

UNITED WISDOM

World and consciousness: a map of the main questions

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

World and consciousness: a map of the main questions

Epigraph

> *“[...] it is possible I may be mistaken [...]”*

René Descartes, *Discourse on the Method*, Part I, in John Veitch's English translation. This is a checked excerpt; omissions are marked. Descartes is qualifying his assessment of his own intellectual path, rather than rejecting every possibility of knowledge. Text and context.

What this article is about

Discussions of the world and consciousness often begin with an enormous question: what really exists? Yet several other questions are hidden inside it. What does a person directly experience? How do we learn about events we did not witness? What makes an explanation persuasive? When does an account of personal experience become a claim about the structure of the whole world?

This article offers a map of these distinctions. We will compare Aristotle's question about being, Descartes's search for a foundation of knowledge, the account of knowing in the Kena Upanishad, and Einstein's precise definition of physical time. Their answers belong to different projects; they do not combine into a single concealed doctrine. Comparing them helps us notice which questions overlap and which require different kinds of investigation. The final sections suggest routes for further reading and a way to examine a complex claim, respecting a person's experience while asking what supports the conclusions drawn from it.

I. One world, several questions

A question about the world becomes clearer when we distinguish its subject from our way of approaching it. Imagine an evening by the sea. One person describes the colour of the sky, another records the time of sunset, and a third asks why a world exists at all. They may be looking in the same direction while trying to find out different things. An account of experienced colour, a recorded time, and a reflection on being cannot answer on one another's behalf.

One question concerns what happened: when the sun disappeared below the horizon from a chosen position, for example. Another concerns how the occasion was experienced: peacefully, anxiously, or with an unusual sense of clarity. A third concerns the basis of a

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

conclusion: whether a clock was used, whether observations were compared, or which argument was offered. A fourth concerns its scope: this evening, human experience generally, or everything that exists. A memorable expression can carry several of these claims at once without making their relationship clear.

Suppose someone says that the world felt unified during that evening. The report deserves attention as an account of experience. A further claim that the world has a particular structure needs an additional basis. Naming an experience does not automatically supply that basis. Conversely, an exact time record does not tell us what the evening meant to the person. Keeping these limits visible preserves both kinds of information instead of making one displace the other.

In the opening of Metaphysics IV, Aristotle distinguishes inquiry into being from investigations that delimit a particular domain. That difference in scope is useful here, although present-day scientific institutions cannot simply be projected onto his text. Our map will use four reference points: subject, experience, support, and the limit of a conclusion. These help clarify a question before we choose a preferred answer. A dispute about the world may then turn out to concern a definition, different observations, or a real disagreement about existence. Each calls for a different next step.

II. What it means to ask about existence

Asking what exists differs from asking how to measure something. In Metaphysics IV.1, Aristotle proposes an inquiry into being as being. This is the conception of a general philosophical field, rather than a list of things currently visible to an observer. It invites questions about what different cases of existence have in common and what properties we attribute to them at the most general level.

For an introductory map, it matters that we do not turn this formulation into a completed modern theory. Aristotle has his own vocabulary, purposes, and subsequent arguments. Here we use only his distinction between a general field of inquiry and particular investigations. It does not follow that a philosopher can answer a physical question without the relevant data, or that measurement replaces every question about being. Different scales of inquiry can be connected, but the transition between them needs to be explained.

Imagine a museum discussion about an old letter. We can ask whether a manuscript exists in an archive, whether it is authentic, whether the feeling its author describes exists, and in what sense the letter's meaning exists. These questions need not have the same answer or the same method of investigation. Establishing authenticity requires work on the document's provenance. Understanding the feeling involves interpretation. A general question about the

status of meaning allows philosophical positions. The word “exists” remains, while the work required changes.

It is therefore useful to complete the question: exists in what sense, and on what basis is that being claimed? This does not make the question trivial. It identifies what needs investigation. Losing an original document does not settle everything about the content of a surviving copy. Finding an account moving does not establish the manuscript's authenticity. Finding a general view of the world persuasive does not remove the need to check a particular fact. A broad inquiry into existence becomes more productive when it retains these distinctions, rather than absorbing them into a single word.

