

UNITED WISDOM

Before explaining someone else's motive: what can we ask them?

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-09-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Before explaining someone else's motive: what can we ask them?

Epigraph

> *“I do not wish”*

Mary Wollstonecraft, A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, Chapter IV, 1792. An excerpt from her response to Rousseau's quotation immediately before it. The author's own voice and historical argument about agency.

What this article is about

Someone leaves a meeting suggestion unanswered, and an explanation appears faster than the answer: they do not care, want to display power or deliberately keep you waiting. One interpretation may prove correct. Yet what is known is an action and our reading of it, while its reason may remain unknown. An internally convincing explanation grants no access to another's intention. A calm, voluntary conversation offers another step: distinguish the event, consider several possible explanations and ask a question the person can answer in their own voice. An answer may clarify meaning without removing every doubt.

This article concerns that limited check. It proposes neither guessing character, diagnosing lies nor endlessly excusing observed harm. Everyday scenes are fictional. Alternative interpretations prevent a first guess becoming fact rather than conceal unpleasant evidence. Someone may keep personal matters private, while you may decide how to act with incomplete answers. Clarifying reasons cancels no consequences and creates no agreement. Threats, coercion or danger from disagreement require no joint exercise. Accessible local emergency and specialist assistance have separate priority; the article replaces no individual safety plan.

I. An action and its reason are known differently

Events can be described through available information: a message sent, no answer by the agreed time, a meeting cancelled. Saying someone wants to humiliate concerns a purpose instead. Notice the transition between them. This neither prohibits conclusions nor requires considering explanations equally likely. It preserves the grounds: observation, information received and conjecture. The more significant a decision, the more important it is to avoid hiding that transition behind certainty that one action makes everything obvious. Different kinds of knowledge should remain visible when assessing what to do next.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Imagine Arina proposes a Saturday walk with Maxim. By Friday, no answer has arrived. She knows her proposal remains unanswered by the time she needs. Whether he read it, wants to walk or considers this a sufficient decision deadline remains unknown. Deliberately devaluing her time adds a reason. That interpretation can arise without the fictional scene confirming it. Arina can name waiting's inconvenience and plan independently without making an unknown intention an established account of personality. A practical decision does not require knowing every possible internal reason first.

An action sometimes includes an explicit statement of intent. Someone states wanting to harm or promises punishment for refusal. Available words need not then be replaced through endless benevolent possibilities. Here too, identify what was said accurately rather than read the entire mind. This article does not assess danger in a specific situation. In danger, appropriate local help matters more than continuing the check. Separating event and motive should preserve responsibility for observed conduct rather than transfer it to someone feeling upset or afraid. Unknown intentions do not automatically diminish serious actions.

One specific event suffices for ordinary discussion. Obtaining correspondence, secret recording or a detailed dossier is unnecessary. Information from a third person can be identified separately from personal observation. Uncertain memory requires no invented date. Clarity starts with an honest knowledge limit. We learn more by selecting an accessible subject without automatically expanding it into every past and future action, rather than accumulating maximum control. A narrowly stated event allows a question without pretending to have a complete record of another person's life.

II. Alternatives widen a question without excusing an action

Several reasons can be considered for one action. No answer may concern an unread message, uncertain plans, refusal without words or another cause. Listing possibilities does not make them facts. They show that an observation need not determine one motive. Ten options or the most pleasant one are unnecessary. Two substantively different conjectures can suffice if a meaningful check distinguishes them. Allow the actual answer to fall outside our list altogether. Another person may identify circumstances we never considered and which change the subject rather than select an offered label.

Arina can suppose Maxim lacks his schedule or does not want the walk. The first prompts a question about decision timing; the second permits a negative answer. A third possibility is treating the suggestion as a general idea needing no Friday confirmation. That concerns different expectations. Relationship convenience does not choose the explanation. Arina remains dissatisfied with an absent answer regardless of its cause. Possibilities help ask accurately rather than present a verdict disguised as a small request for clarity. The question can remain open while the consequence is already known.

