connection, meeting places, recurring activities, limited reciprocity, and several separate acquaintances. This differs from organising an old friends' evening and from the full subject of autonomy within an existing group. Every scene is fictional. Addams's historical text is used briefly and critically, without adopting moral policing. The voluntary practice treats no loneliness, appoints no number of friends, and does not guarantee acceptance. Actual safety and access need separate consideration; an attractive promise of belonging does not replace it.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. An absent circle can be described through wanted participation

Nina misses several things: a walk, a book conversation, and a familiar greeting on arrival. The first needs someone with suitable time and interest in the route; the second a chance to discuss; the third may need repeated attendance at one place. These can combine or remain separate. Distinguishing them does not forbid wanting close friendship. It identifies what to seek now, without making a first acquaintance create an entire new life, or treating every small offer as failure because it has not replaced the old circle.

Having no company establishes no cause by itself. Nina may be newly arrived, have an inconvenient schedule, or not know available places. Her former ways of meeting may no longer suit her. Neither blaming the city nor blaming herself is required in advance. Name what is known: available activities, existing meetings, something she wants to try, and what remains absent. This is no diagnosis; it concerns participation. Loneliness can persist after a place is found. The article promises no relief and treats external contact as no established proof of inner wellbeing.

Wanting to be among people has a scope. Today Nina wants an hour's activity rather than a new family or daily company. Tomorrow she may want something else. A small request need not pass an examination in depth. Acquaintances for one activity can coexist with openness to later closeness, without promising it. Those she meets also have a scope: conversation after a session may suit them while evening messaging does not. This limit need not devalue the contact; it identifies where it currently exists.

Distinguish an aim from an available step. A trusted circle may be the aim and learning about an open meeting the step. A schedule creates no trust, but its modest result is not meaningless. Each step can be assessed separately: Nina learns whether newcomers are admitted, whether the activity suits her, and later whether someone responds. These need not become a premature description of a new family. Nor must the first attendance immediately establish that the entire search will inevitably produce the circle she wants.

II. A meeting place has conditions beyond an attractive name

Nina sees a book-evening announcement. Club suggests an environment without yet explaining entry, booking, price, language, or timing. These concern first attendance rather than whether she is interesting enough. Necessary information can be sought without an entire personal history. An organiser may not answer everything; unknowns remain unknown. Significant conditions should be checked before joining. The article supplies no current city addresses and does not establish every discovered arrangement as safe because its description is friendly.

Different places offer different possibilities. An open walk permits meeting along a route; a class requires skills or preparation; a public space may allow presence without conversation. A community's name does not guarantee identical access to these activities. Nina can choose an activity she likes even if no acquaintance follows. That is a possibility rather than a compulsory search rule, and may keep each evening from becoming an acceptance test. Interest does not abolish her wish for human contact, however. Both wishes can be acknowledged while recognizing that one occurred and the other did not.

Entry costs extend beyond money. Travel, time, language, materials, and willingness to participate publicly affect choice. Nina need not become the announcement's implied ideal visitor. Another available format can be explored, without requiring an organiser to create every individual possibility. Unsuitable conditions can indicate a mismatch with that place rather than personal failure. Searching elsewhere requires neither compulsory justification for declining nor a verdict that the environment is bad because its actual participation is presently unavailable.

A first choice can be temporary. Nina visits once to learn the format without immediately taking a lasting role. If trial entry is available, understand its limits. Some places require a commitment over time; that cannot silently become a free one-off meeting. Exploring a proposal differs from accepting a condition. Wanting to try does not cancel known rules, and rules should not expand retrospectively through claims that true participants must now attend forever. Initial access concerns one place and activity rather than someone's whole future belonging.

III. The historical city raises opportunities rather than worth

In the opening of The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets, Addams discusses inadequate urban recreation opportunities and existing associations. This is historical social reasoning, not a test of our search for acquaintances. Moral policing, age generalisations, and medical metaphors are rejected. The narrow question is where participation is possible at all.

