

UNITED WISDOM

The Strongest Objection: How to Test Your Own Position Honestly

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-02-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Strongest Objection: How to Test Your Own Position Honestly

Epigraph

> *He who knows only his own side of the case, knows little of that.*

John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, chapter II, paragraph discussing the opposing case; the English text of the selected edition. This is a proposition in a philosophical argument for freedom of discussion, not an experimental finding about every disagreement.

What this article is about

A convenient objection is easy to defeat: choose someone else's clumsy formulation and expose its weakness. That victory does not yet test your position. A serious objection concerns something your conclusion depends on: reliable evidence, a causal connection, the cost of a decision, or authority to make it for others. This article explores how to find that point without turning conversation into a contest of eloquence. We distinguish an actual opposing position from an invented opponent, factual disagreement from conflicting values, and revising a claim from rescuing it after the event. Mill, Plato's Socrates, and selected Analects teachings become interlocutors while retaining their different historical purposes. The practical outcome is a bounded procedure: state your claim, identify a serious difficulty, specify a possible check, and name a condition for revision. It promises neither to eliminate disagreement nor to make anyone permanently impartial.

I. What are we actually defending?

Before looking for an objection, we need a position that someone can object to. “The new arrangement is better” sounds definite until we ask: better for whom, by which measure, and over what period? In an invented workshop, someone proposes a shared log of all customer inquiries. One colleague wants to stop losing messages, another wants faster replies, and a third needs to work without constantly completing a form. These goals differ. If a proposal promises every benefit without a cost, any isolated success can confirm it and any shortcoming can become an irrelevant accident. Testing begins by limiting the promise: which outcome should change, and which action is supposed to produce it?

We can separate three layers. The first reports a situation: some inquiries receive no answer. The second proposes an explanation: staff cannot see a shared list. The third recommends an action: create a log. A sound observation can coexist with a mistaken explanation and an

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

unsuitable action. Perhaps a list already exists but nobody has responsibility for replying. Another log would reproduce the problem elsewhere. An objection to one layer need not destroy the others. Someone can retain their commitment to answering customers while reconsidering their chosen means. When the layers merge into a slogan, a limited correction can feel like abandoning the entire purpose, although the work has simply become more precise.

Our written position should also retain its actual strength. If someone said a measure “sometimes helps,” we should not test them as though they promised it “always works.” Equally, the proposer should not pretend, after a difficult question, that their original promise was much smaller. They can revise it and acknowledge the change. That clarifies what was tested and what will be tested next. A transparent record prevents an ambiguous victory in which a speaker quietly retreats to a more convenient assertion. A serious objection requires both participants to recognise the same subject, rather than pursue a moving sentence whose meaning changes after every reply. Revision remains possible; an invisible change of subject makes that possibility harder to assess.

II. From another voice to a serious difficulty

In chapter II of On Liberty, Mill asks readers to hear opposing arguments from people who genuinely defend them and encounter their persuasive form. His subject is freedom of thought and discussion, not a measured effect of today's exercise. The bounded question here is whether an objection comes from the contested point or was designed to be easy to answer. A disagreeable remark is not necessarily a strong objection. A harsh tone can accompany a weak argument, while a polite sentence can reveal a decisive difficulty.

In the workshop, the log's proposer chooses a convenient opponent: “You simply dislike organisation.” This conjecture about motives does not test the arrangement. A colleague's actual concern might be: “When a customer calls, I need to address their problem first; a mandatory form will delay my response.” The argument connects a requirement with an action's cost. We can now ask which information is needed before answering and which can be recorded later. The proposal may survive, but its shape changes: the log should support the work, rather than merely display control. Hearing the difficulty does not mean conceding in advance. It means allowing the argument to affect the design instead of replacing it with a characterisation of its speaker.

An honest paraphrase can be offered back: “You are concerned about this consequence because the action is arranged this way. Is that your point?” Agreement confirms the paraphrase's accuracy, not the position's truth. When the speaker is unavailable, identify the reconstruction as yours and consult the most relevant primary text. Do not attribute every improvement you invent to its author. Understanding an existing objection differs from

constructing a stronger new one. Both can help, but they test different things. In one case we answer a person or text; in the other we explore a possibility they have not asserted. Keeping that distinction visible prevents our own imaginative argument from becoming supposed evidence of what another person believes.