An alternative differs from an excuse. Unintentional action can have substantial consequences. Someone may have forgotten a message while waiting still disrupted plans. A stated reason can be acknowledged and its consequence discussed separately. Repeated arrangements can also be unsuitable without proven malice. No explanation must be found that makes everything acceptable. Assess the event and available account separately without making clarification a duty to calm down or continue under unsuitable conditions. Recognising an account leaves room for deciding its practical significance differently.

If explanations differ only in accusatory wording, a list widens nothing. Lazy, selfish and disrespectful can conceal one predetermined assessment. Substantive alternatives concern circumstances and purpose of this action rather than personality defects. Sometimes retaining one unknown is more reasonable than simulating expansive analysis. Explaining the whole person is unnecessary. We seek only information relevant to the present decision and permit incomplete access even after conversation. The list serves a question rather than a diagnosis or a demand that everything about someone become intelligible.

III. A question should distinguish possible explanations

A useful clarification changes the next step depending on the answer. If refusal and indecision are uncertain, ask about that distinction. Uncertainty permits discussing timing; refusal allows plans without joint action. When every answer will confirm the same interpretation beforehand, nothing is checked. The respondent merely supplies material for a ready-made accusation. Propose a question that permits discovering an unwelcome, unexpected or incomplete meaning. The possibility of learning something different is part of clarification's purpose rather than an obstacle to obtaining reassurance.

Arina might ask whether Maxim wants Saturday's walk, remains uncertain or prefers keeping the reason private. First demanding why he disregards her time is unnecessary. A shorter question may concern the decision alone: should their walk be considered unconfirmed? Not every motive becomes known, but a planning distinction appears. Practical clarity sometimes needs less inner information than expected. Respecting your time can coexist with another's right not to explain every personal choice extensively. A limited question can answer the immediate task without settling the whole relationship.

The abstract of Eyal, Steffel and Epley's 2018 study reports twenty-five experiments: imagined perspective taking did not consistently improve accuracy, while obtaining information through conversation helped in the final experiment. The abstract, not the entire methodological analysis, was read. This limited reference distinguishes guessing from new information; it guarantees neither our exercise, honest answers nor applicability to every conflict. No result is transferred to Maxim or converted into a hidden-intention test.

Limit the question's subject. Why you always behave this way encompasses an indefinite history; what an unanswered Saturday proposal meant concerns one scene. Known repetition can still be discussed later. Begin with something a person can clarify without defending their whole personality. This is an editorial practice rather than a proven conflict-reduction method. A question may remain unanswered under particular conditions. Accurate wording creates no right to demand explanation at any cost or call refusal confirmation of an accusation. Its value can remain identifying what is still unknown.

IV. An answer is a stated perspective, not complete access to consciousness

Explanations provide a person's message. It may be accurate, incomplete, changed over time or unconvincing. Respecting their voice does not make every detail established truth. Distinguish what was said from independently confirmed information. Precision preserves openness to correction and personal assessment. Conversation gives new information without making a listener observer of every inner cause. Several circumstances can concern one action, and its speaker may not yet articulate them completely. A stated reason deserves consideration without being made either infallible or automatically deceptive.

Maxim says he lacked his work schedule and postponed deciding. Arina receives a stated reason. She can ask whether he would briefly report uncertainty next time if that matters to her. The reason cancels no lost waiting time and does not prove that this will never recur. A new suggestion requires its own answer. This fictional scene does not guarantee consent. It distinguishes clarifying a cause from agreeing future arrangements, so one result does not silently replace the other during later assessment. Learning why something happened does not establish a new shared rule.

An answer may fail to convince. Arina may know other events difficult to reconcile with it. She can identify a specific discrepancy without calling someone a liar from one impression. Ask about the differing circumstance or retain disagreement. The article provides no deception-detection method; a listener's internal certainty is no verification either. Insufficient evidence remains a decision limit. Cautious choices, declining shared plans or seeking further accessible information can remain possible without claiming proven knowledge of every purpose. Uncertainty and practical agency can coexist.