This brings attention back to the environment. If Nina knows only an office and shop, telling her to be sociable identifies no meeting place. Desire can exist without an available opportunity. Conversely, an open space does not itself create a chosen connection. Its activities and admission need examination. The historical source proves neither a current club's quality nor visitors' future intentions. It retains the practical side of opportunity: someone may need an understandable place and an actual format for meeting, as well as a suitable mood.

Addams's assessments should not be transferred to modern recreation. Dancing, noise, a commercial format, or age differences establish no danger or people's moral worth by themselves. A good environment need not be sought through a ready-made division of worthy and unworthy visitors. Establish actual offers, prices, access, and activities. Significant risk is a separate matter. A historical ideal of proper recreation must not become a pass Nina must present before she can want company and an interesting evening.

The comparison also makes participation no obligatory service to the city. Nina can choose a personal activity without proving social benefit, join a shared undertaking whose subject matters to her, or lack energy now. The source gives social organisation its own moral aim; the fictional participant retains her scope. Having no circle must not become a duty to be useful to everyone immediately. Available participation can begin belonging, without purchasing it through endless work never accepted and silently taken by others for the shared cause.

IV. Recurring activity can bring recognition without ready-made friendship

Nina attends several meetings because the book discussions suit her. Faces and starting procedures become familiar. People notice her presence, although friendship is absent. This is a possible stage rather than a proven effect of repetition. Attendance count grants no right to closeness. Small changes can be seen: she knows a name, where to sit, and a shared conversational subject. These differ from complete trust and can matter without immediately promising the circle that will later replace every previous relationship.

Repetition matters within available desire. If Nina dislikes the activity and endures it for future acceptance, its cost deserves notice. No compulsory attempt count is appointed. She may give the place time, choose another format, or stop. An organiser does not know her correct endurance period. One awkward moment does not necessarily establish final incompatibility either. Unclear procedures, unfamiliar surroundings, and absent interest can be distinguished. Choice stays specific, without instructions always to persevere or always to leave after the first feeling that things are not yet easy.

A shared activity supplies a subject for approaching someone. Nina can ask about reading, suggest another book, or clarify a route. A small conversation need not first require personal disclosure. The question also purchases no obligation to continue. Someone can reply briefly, be busy, or decline contact afterward. These possibilities do not require guessing a hidden final judgement. Recognize a response within its scope rather than depicting an absent one, as though a polite greeting already invited permanent correspondence, personal help, and weekends together.

Recurrence has conditions. Meetings can move, membership change, or a place close. Nina need not organise an entire new life around one uncertain continuation. What persists can be established without asking a small club to guarantee eternity. If the format ends, an individual contact may continue through mutual choice or remain a memory. This need not be failure. Belonging sometimes concerns a period of participation rather than a lifelong circle. History matters without assigning future roles or cancelling people's ability to choose another continuation.

V. A small invitation leaves a real answer

After a meeting Nina wants to walk partway with Asya. One invitation can name route and time, giving Asya something specific to answer. Nina need not present it as the beginning of great friendship or conceal her wish behind an invented need for help. A small invitation can be sufficiently honest in itself. It leaves refusal, change, and uncertainty; its quality does not depend on immediately gaining closeness or establishing that one person in the new city is now available for every part of life.

Asya can accept the walk without accepting evening tea. Nina receives one response rather than general access. The walk can be recognized without enlarging its meaning; another format needs another invitation. Previous agreement need not be presented as debt. Nina's wish also does not become ridiculous because it differs. She can be disappointed and hear the answer. Belonging need not require hiding every unpleasant feeling. Voluntariness remains when feeling is acknowledged without requiring someone immediately to correct it through participation.