III. Strongest does not mean most frightening

The most alarming imagined outcome is not always the strongest objection. Someone might claim that the new log will eventually destroy the workshop, but without a connecting explanation this is only a dramatic picture. A smaller concern—that staff cannot record information during a call—may be stronger because it identifies a particular condition. Strength depends on the dependency an argument reveals, not the drama of its ending. This is a working criterion for reasoning, not a psychological scale. It allows us to investigate risk without requiring catastrophic fantasies or promising that moderate language automatically makes a decision sensible. A restrained objection still needs support; an upsetting objection can still identify something real.

We can distinguish objections by their target. One questions the evidence: are inquiries actually being lost? Another questions the explanation: does the missing list cause the problem? A third concerns feasibility: can staff use the log? A fourth asks about consequences and the distribution of work. A fifth concerns authority: who can require others to enter information? The last two can remain after technical success. Even a functioning log does not settle an unagreed workload. Choosing only the target we can already answer leaves testing incomplete. We need not resolve every human question at once, but we should identify the material choice and who has standing to decide it.

An objection's importance depends on the task. A small, reversible change may permit a limited trial and an observation of its outcome. A change to other people's obligations also requires agreement about conditions. For a factual claim, the quality of evidence matters more than the number of supporters. This gives checks an order: which difficulty can change the next step now? The answer need not be the deepest philosophical problem. Sometimes essential data are missing. Sometimes the data exist but the selection criterion remains disputed. Confusing these cases can produce endless information gathering when the disagreement already concerns whose cost is being treated as acceptable. More numbers cannot automatically settle that question for the people who bear it.

IV. Expertise and the limits of a confident voice

In Plato's Apology, Socrates recounts investigating the Delphic answer by meeting people reputed to be wise. He distinguishes artisans' skill from their claim to know other important matters. This is a courtroom speech transmitted by Plato and connected with Socrates' divine mission, not a neutral modern observer's report. The limited distinction useful here separates competence in an activity from warrant to judge everything. Someone may understand a tool but misread a customer's expectations; another may speak well without knowing the process they describe. A particular excellence need not cover every uncertainty. The historical account provides a question about scope, rather than a complete procedure for selecting contemporary expertise.

That distinction also applies to the objector. We should not reject a technical question because its speaker presents it awkwardly. Nor should we consider it settled because an eminent craftsperson asked it. We can identify the competence relevant to the assertion and the support for this specific argument. Reputation can help us decide whom to hear carefully; it cannot substitute for an answer's content. In the invented workshop, an experienced employee knows the usual course of calls, but the new log may alter it. Their description of the existing process deserves attention, while their forecast requires a separate check. Respect for experience remains compatible with identifying the boundary beyond which experience supplies no ready result.

The Socratic story should not become permission to humiliate people in order to expose ignorance. The speech itself recounts hostility and dangerous consequences. A contemporary voluntary discussion has different conditions: participants can limit the subject, decline a public examination, or choose a written question. Our purpose is to identify a weak basis for a position, not stage a personal exposure. This applies to our own confidence too. Saying “I do not know that” does not declare us incapable of all decisions. It can identify the specialist or evidence we need. A serious objection is valuable because it locates work, not because it leaves someone without dignity or permission to continue thinking about the matter.

V. Checking a fact and choosing a value

Not every disagreement can be resolved by another measurement. Suppose the log reduces lost inquiries but requires work after the shift. One participant considers that a small cost for reliability; another declines to give up personal time. They may understand the same facts and differ over acceptable obligations. Another efficiency chart will not remove the second concern. They need to discuss work arrangements: simplify the entry, allocate time during the shift, change the proposal, or abandon it. This invented example distinguishes tasks; it is not a legal judgment about a particular workplace. Data make consequences visible but do not decide on behalf of everyone who must bear them.

We can formulate the check in two parts. “Learning this would change our assessment of the result” addresses factual uncertainty. “Even with that result, this condition remains unacceptable to me” identifies a boundary of agreement. The latter should not automatically be dismissed as stubbornness: it may describe what the former check never covered. A value boundary also benefits from specificity. “I oppose control” can mean avoiding unnecessary information, rejecting assessment by entry counts, or declining extra duties without discussion. A concrete formulation can reveal a possible agreement while preserving someone's right to refuse it if a material boundary is still crossed. Clarification identifies the options; it does not guarantee that any available option will satisfy both people.

