

UNITED WISDOM

Fact, Hypothesis, Faith, and Symbol: Distinguishing the Grounds of Claims

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Fact, Hypothesis, Faith, and Symbol: Distinguishing the Grounds of Claims

Epigraph

> *“Our beliefs guide our desires and shape our actions.”*

Charles S. Peirce, The Fixation of Belief (1877), III. English original, in a philosophical discussion of belief and action.

What this article is about

A friend has not answered a message, and a story has already formed: they are offended, the relationship has changed, earlier trust was misplaced. Yet the screen shows only the absence of a reply. Its cause is still unknown; trust concerns the relationship’s history; a saved photograph recalls what that relationship has meant. Fact, hypothesis, faith, and symbol appear side by side. Distinguishing them can make our words and other people’s arguments easier to understand. It does not require sorting people into rational and irrational groups, removing religious life, or stripping objects of personal meaning. It asks us to notice the grounds of a statement, what we expect it to establish, and what could change our confidence. This article offers a language for that work. Historical texts provide interlocutors; the everyday scenes are original illustrations rather than findings from psychological studies.

I. Establishing what is actually being claimed

“Fact” often sounds like a discussion’s end. First identify the claim: “They have not replied” may describe an application at a particular time. It establishes neither whether the message was read, whether the phone works, nor the person’s feelings. Adding those interpretations turns observation into explanation. Separating them needs no suspicion: describe the evidence and leave the unknown unresolved.

A factual claim concerns something we believe happened or exists. Its name does not make it infallible. A photograph may have been taken earlier, a record may carry the wrong date, and memory may combine two conversations. The possibility of error does not reduce every observation to arbitrary opinion. It means the statement has a route for checking it. We might clarify the time, compare independent records, ask a participant, or discover that the material available is insufficient for the precision we need.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The breadth of a conclusion matters too. One person says, “During the meeting, I was prevented from finishing three times.” Another replies, “Nobody in this group ever listens.” The first statement is limited to an episode whose sequence can be checked. The second covers all participants and all meetings. That extension may express accumulated experience, but the experience needs to be presented separately. A stronger word does not add evidence. Clarifying the scope preserves the experience’s seriousness while making the actual disagreement easier to address.

In Chapter I of How We Think, John Dewey distinguishes direct perception from accepting something through inference. What matters here is that boundary, rather than a promise that perception is completely reliable. Seeing a wet umbrella may suggest rain. Yet the umbrella could have been washed or brought from another district. The observation does not contain a ready-made cause. Learning the conditions in which the object appeared helps establish one, and different explanations require different additional material.

Not every conversation requires the same detail. At home, saying that the bread is on the shelf may suffice. Examining a disputed record calls for its source, time, and method of collection. What changes is the demand placed on the statement, rather than the speaker’s dignity. The more depends on it, and the harder an error is to repair, the clearer its grounds should be. Asking “What did you actually see?” can invite joint checking instead of declaring in advance that someone is lying.

Without an original record, honest wording changes: “I remember it this way,” “I have only a copy,” or “A participant told me.” Such limits need not abandon knowledge; they show what another person can assess. A source helps when its scope is clear. Establishing that a meeting occurred does not confirm every alleged word. State support and limits together.

II. A hypothesis leaves room for another cause

A hypothesis offers an explanation or forecast for checking. Its strength involves alternatives, rather than a confident voice. A friend’s silence might reflect work, forgotten notifications, reflection, technical trouble, or tension. The list need not be endless; the first explanation need not be the only one. Nor are all alternatives equally plausible: circumstances can support some more strongly.

A useful proposal indicates what we might expect if it is true. A suspected application problem can be compared with the availability of other channels. Suspected disagreement may call for a conversation, if the person is willing. Yet one successful contact does not establish the absence of tension, and one failed attempt does not prove resentment. Human actions have many causes. Checking should remain proportionate to the question, without turning another person into the subject of concealed tests they know nothing about.

Some hypotheses are arranged so that every outcome counts as confirmation. A reply means concealed resentment; silence means resentment openly displayed. An objection means refusal to admit it; agreement means an admission. The arrangement may look coherent, yet it gives another explanation no possible entry. We can ask whether any imaginable observation would make us revise the proposal. If none can be named, we may be describing a story already chosen rather than a hypothesis genuinely open to examination.