III. Experience as a starting point

Personal experience gives a person an initial way into questions about consciousness, but the occurrence of experience and its explanation should be distinguished. In Part IV of the Discourse, Descartes looks for something that can withstand radical doubt. Within that argument, he connects certainty about his existence to the thinking that is taking place. This is philosophical work on the foundation of knowledge, rather than a report of a brain measurement. Descartes, Part IV.

The move helps distinguish the fact that an experience occurs from the correctness of its interpretation. Someone might be wrong about where a sound came from while genuinely hearing something. A person might misunderstand the cause of anticipation while still experiencing anticipation. These are our explanatory examples, not experiments conducted by Descartes. They illustrate a logical distinction that will matter throughout this map: the existence of experience does not automatically confirm every conclusion included in an account of it.

Descartes then takes a stronger step, arguing that the thinking subject is distinct from the body. That is a particular metaphysical position. Initial certainty about thinking and a subsequent doctrine concerning two kinds of reality are not one brief observation. Assessing the transition requires examining the author's arguments and assumptions. Accepting the starting question does not, without further work, amount to accepting the whole system built from it.

A similar transition can slip past us in ordinary conversation. Someone reports feeling separate from the body and then declares that the experience proves the soul's independent existence. Another person may just as quickly dismiss the experience itself because they reject that explanation. Both responses miss a distinction. We can acknowledge an account of experience, investigate the circumstances in which it arose, and leave its wider ontological interpretation open. This caution promises no final answer. It makes investigation possible

without demanding an advance choice between accepting the entire interpretation and denying that anything was experienced.

IV. Doubt and the basis of confidence

Doubt can help examine the basis of a particular claim when the object of examination is clear. For Descartes in Part IV, it belongs to a historical philosophical project: questioning the senses, reasoning, and the distinction between dreams and waking life to find a secure starting point. The author later connects the reliability of clear knowledge to his arguments concerning God. This context matters. His method does not end with a general instruction to distrust everything.

A reader need not reproduce radical doubt as an everyday discipline. A much more limited research question is available: why do I think this claim is true? An answer may reveal a direct observation, a retelling, or habitual trust in someone. None is automatically reliable or unreliable. An observation can be incomplete, a retelling accurate, and trust supported by a long history of work that can be checked. The task is to identify the support that is actually present.

Imagine a discussion about a photograph of an old building. One participant is certain that the image was taken after renovation because they remember the façade's colour. Another has a dated original. A third knows the history of its publication. Rather than arguing in general about whether memory can be trusted, they can compare particular information: the file's date, the photograph's provenance, visible details, and the limits of each piece of evidence. Clarifying the basis changes the discussion. Confidence becomes connected to a reason another person can understand and assess.

This process does not turn every kind of knowledge into one kind of proof. A historical argument about God cannot be confirmed by dating a photograph; a file's origin cannot be established through philosophical confidence alone. Descartes's intellectual path shows how closely a foundation of knowledge can be connected to an author's wider worldview. For our map, the invitation is to read the transition, rather than extracting a famous proposition. Limited doubt asks a workable question. It allows a judgment to be corrected without declaring all human experience unreliable or turning caution into a compulsory way of life.

V. The knower is not always described as an object

Some traditions ask not only about the content of knowledge but about what makes knowing possible. The first khanda of the Kena Upanishad asks about the basis of the activity of mind and senses. Brahman is then described through a distinctive relationship to these faculties, rather than presented as one more ordinary object that the mind recognises among others. We are reading Max Müller's historical English translation of 1879. This does not amount to checking the Sanskrit original.

The second khanda introduces a paradox involving knowledge and lack of knowledge. It is easy to turn that paradox into a slogan suggesting that having no knowledge is always a deeper form of knowing. Yet the passage concerns Brahman within a particular teaching. In his note to II.2, Müller discusses the difficulty of treating this knowledge as ordinary classification and explains its special character. Transferring the paradox to any question, from a manuscript's origin to the operation of an instrument, would erase that context.

There is a comparison to be made with Descartes's interest in the knower, but a substantial difference remains. Descartes reasons about a thinking subject and develops his own arguments about its relationship to the body and God. The Upanishadic text speaks about Brahman and knowing within its religious and philosophical setting. A shared area of questioning does not make the concepts interchangeable. We cannot quietly translate one doctrine into another's terms and then present the similarity we have created as the authors' original agreement.