Some disputes are mixed. A colleague rejects the log both because they doubt its usefulness and because they reject the workload. A successful limited trial might change the first ground while leaving the second intact. The honest conclusion is then not “all objections have been answered.” It is that one question received an answer and another requires a decision. Separating them protects the proposer from an impossible demand to prove a value another person does not share, and protects the colleague from pressure through numbers. An objection need not be refuted. It can remain a sufficient reason to change or decline an action. Testing your position includes readiness for that outcome, rather than merely preparing a more polished defence.

VI. An example that actually changes the claim

A contrary instance must be compared with a claim's actual conditions. If the log promises never to lose an inquiry, one omission during correct use already challenges the promise. If it promises fewer omissions, a single instance does not establish complete uselessness. Scale and comparison conditions matter. We should also distinguish use from non-use. The proposer cannot rescue the promise by saying “they used it incorrectly” without showing that correct use was understandable and feasible. Difficulty following the procedure may be precisely the defect the objection identifies, rather than an unrelated fault of people who supposedly fail to appreciate a good idea. Feasibility belongs to the proposal when the proposal depends on ordinary participants performing it.

A hypothetical counterexample can be constructed in advance. What happens when three calls arrive together? What happens to an inquiry received by someone without access to the log? Who continues the entry when that person is absent? Such questions expose a design's limits before difficulties become costly. An imagined scene does not tell us how often the event occurs. It reveals a possibility and a condition; relevant evidence or a limited check must follow. Do not describe a possibility as an established widespread failure. Equally, do not dismiss it because previous experience preserved no such instance. Missing records can indicate rarity, poor recording, or genuine absence. Those possibilities call for different responses and should remain distinguishable.

The result may be a narrower claim: a log helps at this volume of inquiries, provided entry has a defined place in the process and responsibility is clear. This is a substantive revision when its new conditions can be checked and genuinely limit the promise. It is an empty rescue when conditions appear only after each failure and never allow a negative conclusion beforehand. The difference becomes visible in the next check. After honest clarification, we know what would warrant reconsideration again. After retrospective rescue, every outcome still counts as victory. A serious objection should leave the revised position open to another test; otherwise the new formulation has merely concealed the old uncertainty behind a more flexible promise.

VII. Learning, reflection, and acknowledged uncertainty

Analects II.15 and II.17 connect learning with thought and distinguish acknowledged knowledge from acknowledged ignorance. These are Confucian educational and ethical teachings, not Mill's programme of liberal discussion. They raise a bounded question about our preparation: have we replaced studying the subject with ingenious speculation? We can invent an impressive objection to work we have never read and touch none of its actual grounds. We can also learn many facts without asking which conclusion they support. Both forms of work matter. The historical teaching does not establish the universality or efficacy of our proposed procedure; it helps make their relationship available for consideration.

Acknowledged uncertainty has a practical form: “I have not checked entry time,” “I do not know who agreed to the new duty,” or “I cannot access the original rule.” Each sentence identifies what could be learned and where a confident conclusion is unavailable. This differs from “everything is relative,” which does little for the next action. Material uncertainty may justify postponement or a reversible trial. Uncertainty that does not affect the present choice need not stop work, provided we can explain why the conclusion holds without that answer. The explanation should be accessible to participants, rather than concealed inside the author's confident manner as if it were a self-evident reason.

Knowing our own limits does not make us judges of someone else's honesty. Another participant can also make a mistake without intending deception or need time to find accurate words. We can allow clarification and return to the argument. This does not require accepting endless changes of conditions, but distinguishes correction from evasion. In our example, a colleague first says the log “will delay everything,” then specifies the delay to the first response. The objection becomes testable. The proposer may likewise withdraw their original promise of complete reliability. Both changes should be named. The discussion becomes more honest through clear records of uncertainty and revision, rather than classifying people as wise or foolish on the basis of one remark.