This does not mean every question must be settled immediately. Checking may be unavailable, intrude on another person’s privacy, or cost more than the question warrants. We can then keep the explanation provisional and choose an action that does not require certainty about the cause. Confirming a meeting time need not settle why someone replied late. Living with an open question differs from indifference: we retain interest while declining to claim knowledge we have not obtained.

A hypothesis can be convenient, elegant, or useful for planning while remaining unconfirmed. Expecting rain, we carry an umbrella; even if it stays dry, the precaution may have been reasonable. The reasonableness of the decision does not prove the forecast correct. This distinction matters particularly after an event. A good result can arise through several circumstances, and a mistaken explanation can accompany a sensible action. Reviewing the forecast’s grounds, the chosen response, and the actual outcome separately produces a clearer account.

“For now I think this because I observed that; different evidence would change my view” states a revision condition. It need not become a conversational ritual: its purpose is movement between question and checking. Holding a hypothesis as identity makes correction feel humiliating. Treating it as a working explanation allows correction to improve understanding and action without defending the mistake.

III. Evidence supports a particular conclusion

Evidence supports particular questions. A closed-door photograph establishes its position when photographed, rather than the cause or owner’s intention. Grounds can shift unnoticed: a confirmed small claim lends apparent certainty to a larger conclusion. Asking which part the material supports, and where an additional assumption requires its own grounds, reveals that shift while preserving the useful evidence.

The strength of evidence depends on its connection to the conclusion, rather than how impressive it appears. Numerous retellings may all descend from one original story. We then have many repetitions, rather than many independent observations. Assessing a report involves asking where the information began, what the first participant could access, and

which links added interpretations. Some chains cannot be reconstructed. When the beginning is unknown, that gap belongs in the account; the number of confident voices cannot close it.

“I have a document” also needs a substantive continuation. Which document, concerning what event, prepared by whom and when? Suppose an invitation survives. It establishes an intention to hold a meeting and invite particular people, rather than their attendance. An attendance list addresses another question, and a recording addresses another again. Different documents can be authentic while failing to establish the conclusion we need. Precision comes from matching the question with the evidence, rather than the force of the word “official.”

Lack of confirmation and confirmed absence are different results. Failing to find a record in one accessible archive does not establish that an event never occurred. If a verified procedure necessarily produced a record, and the relevant collection is demonstrably complete, absence becomes more informative. Even then, the conditions of the conclusion should be stated. Confidence does not extend beyond those conditions by itself. This distinction avoids both unsupported denial and treating every unsubstantiated possibility as an equal alternative to what has been established.

When discussing personal life, some evidence is accessible only to the person concerned. They know what they felt without necessarily knowing its cause or another person’s intention. We can respect “I felt hurt” while separately examining “They intended to hurt me.” That distinction needs considerate language: questioning an explanation need not question the experience. Equally, an experience’s seriousness does not turn every associated interpretation into a fact. Both people gain room to clarify without erasing each other’s account.

A check may end modestly: one part confirmed, another plausible, a third unsupported. This is less vivid than a sweeping story but more useful for action. A record can correct a schedule, experience can prompt discussion of tension, and intentions can remain unresolved. Agreement is not promised; disagreement becomes clearer through existing material, missing evidence, and differing assessments.

IV. Faith, trust, and commitment require context

“Faith” and “belief” have several uses: expecting tomorrow’s parcel, trusting someone, or committing to justice. Religious faith has meaning within a particular tradition, its teachings, and life. Ordinary language connects these senses without making them identical. An argument that begins with one sense and ends with another can produce prolonged objections without a shared question.

In The Fixation of Belief, Charles Peirce considers belief through its relationship to action and inquiry. This is philosophical analysis, rather than a modern test of every form of faith. The relevant question here is how an accepted position directs our choices. Trusting a friend may

lead me to allow time for a reply. My trust does not establish that they must fulfil every expectation. A stance towards someone and a description of a future event remain distinct, even when experienced together.

In The Will to Believe, William James discusses a live, forced, momentous option that cannot be settled on intellectual grounds alone. His conditions matter: this is no licence to declare whatever we want true in every question. He separately discusses caution concerning objective facts. The text helps distinguish having to decide from possessing proof. Even when postponement is impossible, making a decision does not establish the truth of everything we hoped for when choosing it.