This comparison expands the map: describing an observed object does not exhaust every philosophical question. At the same time, it requires us to retain the status of an answer. A sacred text can ground a traditional teaching and provide important evidence of its language. Its existence does not by itself establish an experimental result. Respectful reading remains possible without making that conversion. It attends to the text's internal task, disputed points of translation, and the limits of our understanding. Encountering another tradition can then help us formulate a new question while preserving the freedom not to adopt its metaphysics.

VI. Giving a concept a physical procedure

A physical claim becomes more precise when the relevant quantity's definition is explained. In §1 of his 1905 paper, Einstein examines time through relationships between events and clocks. For an event beside a clock, a local comparison can be made. For events in different places, the coordination of clocks needs an additional definition; the author introduces a procedure involving a light signal. On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies, §1.

This demonstrates discipline in framing a question, rather than explaining how thought creates time. The observer here is connected to a reference system, clock readings, and a physical construction. Without an additional argument, that role cannot be replaced by someone's mood or spiritual perspective. Two people may experience waiting differently, but this does not entail Einstein's relationship between measurements. Physical time and experienced duration each require their own clarification.

Consider a remote meeting whose participants disagree about when it began. One means the invitation was sent, another means the first participant arrived, and a third means discussion started. Before asking how accurate their clocks were, they must select the event being compared. They then need to know how the records were obtained and coordinated. This is an ordinary explanatory example, not a test of relativity. It shows the practical role of definition: using the same word does not guarantee that the comparison concerns the same thing.

In Part IV, Descartes makes a different distinction: conceiving a triangle does not, by itself, prove the existence of a particular triangle. We can compare both authors' attention to what follows from a concept. Their projects nevertheless diverge. Descartes develops a metaphysical argument; Einstein specifies a physical construction of time. Moving between them does not establish a shared view of consciousness. The more limited lesson is that definition, logical inference, and information about the world perform different functions. Making those functions clear reduces the temptation to mistake an elegant argument for a completed investigation of a particular event.

VII. How an experience becomes a claim about the world

Moving from a personal report to a general explanation requires additional steps that should be made visible. An account can begin with an observation, continue with a proposed cause, and end with a claim about reality's nature. If those parts are joined in a fluent sentence, a reader can easily take confidence in the first part as confirmation of the entire chain. Our map allows the chain to be unfolded without discarding the account itself.

Take a hypothetical example: someone says that they stopped noticing time while reading and concludes that time does not exist. The first part describes their experience of an activity. The second interprets that experience; the final claim has a general scope. Discussing the report may involve clarifying what the person remembers and how they are using the word “time.” Assessing the general claim requires an argument about the relationship between experience and physical measurement. A report of being absorbed in reading does not supply that argument by itself.

Comparing the sources helps reveal the possible mistake without prematurely choosing an explanation. For Descartes, thinking provides the beginning of a longer argument. For Einstein,

time receives a specific physical definition. Neither move answers the question about our hypothetical reader, but both show why starting material and a concluding claim should be distinguished. The Kena Upanishad adds another level: a religious and philosophical account of knowing's foundation has its own context, which likewise cannot be replaced by an everyday impression.

This does not prohibit general conclusions. A general conclusion can be meaningful when its transitions and their support are shown. A reader should be free to accept a report while rejecting its explanation, or to accept the question while finding the answer insufficient. That freedom supports substantive dialogue. It matters particularly when an experience is precious to someone. Criticising a conclusion need not become an accusation of dishonesty, and respecting the account need not require declaring everything inferred from it to have been proved.

VIII. Comparison that preserves differences

It makes sense to compare traditions around a defined question rather than the impression created by similar words. Terms such as mind, consciousness, spirit, and knowledge can perform different functions. Replacing them immediately with a single general term makes differences disappear before investigation begins. The resulting agreement may have been created by the researcher's translation. It can be evocative without accurately describing the sources.

Within our small selection, three relationships can be compared. Aristotle distinguishes a general subject for philosophical inquiry. Descartes seeks initial certainty and develops a metaphysical system. The Kena Upanishad speaks of Brahman in relation to cognitive faculties. These texts permit a shared question about the foundation of knowledge and the status of what is known. They do not entitle us to declare that every author described the same entity under a different name. Such a claim would itself require investigation.