Sometimes an account changes after clarification. This may reflect finding words or revised assessment, but not necessarily. We appoint no explanation beforehand. If discussion is available, ask which version now concerns the decision. Someone need not be required never to refine personal meaning. Meanwhile, new wording should erase neither actual earlier promises nor events. A developing voice and responsibility for action remain separate.

Messages can be considered while checking what actually concerns shared plans and consequences. Respect for revision does not require rewriting known history to fit a new account.

V. A person may decline a motive question

Asking creates no right to a complete account. Someone may lack an explanation, keep matters private or find discussion impossible now. Declining does not establish deceit or automatically select the worst conjecture. Yet missing answers matter: shared understanding is limited. Both positions can be recognised. Personal space remains with one participant and assessment of available conditions with the other. Intimacy makes no inner world communal property and requires no indefinite waiting for an explanation sufficient to support a desired plan. A private reason may remain unknown with real practical consequences.

Maxim hypothetically declines explaining why he refuses the walk. Refusal itself may suffice for planning. Arina may be disappointed without needing more information to arrange Saturday differently. If the cause matters substantially for assessing their relationship, that question stays open. The article decides no suitable amount of uncertainty for her. It avoids making uncertainty a proven secret aim. Independent choice can rest on an available answer and personal participation conditions while honestly naming what remains unknown. A decision can be justified without a complete explanation of another's mind.

A smaller question can be offered if both want to continue. Rather than every refusal reason, confirm that no joint plan exists; rather than every delay cause, ask whether an answer can arrive by the needed time. This must not circumvent privacy through a trap. It is valuable where the next action genuinely needs less. If even that exchange is unwanted, stop. Clarification does not include repeating requests in different forms until the desired admission or agreement appears. A reduced question should respect the same boundaries as the original one.

A missing response should not automatically count as acceptance of a new proposal. A shared plan needs confirmation; otherwise someone may choose the next step independently and identify it as personal. This is action with limited information rather than punishment for privacy. Preserving the same level of trust is not obligatory merely because a motive remains unproved. Assessing joint action's availability differs from accusing hidden intent. The first can have substance while the second stays unknown. That boundary leaves both participants agency rather than forcing either disclosure or indefinite participation.

VI. Consequences are discussed separately from reasons

A clarified cause neither returns a missed meeting, completes a task nor automatically removes pain. Name consequences through personal experience and accessible evidence without proving harm was intended. This is a significant limit: identifying intention must not become compulsory before protecting boundaries or recognising an unsuitable outcome. An explanation can coexist with hearing that the arrangement does not suit another. It deserves consideration without authority to cancel the other's significance. The event and its meaning for different people need not resolve into one shared judgment before any practical choice becomes possible.

Arina says waiting prevented arranging another trip. Maxim may understand while considering his conduct justified. Genuine disagreement concerns consequence and acceptable arrangements. Notification timing or independent plans can be discussed without securing agreement that he intended to spoil Saturday. A practical question exists while motive remains unknown. Participants can decide which conditions they accept without agreeing on every internal reason. This fictional scene promises no reconciliation and prescribes no choice. It makes a concrete consequence available for discussion without requiring an accusation to establish its importance.

Repeated known actions should be described as repeated actions. Several unconfirmed plans can justify rejecting that organisational method without diagnosing character or calculating hidden strategy. Permanent record keeping is unnecessary. Accessible significant information and honest memory suffice. The article appoints no episode count requiring a particular decision. Readers assess what matters to them while distinguishing events, consequences and conjectural explanations. Repetition can have practical weight without giving complete access to intention, and uncertainty need not remove a person's right to alter participation.

Threats and control should not disappear behind causes. Finding wording that forces admission or testing reaction through refusal is unnecessary. Current danger prioritises accessible local emergency assistance; coercion calls for specialist support through a safe contact method. This map determines no safety and provides no individual plan. Unknown motive does not make conduct harmless. Accuracy about inner life should support honest assessment rather than require dangerous contact until every purpose is established. Help and boundaries need not wait for another person to acknowledge their intentions first.