An uncertain answer has consequences too. Asya does not know her schedule, so Nina cannot treat the evening as agreed. A later answer may remain possible if convenient, or she can choose not to wait. The article appoints no deadline after which silence establishes a definite attitude. Distinguish invitation, readiness, and agreement. Here these concern creating a new possibility rather than restoring familiar meetings. Two strangers need not first prove identical depths of interest to decide whether to share one short stretch of a route.

When unwillingness is clear, repeated invitations should not be called necessary circle-building. Nina can seek other possibilities while respecting the answer. She need not declare Asya cold; Asya need not promise a future meeting to soften it. Refusal sometimes concerns one arrangement and sometimes more. Clarification can occur without persuasion, but is not always necessary. A circle is not created through entitlement to everyone encountered. It needs real answers, including unpleasant ones, and allows contacts to remain within a shared activity rather than becoming the closeness one person hoped for.

VI. Contribution need not pay for human recognition

Nina can offer something small: bring a book, arrange chairs, or describe a route. A contribution becomes an activity if needed and accepted; it need not earn permission to be present. Where visitors are admitted, organisation need not be undertaken to obtain a greeting. A working role nonetheless has conditions. Promising it solely to gain affection cannot make performance optional. Name available contribution by subject and scope so it remains an activity rather than an indefinite deposit toward a community's future love.

A newcomer may have less time than regular participants without less worth. One small part can be performed reliably while the rest is declined. A group may nevertheless need a greater scope for a task; a mismatch can be established without demanding the same role under every condition. The article does not discuss entire autonomy within an environment. It asks what connection a first contribution creates and at what price. Becoming a permanent assistant cannot rely on unspecified gratitude inevitably turning into desired friendship and trust.

Reciprocity can be small and different. Nina helps with an item, someone explains procedures, and someone else remembers her name. These establish neither a universal balance nor full acceptance. Their usefulness can be seen without requiring identical gestures. If contribution keeps expanding while Nina's own participation is absent, examine the arrangement. Polite gratitude may be sincere without offering the interaction she needs. Automatic accusations are unwarranted, as is devaluing her own need because an organiser calls the work useful and offers further duties instead of an answer.

Sometimes the shared undertaking remains the connection's main content. People enjoy working together without wanting separate friendship. This need not be inferior. Nina can choose its available scope and seek personal conversation elsewhere. Useful collaboration need not always be called closeness. Names help where they do not conceal expectation. Company after a meeting can be proposed separately; help with an item concerns something else. Distinguishing activities keeps gratitude from promising every other form of participation, while the absence of one connection does not erase another's actual value.

VII. Several connections can have different functions

Nina walks with Asya, discusses books with others, and sometimes talks with an old friend far away. This is a possible picture rather than a compulsory scheme. People should not be assigned services from a prepared list. Different participation can nonetheless exist in different places. A book club need not provide night-time help, an old friend know local routes, or a colleague share every interest. Seeing what each connection permits reduces unknown expectation without guaranteeing inner belonging, which Nina may still be seeking.

Diversity does not require more people. A small circle suits one person and several separate places another. No correct count is assigned; solitary activity is no defeat. Actual need and available participation matter more. If Nina overloads a week for a sufficiently complete social life, notice its cost. One suitable format need not immediately expand. Invitation, group, and name counts describe an external picture rather than prove closeness. A separate topic considers that count; here the question is where opportunities arise without filling every free evening.

Old connections need not be cancelled for new ones. Nina can keep correspondence while learning the city. Distance does not make someone less real; a local acquaintance need not reproduce old histories. New and retained links can coexist. Limited time may require choosing actual participation rather than judging which relationships are worthier. Lost former access and valuable present contact can be acknowledged together. Seeking a circle need not prove complete independence from the past before permitting a walk, a new place, or conversation with someone who knows only a small part of her life.

Several possibilities may still be too superficial for Nina's need. Their count should not require saying everything is sufficient. What remains absent can be named without devaluing existing contact. Another format may be needed, time scarce, or the need belong elsewhere than this article. One more club cannot promise trust, but small connections need not all become useless. Existing participation can be retained with unknown continuation, allowing a search without compulsory social-success stories that conceal the fact that wanted participation has not yet appeared.