An honest comparison shows both sides, identifies specific passages, and explains what is being compared: a question, image, argument, practice, or conclusion. After stating a similarity, it names a boundary. Limiting familiar sensory images in Descartes and the Kena Upanishad does not establish a common theory of perception. The God who guarantees certainty in Descartes's reasoning and the Brahman of the Upanishadic text do not become a single concept merely because both are related to knowing.

A difference can be the result of comparison rather than its failure. It helps the reader see which assumptions change and why the answers diverge. It also preserves the distinction between a meaningful resemblance and historical influence. This article does not establish borrowing between the chosen authors. We are making a contemporary comparison of

passages we have read. Describing our own work this way preserves the origin of an idea: what belongs to a source, what belongs to translation, and what belongs to our research decision. Intercultural discussion can then remain open without requiring participants to agree in advance that all doctrines are one.

IX. Routes for further reading

The next question is best chosen by asking what remained unclear in the initial discussion. The World and Consciousness branch contains different directions, and this introductory map cannot replace their detailed treatment. It indicates where other material will be needed. Readers can begin with the question closest to them and return to the general map later.

If the uncertainty concerns how we judge another being's experience, useful directions include animal consciousness and the possibility of artificial intelligence having consciousness. These are separate investigations. What behaviour is observed? How is a study designed? What counts as evidence, and which alternative explanations remain? This introduction establishes neither the presence nor the absence of consciousness in a particular system. Historical arguments about knowing do not replace research into such cases.

If the discussion arose from an unusual personal experience, altered states and religious experience become relevant directions. Those inquiries need to distinguish the account, the conditions under which it was obtained, and its interpretation. They also ask to whom an experience seems persuasive, and in what sense. If a disagreement concerns time, physical measurement and experienced duration can be examined separately. Einstein's definition here provides only a limited entry into the wider topic. It does not complete an inquiry into memory, anticipation, or succession.

Questions about causes lead towards determinism, chance, and explanations involving multiple causes. Questions about properties arising in a whole lead towards complex systems, feedback, and stability. These signposts describe an editorial reading route; they do not assert that an article has been published on every topic. Their purpose is to help formulate the next question. Instead of trying immediately to obtain a unified picture of everything, we can choose a transition that needs examination: from behaviour to experience, from experience to the structure of the world, or from regularity to cause. Reading closely about that transition can enrich the general map too.

X. Confidence that can be refined

Refining a judgment need not mean losing everything we previously understood. When new support changes a conclusion, it helps to identify the extent of the change. Sometimes a date is corrected, sometimes the meaning of a term, and sometimes a premise of a large argument. These have different consequences. Revising a judgment becomes easier to understand when its basis was visible from the beginning.

Return to the imagined conversation about an evening by the sea. Comparing records might reveal that the participants called different events “sunset.” This would correct their comparison of times while preserving their experiences of the evening. Another conversation might reveal that a statement about the world's unity described a feeling rather than an ontological thesis. Part of the dispute would disappear, while interest in the person's understanding of their experience remained. In a third case, disagreement about reality's nature might genuinely persist. Clarification does not guarantee agreement.

None of the four sources gives us a general permission to consider every answer equally true. Aristotle proposes an inquiry, Descartes makes strong claims, the Upanishadic text has a doctrinal context, and Einstein works with specific physical assumptions. Respectful reading notices their demands rather than reducing them to personal taste. At the same time, assessing a particular argument does not oblige a person to accept every associated belief held by its author.

The practical outcome of this map is a more precise relationship to our claims. We can say what we know, how we know it, what we assume, and what remains unestablished. This manner of speaking does not remove philosophical depth. It makes room for it. A question about the world need not hide inside an incidental measurement error, and personal experience need not act as proof of an entire metaphysics. Discussion can continue at the level where the real disagreement lies. There, further reading, a clearer example, or investigation of the supporting evidence can change a particular answer.

What this means in practice

Choose one claim you actually want to understand. A sentence from a book or conversation will do; you need not start with a deeply personal belief. Record it without strengthening it. Then separate description from inference. For example, “I did not notice time while reading, so time exists only in consciousness” contains a report of experience and a separate claim about time's nature. At this stage, no final answer needs to be chosen.

Clarify the subject of each part. The first may concern experienced duration; the second concerns physical time and its relationship to experience. Note the support available to you:

personal memory, measurement, an author's text, or a logical argument. If you cite a book, locate the passage where its author makes the relevant transition. A familiar name or similar word cannot replace that passage.