Hebrews 11 describes faith through hope and the unseen within a Christian theological context. The chapter also includes people who did not receive what was promised during their lives, and accounts of suffering. Treating it as a promise of inevitable worldly success would therefore misrepresent it. Its testimony concerns a particular religious understanding of fidelity. It is neither an experimental procedure for checking claims nor a universal definition of faith for all religions or for readers without religious belief.

Trust does not remove boundaries. It may involve willingness to listen, allowing reasonable freedom, and avoiding an unsupported assumption of the worst. It does not require abandoning available checks when the consequences matter. Nor must it continue unchanged after repeated deception. How to trust involves the relationship’s history, our commitments, and acceptable conditions. A beautiful sentence about faith cannot supply a universal answer while excluding actual interactions and the other person’s freedom to say no.

Commitment should not masquerade as discovered fact. “I want to remain honest” states an orientation, without proving every later action honest. We examine knowledge and conduct’s correspondence to the commitment. Acknowledging a mistaken judgment need not destroy a value; it can make commitment concrete again. Clarified facts sometimes reveal which action could express that value now.

V. A symbol carries meaning without predicting an outcome

A ring, photograph, or place-name can mean more than its material. In this original illustration, a ring recalls a mutual promise. Weight, presence, and history differ from what was agreed, by whom, and how it is understood now. Losing the ring establishes an object’s loss; it establishes neither a relationship’s end nor predicted misfortune. Those claims need separate grounds.

Symbolic meaning can be personal, shared, or established within a tradition. It is therefore insufficient to say everyone can simply assign any meaning to any sign. A shared symbol has a history worth learning; a personal one has its owner’s explanation worth hearing. Yet knowing the history does not determine what an object means to a particular person. They may accept

an inherited meaning, change their relationship to it, or preserve the object as a memory without sharing every associated belief.

Checking facts does not exhaust a question of meaning. We can investigate an old photograph's authenticity, but establishing its date does not measure its value to a family. Equally, family value does not make every story about it historically accurate. The two conversations can support each other. Discovering that the photograph was taken on another day need not erase the person's place in memory. We can correct the caption and preserve the relationship without defending a mistaken date.

Difficulty arises when a symbolic gesture is quietly assigned a guaranteed external effect. A letter written in someone's memory can express a relationship. It does not establish that another person read it or that a particular event must occur. Religious practice should be understood with attribution to a particular tradition, rather than generalized on everyone's behalf. A claimed observable result raises its own question of evidence. Calling the gesture a symbol does not exempt that result from checking.

Demanding proof from a symbol for something it was never meant to establish also mistakes the question. Someone says, "This house reminds me of childhood," and is challenged to prove that buildings store memories. We can clarify that the person remembers while the house provides an occasion and reference point. A meaningful account of place remains. Literal checking need not erase an intelligible metaphor when nobody uses it to claim additional hidden physical properties in the building.

Shared symbols can become disputed: an object signifies fidelity to one person and pressure to another. Measurement cannot settle this. Personal accounts, freedom to reject imposed meaning, and agreements about shared space matter. Facts do not thereby become relative; questions of participation and recognition accompany them. Establishing events and agreeing how to handle their signs remain connected, distinct tasks.

VI. Different grounds can coexist in one sentence

"I dreamed of a conversation, so my friend thinks of me, a sign everything will go well" contains several transitions. The dream is personal experience; the friend's thoughts need evidence. "Sign" may express meaning, while a good outcome is a prediction. Distinguishing these neither mocks dreams nor forbids hope; it prevents emotional coherence from confirming every part.

The same mixture appears without religious language. "Our plan is modern, so it will certainly work" joins an evaluation to a prediction. "Everyone says it is useful, so I must take part" turns a report of widespread opinion into a personal obligation. "I liked the result, so our original explanation was correct" confuses satisfaction with checking a cause. These examples do not

identify a special group of irrational people. They are ordinary verbal shortcuts that become more visible when consequences require careful reasoning.

Distinguishing grounds does not create a hierarchy of human worth. An observation does not make its observer superior to a person of faith; a profound symbol does not remove responsibility for checkable claims. Someone may use all four forms during one day: establish the time with a clock, propose a reason for a delay, trust a companion, and choose a meaningful gift. The issue is whether the form fits the task. A clock cannot measure fidelity, and a gift cannot establish that a separate promise has actually been fulfilled.