VIII. Testing without a contest in humiliation

An objection can address a thought or force its holder to defend their right to be heard. “How would this work with three calls?” and “Do you understand the job at all?” create different conversational tasks. One opens a condition; the other requires a response to a personal assessment. A suitable formulation does not guarantee calm or agreement. Even necessary clarification can feel painful. Still, a question's author is responsible for what they invite people to discuss. If the purpose is to test a design, the question should remain connected to it. Sarcasm and public pressure add an obstacle that can later be mistaken for evidence that the other person's position is weak.

Honest testing permits different forms of participation. Someone can write an argument, request a pause, or restrict discussion to one question. Not every position must be defended immediately before a group. Agreeing to discuss a work tool does not mean agreeing to scrutiny of one's entire life or character. Naming the subject and possible outcome helps: we are deciding whether to trial a log, not assessing employees' maturity. This is an authorial proposal for contemporary discussion, not a reconstruction of a shared ancient discipline. It aims to preserve the possibility of a substantive answer and refusal of an unsuitable format. Without that possibility, a strong voice can win the meeting while leaving its most important argument unexamined.

Particular care is needed when someone reports harm or a broken promise. Seeking a strong opposing case does not impose a duty to doubt their experience for intellectual balance. We can distinguish their report of experience from a specific factual inference and decision that require evidence. People should not become involuntary objects of others' reasoning exercise. Here the procedure primarily concerns one's own position and an agreed shared task. If the conversation does not permit a safe refusal, that is already a material condition of the decision. A beautiful paraphrase cannot remove it. Honest discussion includes asking who can actually participate in the check and what happens to someone who says no.

IX. What counts as an answer?

An answer must address the dependency the objection exposed. If a colleague asks about entry time, listing the benefits of organisation does not answer. If they ask about access, assurances of good intentions do not close the gap. Sometimes an answer changes the design: a brief entry after the conversation, a clear handover, or access from the relevant location. Sometimes it acknowledges that no solution exists yet. “We do not know how to make this feasible” conveys more than a promise that sufficient effort will fix everything. It permits postponement or a separate check while retaining the distinction between preparing an idea and confirming its suitability under actual conditions.

We should also record what remains. An abbreviated form reduces workload without assigning responsibility for a missed call. Allocated time addresses entry without establishing that the selected information is useful. When the proposer names the remainder, the colleague need not prove every boundary again. This does not demand an infinite list of shortcomings. Identify those that materially affect the next action. A decision can remain reasonable with uncertainty when its cost and possibility of revision are clear. We cannot use that allowance while also claiming that every risk has been definitively refuted. A bounded response makes its own limit visible instead of converting an incomplete answer into a declaration of complete resolution.

An accepted answer also has a status. “We can try that” permits a limited trial; it does not establish success. “That is convincing” may mean the argument is understood without

agreement to a duty. “I agree” needs an intelligible object. After a serious objection, restore the shared outcome in one concrete statement: which action was chosen, under which conditions, and which result would prompt reconsideration? Reasoning can then become a checkable agreement. Absence of agreement is also an outcome that can be named without staging unanimity. The objection has already helped if it reveals why the earlier simple formulation could not provide a decision for everyone involved in the work.

X. What remains after honest revision?

Testing can end with retaining a position. Its reason should have become more specific: someone now understands the difficulty as well as the proposal's attraction. A response that addresses the difficulty gives confidence a more definite ground. Without that response, limitation or withdrawal is more honest. None of these outcomes assesses a person's entire worth. In the workshop, the proposer can retain the goal of reliable replies and abandon the shared log because another handover method fits better. They have changed a means, not betrayed the importance of customers. Separating purpose and means permits revision without requiring people first to stop caring about what motivated their decisions.

Revision can be communicated without a dramatic confession. Name the earlier claim, the ground for change, and the new boundary: “I proposed mandatory entry before replying. During simultaneous calls, that would delay work. I now propose answering first and checking handover separately.” People can see what changed and why. If others were affected, the consequences of the earlier version also need discussion; an attractive new statement alone is insufficient. Acknowledging a mistake need not become endless self-accusation. The work concerns correcting a decision, restoring an agreement, and checking what remains if participants are willing to continue. Its completeness depends on the subject, rather than the emotional force of someone's admission.