Next, formulate one limited step. You might compare two definitions, read the neighbouring paragraph, ask what a speaker meant, or find research into the particular phenomenon. A physical question needs the relevant procedure and data. Understanding a religious or philosophical text needs the teaching's context and attention to translation. When the required support is absent, leaving a conclusion open is legitimate. It is a substantive outcome when you can identify what is missing.

Finally, try rewriting the initial sentence so that its scope matches its support. Our imagined example could become a more modest report: “While reading, I barely noticed duration; I do not yet know what that implies for the general question of time.” Another examination might retain a strong conclusion if its arguments withstand scrutiny. The aim is to clarify the transition, rather than necessarily weaken every thought. This is our proposed way of reading and discussing claims, not an experimentally validated programme for improving well-being. If a discussion becomes unnecessarily taxing, you can choose a less personal example or stop. Whether to continue remains your decision.

Key quotation

> *“It is not understood by those who understand it, it is understood by those who do not understand it.”*

Kena Upanishad II.3, F.Max Müller's translation in *The Upanishads*, Part I, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1879, p.149. “It” refers to Brahman. The paradox concerns a particular account of knowing within the text; it does not make ignorance of any subject evidence of wisdom. The Sanskrit original was not checked for this article. Passage and notes.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	What it helps clarify	Boundary
Aristotle, Metaphysics IV.1 / Descartes, IV, the paragraph about thinking	A general subject of investigation can be distinguished from the initial certainty used to construct an argument.	Inquiry into being and Descartes's starting point do not establish one ontology.
Descartes, IV, the following paragraph on the thinking subject / Kena I.2 and I.6	Both prompt questions about the knower's relationship to the faculties of knowing.	Descartes's thinking substance and Brahman are not interchangeable; these are philosophical teachings, not contemporary experiments.
Kena II.1–4 and note 149:1 / Aristotle IV.1	The comparison asks whether a subject is treated as an ordinarily classifiable object or whether the inquiry has a more general purpose.	Müller's account of knowing Brahman is not Aristotle's field of inquiry and establishes no universal unknowable object.
Einstein §1, clocks A and B / Descartes IV, triangle and existence	A coherent concept and establishing a relationship in a particular case perform different tasks.	A physical definition and a metaphysical argument do not confirm each other's theology.
Einstein, introduction and §1 / Aristotle IV.1, particular sciences	Identify a question's domain before extending its conclusion.	An ancient distinction of fields does not turn special relativity into a general theory of consciousness.
Descartes IV, closing paragraphs on senses, imagination, and reason / Kena I.3–6 and II.3	Limits on sensory images can play a role in philosophical accounts of knowing.	Descartes's divine guarantee and the account of Brahman differ; resemblance does not justify abandoning factual checks.

This is a contemporary comparison of selected texts, rather than evidence of historical contact or a shared hidden doctrine.

Primary sources

• Aristotle, Metaphysics IV, W.D.Ross's English translation. IV.1 was read in full, together with the opening of IV.2. It supplies an ancient formulation of a general subject of inquiry. The translation's exact print date was not established from this page.

• René Descartes, Discourse on the Method, John Veitch's English translation. The opening of Part I and the whole of Part IV were read. The original work dates to 1637; the historical English exemplar's year was not established here. The French original was not checked.

• Kena Upanishad I, II, and IV. F.Max Müller, *The Upanishads*, Part I, SBE1, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1879. These khandas and their notes were read in full; III and the Sanskrit were not checked. A religious and philosophical primary text in a historical translation, including the translator's qualifications.

• Albert Einstein, On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies, 1905; W.Perrett and G.B.Jeffery's translation in *The Principle of Relativity*, 1923, John Walker's electronic edition. The introduction and complete §1 were used, rather than the entire paper. This supports the discussion of defining physical time; the German original was not checked.

Tags

world, consciousness, reality, experience, knowledge, being, ontology, epistemology, justification, observation, measurement, definition, interpretation, doubt, thinking, subject, body, Descartes, Aristotle, Kena Upanishad, Brahman, Einstein, time, reference frame, synchronization, philosophy, religious text, intercultural comparison, limits of inference, further reading

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.