VII. Clarifying without appointing a correct inner response

Motive questions can become demands to feel correctly: why is what matters to me insufficiently important to you? That already assigns a deficiency. An open question concerns someone's understanding of an event or chosen action if they will explain. Their answer may differ from expectations. Leave room to hear the difference without immediately correcting their inner world. This accepts neither every action nor its effects. Position, consequence and available participation are considered separately from prescribing a predetermined degree of feeling. Clarity cannot require another to become emotionally identical.

Arina may discover that Maxim treats walking as an optional possibility while she requires earlier decisions for shared plans. Genuine difference need not include concealed punishment. They can agree confirmation or find the format unsuitable. Her need can matter while his right not to want a walk remains. Practical resolution need not force equal importance. Clear conditions can accommodate differences if both want to continue. The fictional exchange establishes neither that they should reach agreement nor that one person's preference outweighs the other's by default.

Nor should motives be assigned benevolently. Saying someone simply fears intimacy can be as unverified as accusing indifference. Gentle language does not make mind reading accurate. Offer an interpretation as conjecture and ask whether it fits their experience when such discussion is wanted. They may reject it without proving otherwise. Listeners gain no privilege to know hidden truth better merely because an explanation sounds psychologically persuasive or helpful for preserving relationships. A kindly account still needs accurate status as an account rather than established access to another's reasons.

Personal interpretations also need checking. If every new fact is rearranged to confirm the first assessment, conversation changes no knowledge. Notice what would count as clarification: another deadline, a different subject, stated refusal or uncertainty. This requires neither abandoning caution nor treating any answer as decisive. It preserves honest evaluation. An explanation can remain unconvincing without every possible response being predetermined proof of a motive that cannot be confirmed or rejected. A question needs room for an actual correction, even when the correction leaves other concerns unresolved.

VIII. Historical agency, research and religious ethics

In Chapter IV of A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, Wollstonecraft responds to Rousseau in defence of women's agency and reason's development. This is historical normative reasoning. Surrounding views about women, health or education are not adopted as modern scientific facts. Our comparison asks who defines a personal position: clarification preserves their voice. This is editorial application rather than a validated method from Wollstonecraft or a duty to accept every period claim to respect agency today.

In Matthew 7:7–12, King James Version, asking and treatment of others belong to religious instruction. Reciprocal ethical attention can be compared with independent answers, but supplies neither motive access nor compulsory disclosure by a partner. The perspective research abstract has different grounds. Normative argument, religious ethics and empirical accuracy questions do not coincide. The shared theme is editorial and establishes neither agreement among all traditions nor a guarantee for this exercise. Similar concerns preserve distinct reasons for being considered.

Readers can use one distinction alone: separate conjecture from information without adopting the whole historical argument, or respect religious ethics while disagreeing with an explanation. Sources appoint no identical worldview for participants. They widen questions when limits remain. Names create no information about Maxim and make no fictional scene a research result. Decisions still need actual answers, available circumstances and personal assessment of suitable participation conditions. A comparison supports that assessment without performing it in advance or requiring agreement with every source.

Comparison also preserves stopping. Respect for agency or proving openness should not demand continuing an exercise. Voluntary participation includes declining our map. Sometimes no accessible question exists; sometimes personal action matters more than further explanation. Unknown circumstances remain. Sources distinguish grounds rather than replace life with a protocol. Respecting primary material includes attribution and transfer limits; respecting readers includes independent choice of another format, pause or separate help. The authority of a worthwhile ideal cannot determine that a particular conversation should continue.

IX. Independent decisions remain after clarification

Results can be modest: a stated reason appears, one interpretation is excluded, refusal confirmed or uncertainty retained. None proves everything else. A learned motive creates no consent to future plans; kindly intentions do not guarantee suitable action; an incomplete answer proves no malice. Name changed understanding separately from consequences. Decisions then need neither complete explanation of another's inner world nor a promise that sufficient information makes choice easy. A limited result can matter substantially while leaving the next task unresolved.