VIII. An unfamiliar environment can remain unsuitable

After several visits Nina finds conversations differ from what she wanted. The activity may interest her without much personal exchange, timing be unavailable, or members decline outside meetings. These describe a format rather than judge the entire city. Participation can be limited or another possibility sought. Unsuitability does not require proving the group broke a rule. Conversely, her wish does not oblige others to remodel every meeting until this newcomer gains belonging.

Unsuitability differs from humiliation and coercion. If newcomers must endure insults, disclose too much, or accept unknown debts for admission, ordinary awkwardness explains little. Openness does not require a risky test. Search practice ends under threat; actual protection depends on circumstances, and the article supplies no local help procedure. Needing a circle does not justify enduring every treatment. Being among people matters without becoming a reward purchased through loss of safety or compulsory agreement with every action of an unfamiliar environment.

Leaving can be unpleasant in less dangerous circumstances too. Nina knows names, regrets invested time, and dislikes starting over. These are real considerations. Some suitable participation can remain, or a pause be taken. Independence does not require immediately severing everything. The full price of exit belongs to another topic; here notice whether earlier investment keeps someone in a format no longer creating wanted possibilities. Past time does not guarantee future acceptance. Staying need not be weakness either if she understands and accepts the present limited scope.

A search can produce no result within the available period. This honest outcome need not hide behind a promise of a circle soon. Nina can retain contacts, change activity later, or stop now. Money, time, language, and transport limitations do not disappear through correct wording. Endless initiative cannot be demanded without resources. The article distinguishes possibilities rather than appointing a duty to find company. Different support deserves separate consideration if needed. Having no new circle proves neither poor practice nor a need to earn connection through greater willingness to change herself.

IX. Recognition and trust need different information

Recognition on arrival gives Nina a familiar place and may feel pleasant. It establishes no willingness to help with personal questions. Responses become known through requests and activities rather than acquaintance duration automatically. Secret examinations of everyone are unnecessary. Gradually notice what happens: someone honours an agreement, hears refusal, or replies within their scope. These facts have limits. One good conversation proves no reliability everywhere; one brief answer establishes no final disinterest in every future contact.

Trust has an area too. Nina can trust someone to choose a route without wanting personal disclosure. This makes no dishonest connection. Complete disclosure need not confirm authentic participation, and another can retain similar limits. Gradual contact is not compulsory progress toward complete closeness: it can stop at an activity. A wish for more can receive a different answer. Actual possibilities matter more than defending an attractive circle label as though it establishes every future access to time, information, help, and personal attention.

Belonging may concern an understandable format as well as a person. Nina knows the meeting is open and her participation accepted in a scope. This differs from promised friendship. A group can offer a stable role without intimate conversation; someone can offer conversation outside it. Their grounds need not compete. Establish expectations and realities. Formal membership does not guarantee a sense of belonging, while an unpleasant feeling does not automatically abolish established access. External arrangements and inner experience remain separately visible without compulsory sufficient gratitude.

A name for her environment can emerge later or never. Valuable participation can exist without one shared name. Nina can say she attends meetings rather than has found a new family, without reducing their significance. She may also call the circle important if that matches her experience. The article assigns no correct emotional distance; it merely treats a name as no evidence of every property. Participation concerns actual formats, trust its area, and closeness the people who may want different things without producing identical histories to give a search an outward appearance of completion.

X. A new circle can begin with an available place

Return to Nina. She learned an open format, attended a book meeting, spoke with participants several times, and offered a walk separately. This is one possible fictional outcome rather than proof that searching succeeds. Asya may agree, meetings continue, and a familiar circle still feel absent. Actual participation and a remaining wish can coexist. The modest result matters: one conversational opportunity previously unknown now exists locally. It need not immediately replace an old environment, supply personal support, or promise every future evening.