The distinction matters especially when a claim becomes a demand on someone else. “I believe you need to do this” states my position without replacing your consent. “It is our shared symbol” does not establish that everyone understands it alike. “I observed one case” does not impose an obligation on all. A proposal becomes a joint decision through its content, grounds, possible consequences, and room for refusal. A person’s dignity should not depend on accepting the explanation I offer.

Personal conviction can coexist with an accurate description of its status. “This has religious meaning for me” differs from “This proves that the event will happen.” “I choose to trust” differs from “Every circumstance is confirmed.” Clarification can feel difficult because a familiar strong sentence protects an important feeling. The feeling does not necessarily need an enlarged factual claim to protect it. More precise words may convey its significance better, allowing respect for the person without demanding agreement with an unsupported conclusion.

Living language does not separate neatly: literary images can combine memory, hope, and observable life. Poems need not become dissected records. Distinguishing grounds helps when it is unclear what we must accept or do. An understood image can retain its fullness without becoming compulsory proof. When used to demand decisions, however, the grounds and limits deserve examination.

VII. Matching confidence to its grounds

“True” and “false” do not exhaust precision. Established events, plausible explanations, and open questions differ. “Confirmed by this record,” “fits available circumstances better,” and “not established yet” should describe actual states, rather than decorate unchanged certainty. A useful qualification identifies checked material, the inferred portion, and further information that could affect its assessment.

An unsupported number can replace an unsupported absolute: “ninety per cent certain” may describe only an impression. Without an assessment method, it need not improve on verbal confidence. “I lean towards this because…” can suffice. Numbers need a relevant procedure

and meaning; otherwise invented precision presents measurement's appearance instead of explaining how the judgment arose.

Uncertainty does not require treating every statement alike. Some have checked support; others remain conjectural. Respecting a speaker need not erase that difference. Two conflicting memories deserve attention, yet a surviving recording may settle the limited question of the words spoken. It may not settle their experienced meaning. Giving each ground its appropriate scope allows us to clarify the event and hear the experience without declaring either useless for the sake of the other.

Confidence also has a time dimension. "On the evidence available today" makes room for new information without removing the duty to use what exists. Future discoveries cannot indefinitely excuse refusal to acknowledge what is well supported now. Equally, today's material need not be declared the final possible word. Practical decisions are made with finite access to information. We can state their conditions, choose a reasonable point for reconsideration, and avoid demanding knowledge of every circumstance before taking any action.

Confidence in a value can remain while confidence in an explanation decreases. Someone still wants to be fair after discovering a mistaken judgment about another's conduct. They still care for a memory after correcting an object's origin. Revising facts need not destroy everything attached to the earlier account. Naming exactly what changed helps prevent withdrawal of one conclusion from becoming an automatic rejection of relationships, hope, or an entire set of commitments.

"I do not know" belongs alongside willingness to clarify, rather than ending every difficult conversation. For an accessible question within our responsibility, name the next step. Impossible checks or decisions belonging elsewhere can leave a limit unresolved. Modest claims allow active attention: arrange contact without knowing a delay's cause, or participate in present needs without establishing an event's final meaning.

VIII. Disagreement and revision without erasing the person

A discussion of grounds can become a contest of superiority: terminology on one side, defence of a life on the other. Start with which claim needs clarification, and why. Attendance differs from commitment to a shared undertaking; origin differs from personal value. A clearer subject reduces the temptation to assess someone's entire person through one disagreement.

We can invite a person to name their grounds without deciding the answer in advance. Is this experience, a participant's report, a hypothesis, or an accepted conviction? Several forms may coexist. Asking how the observation connects to the conclusion can then help more than demanding a final label. We should be willing to answer the same question about our own

position. If only the other person is examined, discussion becomes a one-sided test. Joint checking needs reciprocal responsibility, even when access to information differs.

Clarification does not always end in agreement. People may assess evidence differently, hold different commitments, or belong to different traditions. Yet false disagreements can be reduced. One person may discuss symbolic significance while another objects to a prediction nobody intended. Both may acknowledge an event while differing about its explanation. Naming the difference need not dissolve it. It helps determine the next conversation and where joint action remains possible despite continuing disagreement.