In our fictional scene, Maxim reports his unknown schedule but declines answering by Friday. Arina now knows his stated reason and lack of shared conditions. She can arrange Saturday independently. This proves neither a bad motive nor a silent agreement on new arrangements. Another format may be wanted later. The article appoints no relationship outcome. It retains a limited result without making one clarified cause a ready-made answer to how people should act together next. Her own decision and his answer remain distinct events.

Even a convincing explanation needs future agreement checked separately. An unconvincing one permits doubt and personal participation choices without categorical mind reading. No answer permits acting with limited information. Guessing until complete mutual satisfaction is unnecessary. These options leave room for caution and respect. No question guarantees truth, and no personal choice is infallible. Name grounds honestly: event, stated cause, remaining conjecture, accepted condition and performed step have different statuses. Precision helps keep those statuses visible while practical uncertainty remains.

The practice aims to reduce ownership of another's inner answer and make personal questions more accurate. This is an editorial aim rather than measured effect. People remain sources of their stated perspectives; listeners retain assessment of evidence and boundaries. Freedom requires no complete agreement. Explanations can be understood while actions remain unsuitable; one correction accepted with another disagreement retained; discussion ended without diagnosis. The next step then rests on named knowledge and limits rather than the persuasiveness of a story nobody else confirmed. A clearer question can inform choice without commanding its outcome.

What this means in practice

For a calm, voluntary situation, choose one action already explained through another's motive. Notes are optional. Name the available event separately from your conjecture. Consider one substantively different explanation if possible, avoiding pleasant excuses or lists of character defects. Ask which answers would actually change understanding. If none could alter the interpretation, you may want to state an assessment rather than clarify. Acknowledge that without requiring immediate continuation of joint discussion. Reflection itself need not become another demand on a person whose reasons remain unknown.

When both want and conditions are safe, ask one question about this subject. Allow another explanation, incomplete answer or refusal. Personal planning may need a decision rather than every cause. Clarification should become neither a trap nor lie test. Threats and coercion end joint exercises; directness or refusal should not test someone. Accessible local emergency and specialist assistance have separate priority. The article offers no individual safety plan or reason to seek disclosure before receiving appropriate help.

Afterward, distinguish stated perspective, confirmed circumstance, retained uncertainty and genuine disagreement. Consequences, consent and performance are assessed separately. Without a shared plan, act independently without making missing information a proven motive. An accurate question does not guarantee a suitable answer. It preserves learning and knowledge limits while future participation remains a separate choice, ceded neither to the first guess nor every confident account another gives. A partial answer can inform that choice without being made complete certainty about anyone's inner world.

Key quotation

> *“over themselves”*

Mary Wollstonecraft, A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, Chapter IV, 1792. A second excerpt from her response to Rousseau. Agency rather than authority over someone else's answer.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Difference
Wollstonecraft and editorial practice	Independent position	Historical argument is no motive-checking method
Eyal and colleagues and practice	Conjecture and information	Limited research does not guarantee an honest answer
Matthew 7 and independent response	Considering another	Ethical instruction grants no compulsory disclosure
Historical reasoning and research	Who reports perspective	Normative grounds differ from empirical accuracy
All three references	Questions and knowledge limits	Foundations form no universal technique

This map is editorial. Differences remain without declaring consensus or validated exercise effectiveness.

Sources

• Mary Wollstonecraft — A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, 1792, Chapter IV. Selected paragraphs surrounding her Rousseau response read; her own voice quoted. Not the entire treatise; historical generalisations are not modern facts.

• Tal Eyal, Mary Steffel, Nicholas Epley — Perspective mistaking, 2018, JPSP 114(4), 547–571. DOI 10.1037/pspa0000115. Bibliography and complete abstract read rather than full methodological and statistical analysis.

• Matthew 7:7–12 — King James Version. Specified passage read as religious ethical reference, without direct quotation or guaranteed disclosure of motives.

Tags

motive, action, reason, perspective, hypothesis, question, clarification, observation, interpretation, information, uncertainty, answer, refusal, privacy, agency, consequence, boundaries, voluntary participation, consent, promise, verification, disagreement, conversation, relationships, Mary Wollstonecraft, Eyal, Steffel, Epley, Matthew, independent choice

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.