In another outcome the book format is unsuitable and Nina stops attending. This differs from complete initial uncertainty: she now knows one unsuitable place. Knowledge should not be depicted as the desired connection, however. The attempt's cost and continuation can be assessed through actual resources. Another step may or may not be available. Searching need not become a story where every difficulty inevitably produces a beautiful new family. Someone can lack that outcome now without explaining it through insufficient openness, wrong character, or an unproven inability to belong.

This differs from organising existing friendship by creating opportunities before partners and formats are known. It differs from autonomy in an existing group by exploring access to places rather than fully examining an established community's power and commitments. Several connection functions need no complete resemblance or friend count. The historical urban question remains separate from editorial practice. These distinctions preserve scope. We know neither Nina's best circle nor current local listings, and cannot promise that an orderly invitation turns a meeting into trust.

Belonging can be sought while retaining independence in a first step's scope: learn conditions, choose an activity, hear responses, acknowledge limits, and retain other links. This is no compulsory social-growth programme. Someone may want a large circle, one walk, or a familiar place. Participation need not promise everything or demand everything from one person. A circle may develop gradually and differently, or never. Describing today's opportunity honestly permits life to continue without giving an unknown future environment prior authority over worth, safety, and the entire meaning of wanting to be among people.

What this means in practice

If you want to explore one safe possibility, name wanted participation: an activity, conversation, walk, or familiar place. No compulsory list of every social need is required. Establish one available format and essential conditions: entry, time, cost, language, and expected involvement. Unknowns are no guaranteed access. A lengthy role need not be accepted for initial presence where the arrangement does not require it.

After attendance, distinguish actual interest, greeting, conversation, invitation, and reply. A small activity promises no friendship. If appropriate, suggest another format with genuine refusal available. Clear unwillingness ends persuasion. Contribution to a shared undertaking can have a named scope without becoming concealed payment for compulsory personal closeness.

Later consider what became possible and what remains unavailable. Several connections can remain, a count stay small, or the search change. This editorial practice is no tested technique; acceptance, trust, and loneliness relief are not guaranteed. It ends under threat, and help does not wait for successful acquaintance. A sufficient outcome is honestly recognized access to one kind of participation, or an equally honest absence of a suitable format, without judging personal worth or making one new group the entire world.

Key quotation

> *...filling a genuine social need...*

Jane Addams, The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets, Chapter I, web133, closing part of her own sentence. Historical associations' social function does not guarantee personal closeness and transfers no standards to today's group.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Difference and limit
Addams ↔ urban opportunities	Where is participation available at all?	Historical social reasoning assesses no present strangers; moral policing and medical metaphors are rejected.
Need ↔ available place	What format can be sought now?	Wanting connection creates no entry; understandable entry creates no closeness.
Repetition ↔ recognition	What changed after attending?	A familiar face proves neither trust nor entitlement to personal help.
Contribution ↔ reciprocity	What activity is accepted?	Work purchases no affection; small reciprocity need not become full friendship.
Several links ↔ belonging	Where are different forms of participation available?	There is no correct people count; one group need not be someone's entire world.

The map distinguishes historical source from editorial reasoning rather than establishing a general law of friendship creation.

Sources

1. Jane Addams. The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets. New York, Macmillan, print title 1930; copyright and first publication October 1909. Gutenberg 16221, updated 11 December 2020. Metadata and continuous selected Chapter I context, web100–139, were read: part of a chapter, not the whole book. Both roles use her own prose 133 rather than embedded dialogue or Plato. Historical age and gender generalisations, moral policing, and medical metaphors are not adopted; rights UNKNOWN.

Tags

belonging, new circle, participation, city, moving, acquaintance, meeting place, walk, club, activity, open entry, conditions, time, cost, language, independence, repetition, recognition, invitation, refusal, contribution, reciprocity, trust, closeness, different connections, old friends, access, uncertainty, safety, Addams, historical comparison, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, connections between 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 unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.