The strongest objection can therefore be understood as an invitation to locate the limit of our being right. Here it is neither a universal truth test, a technique for winning, nor a guarantee of harmony. It requires encounters with an actual opposing argument, the basis of our own inference, and the possibility of changing the next step. Mill's freedom of discussion, Socratic examination of wisdom, and Confucian teaching on learning offer different horizons. They cannot merge into one ancient instruction. Their comparison makes a question visible that we ask in our own name: which serious difficulty will I admit to my position, and what could it change if it proves well founded?

What this means in practice

Choose a small decision that actually belongs to you and can be revised. Write one assertion, separating your goal from your proposed means. For example: “This handover method should reduce omissions if staff can follow it during their shifts.” Record what you observed, what you learned from a source, and what remains a supposition. This is an original reasoning exercise without an established research effect.

Formulate one objection to a material dependency: evidence, explanation, feasibility, cost, or authority. If you rely on another person's position, check your paraphrase where possible. If you construct a hypothesis, label it accordingly. Several frightening scenarios are unnecessary. One difficulty capable of changing the present step is enough. Ask whether answering it requires a fact, a clarified criterion, or another participant's agreement. Do not replace these different responses with a promise to convince everyone.

Name an available check and possible outcomes in advance. Which observation would retain the proposal? What would narrow or overturn it? What would remain unknown after a trial? You can decide to wait when an essential answer is unavailable. Where others are involved, agree on participation conditions and the right to stop. After checking, record only what actually changed. Neither unwavering confidence nor compulsory surrender is required. What matters is an intelligible connection between the answer obtained and your next decision.

Key quotation

> *Learning without thought is labour lost; thought without learning is perilous.*

Analects II.15; James Legge's English translation. This educational and ethical teaching is not identified with a contemporary experimental procedure.

Connections between traditions

1. **Reputation and grounds.** Plato's Apology, the account of politicians, poets, and artisans, distinguishes reputation from the limits of knowledge; Mill's On Liberty II distinguishes holding an opinion from understanding opposing reasons. Their meeting concerns the basis of confidence. A courtroom defence of Socrates' divine mission differs from a political argument for free discussion.

2. **Learning and thought.** Analects II.15 connects learning with reflection; Mill II asks readers to encounter a position's actual difficulty. Information should participate in understanding rather than merely be memorised. Confucian ethical education and liberal discussion retain different purposes. No shared ancient technique is asserted.

3. **Acknowledged ignorance.** Analects II.17 asks a learner to acknowledge knowledge and ignorance; Plato's Socrates contrasts his ignorance with others' confidence. Both raise the question of presenting the unknown as established. The teacher's instruction differs from a narrative tied to an oracle and a mission; their accounts of wisdom are not declared identical.

4. **Competence and scope.** The artisans in the Apology and Analects II.17 invite a question about where knowledge exists. Our practical connection is that a particular skill does not automatically settle every dispute. Plato's craft knowledge belongs to inquiry into the Delphic answer; the Confucian passage concerns acknowledging knowledge. Contemporary expertise requires its own selection.

5. **Hearing and revising.** Mill II considers the persuasive opposing position; Analects II.15 connects thought with learning. This article asks what an argument heard could change in our decision. Recording objections and revision conditions is our proposal, not a procedure attributed to either text or an intervention whose efficacy their comparison proves.

Primary sources

1. John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, chapter II, 1859; Gutenberg 34901. Read the passages on understanding arguments and free discussion, printed pages 64–71 of the selected edition. Epigraph; philosophical argument, not empirical statistics.

2. Plato, Apology, translated by Benjamin Jowett; the Delphic answer and encounters with politicians, poets, and artisans, locator 20e–23c. Primary philosophical courtroom text; not a complete historical report or a test of every form of dialogue.

3. Analects II.15 and II.17, translated by James Legge, Gutenberg 3330. Primary Confucian text: learning, reflection, and limits of knowledge. Key quotation.

Tags

objection, position, reason, argument, testing, revision, uncertainty, knowledge, understanding, evidence, cause, decision, purpose, means, counterexample, condition, authority, agreement, values, dialogue, freedom of discussion, John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, Plato, Apology, Socrates, Confucius, Analects, learning, reflection

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.