When new evidence changes a conclusion, the correction should be clear enough. “I said the meeting was Tuesday; the record shows Wednesday” helps more than a vague “it is complicated.” We can then identify what remains valid and what needs a new decision. Consistency need not preserve an error, nor must correction declare an entire earlier life false. Responsibility should match the claim’s content and consequences. Acknowledgment matters particularly to people who have already relied on our words.

Revision can give symbols and commitments new content. A corrected photograph still recalls someone; trust may become cautious without disappearing; correction can express honesty. These are possibilities, not promised conflict outcomes. Relationships sometimes end and painful questions remain. Distinguishing grounds cannot guarantee reconciliation, but defending an unsupported claim need not add to an existing difficulty.

Careful thought need not remove hope, trust, or images; each can have a clear role. Facts describe what is established within limits; hypotheses open explanations to checking; faith and trust retain context and boundaries; symbols convey meaning without becoming predictions. They coexist in life without one doing all the others’ work. Precision can serve truth and human meaning together.

What this means in practice

Choose a modest statement from a conversation you can examine without intruding on privacy. Start with an ordinary situation, rather than a consequential decision requiring specialist help. Write the exact phrase without strengthening it; separate multiple conclusions.

Ask what describes an event, proposes a cause, expresses trust or commitment, or carries symbolic meaning. All four need not occur. Do not assign categories merely to complete a table. Mark any mixed transition you want to clarify.

Describe the grounds: observation, a record, an identified report, memory, or accepted conviction. State what they do not show. A missing reply can be visible while its cause remains unknown. Do not collect concealed information about someone to complete this exercise.

For a hypothesis, name a realistic alternative and an accessible circumstance that might distinguish them. Choose a simple ethical check, if available. Otherwise keep the conclusion provisional. Find an action needing less knowledge: confirm an arrangement, express a need, or wait an agreed time.

For trust or symbols, identify meaning you wish to preserve independently of disputed details. Memory need not depend on a photograph's exact date; a value need not disappear with a mistaken explanation. Meaning alone does not confirm a prediction.

Rewrite the phrase accurately: "There is no reply yet. I do not know why. I want respectful contact and will confirm the meeting time." Identify what changed and who might need the correction. This original clarity exercise has no claimed demonstrated psychological efficacy or guaranteed ability to resolve conflict.

Key quotation

> *"We do not put beliefs that rest simply on inference on the surest level of assurance."*

John Dewey, How We Think (1910), I§2, p9. English original; distinguishes perception from inference without rejecting justified reasoning.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Source and specific support	Difference and limit
Observation and inference	Dewey, How We Think I§2	Inference needs grounds; the umbrella illustration is original, not a research finding.
Belief and action	Peirce, The Fixation of Belief III–V	Philosophical inquiry into habit and investigation, not proof of every kind of faith.
Choosing under uncertainty	James, The Will to Believe I, IV, VIII–IX	Genuine-option conditions do not permit arbitrary declarations of objective facts.
Christian faith and hope	Hebrews11:1–40	Testimony within a tradition; suffering and unreceived promises exclude guaranteed worldly success.
Meaning and checkable events	Original comparison of these limits in sectionsV–VIII	Symbolic scenes are original, not a universal cultural theory or an efficacy promise.

Primary sources

1. John Dewey. *How We Think* (1910). Chapter I §§1–4, original pp1–13; quotation §2 p9. D.C. Heath 1910 English original; Project Gutenberg #37423 transcription. https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/37423/pg37423-images.html

2. Charles S. Peirce. *The Fixation of Belief* (1877). Popular Science Monthly12 Nov1877 pp1–15; sections II–V and conclusion, epigraph III. Peirce.org transcription of English original. https://www.peirce.org/writings/p107.html

3. William James. *The Will to Believe* (1896). Sections I, IV, VIII–IX; contextual reading III–IX and opening X. English original essay, Wikisource transcription. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Will_to_Believe

4. Epistle to the Hebrews. *Hebrews, chapter11* (First century CE; KJV1611 translation). 11:1–40, especially1,13,35–39. King James Version, Bible Gateway. https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Hebrews%2011&version=KJV

Tags

fact, hypothesis, faith, symbol, evidence, grounds, observation, inference, checking, confidence, uncertainty, trust, commitment, value, memory, meaning, metaphor, dialogue, disagreement, revision, responsibility, consent, boundaries, Peirce, Dewey, James, Christian tradition, epistemology, critical thinking, everyday life

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.