Reading / EN

Closeness needs a recognizable boundary.

Observation, effect, and the possibility of discussing a conflict more precisely.

Epoch AdL · Bib / 2026-10-22

Closeness needs a recognizable boundary.

A late message becomes an accusation. What changes when we consider statement, interpretation, intention, and effect separately? A reading about relationships, commitments, and agreements open to correction.

The argument begins before the last sentence

Two friends have arranged to spend an evening together. One writes in the afternoon that he will be late. The other initially replies curtly and later cancels the meeting altogether. The next day, they say: “You don't care about our time” and “You turn every little thing into a problem.” This example is fictional. It contains little secure knowledge about the people, but already two far-reaching judgments about them.

The visible occasion is the late message. Whether it is also the whole cause of the conflict remains unclear. Perhaps several meetings have already been postponed. Perhaps the time was never clearly agreed. Perhaps the disappointment concerns not so much the lost evening as the lack of an opportunity to rearrange one's own plans. Reading the source therefore begins

with a simple shift in attention: from the last accusation back to the conditions to which it responds.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 15.5, p. 72; chapters 17.3–17.4, p. 77; chapter 44, pp. 130–131. The conflict values stipulated there are demonstration data, not collected assessments of relationships.

What happened, and what does it mean to me?

An observable statement would be: “On Tuesday we discussed 18:00; at 17:00 the message came that you could only make 20:00.” The statement “My time means nothing to you” interprets what happened. That interpretation may express an important experience. It is nevertheless different from a description of the event. Separating the two levels does not strip the feeling of its significance. It makes visible where understanding or disagreement is possible.

Observations, too, are not entirely free of presuppositions. Memories can differ, a chat can be incomplete, and an agreement may have meant different things to each person. The first question would therefore be: “Do we remember the sequence in the same way?” Only then can they discuss more

precisely which expectation was disappointed. A small, verifiable detail can be more dependable than an extensive description of someone's character.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 15.5, p. 72; chapters 17.3–17.4, p. 77; chapter 44, pp. 130–131. The conflict values stipulated there are demonstration data, not collected assessments of relationships.

Intention and effect are two points to examine

The late friend might explain that an appointment ran longer than expected. This explanation concerns his intention and his possibilities. The other person still had to wait or change a plan of his own. The explanation does not cancel the effect. Conversely, a burdensome effect does not yet permit a secure conclusion that it was produced intentionally. The source treats these questions separately so that neither side silently stands in for the other.

In the conversation, this can produce two simultaneous sentences: “I didn't mean to make you feel less important” and “The late change made planning harder for me.” Both can be true. The next question need not then be which person is fundamentally right. It can be what change would reduce avoidable burdens next time. This presupposes

that those involved are allowed to name the specific effect at all.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 15.5, p. 72; chapters 17.3–17.4, p. 77; chapter 44, pp. 130–131. The conflict values stipulated there are demonstration data, not collected assessments of relationships.

A boundary makes a commitment understandable

“Be more reliable” leaves much unspecified. “If you're going to be more than half an hour late, please let me know as early as possible; then we'll decide again” describes a clearer framework. The relationship is not ended here. Closeness and room to move are arranged so that both can know what they are agreeing to. The number is a fictional agreement between these two people, not a general measure of good friendship.

A boundary also includes one's own possibilities. No one can reliably promise to be constantly available if everyday life does not allow it. A workable agreement should therefore formulate an expectation and also ask whether it can be fulfilled. Saying no to a particular demand can make a relationship more honest than saying yes when failure is already foreseeable.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung

1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 15.5, p. 72; chapters 17.3–17.4, p. 77; chapter 44, pp. 130–131. The conflict values stipulated there are demonstration data, not collected assessments of relationships.

A conversation note in three parts

The following writing exercise is an editorial application. First note a specific sequence, with a place or time where those details are necessary. Then write down the meaning you gave to what happened and the effect you experienced. Finally, formulate a genuine question and a possible request. “You never take me seriously” might become: “When my follow-up question went unanswered in the conversation, I had the impression that my objection didn't count. How did you experience that moment? Can we clarify the point first at our next meeting?”

Before the conversation, check whether your question allows an answer you do not yet know. A question containing only a concealed accusation changes the wording more than the attitude. Nor does the note create an obligation to say everything immediately. Timing, willingness to talk, and the possibility of ending a conversation belong to the framework.

Correction shows itself in later possibilities

A friendly discussion can feel good and still change little. A useful review therefore asks about the next agreed case: did the information arrive earlier? Was the agreement clearer? Could someone object in time? An unsuccessful agreement need not be defended simply because it was carefully worded. It can be simplified, changed, or ended.

The method produces neither equal power nor voluntary consent. Where one person controls the other's possibilities, formal willingness to talk must not be confused with actual freedom. Rights, protection, and the decision against another conversation can also be decisive. The reading provides a language for making distinctions. It decides neither the value of a person nor which relationship should continue.

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung 1.0 · 12 October 2026 · Chapter 15.5, p. 72; chapters 17.3–17.4, p. 77; chapter 44, pp. 130–131. The conflict values stipulated there are demonstration data, not collected assessments of relationships.

Questions

What specific observation supports your accusation, and what meaning have you added yourself?

What agreement would give both people a real choice?

What later action would show that something has improved?

About this edition

Editorially adapted from the final October version of “AdL – Architektur des Lebens”: chapter 15.5 on boundaries, chapters 17.3–17.4 on role and responsibility, and chapter 44, pp. 130–131, on conflict between people. The stipulated numerical example has not been adopted as a measurement. The following everyday scenario and writing exercise are new, explicitly fictional applications.

Develops the distinction between action, interpretation, intention, and effect through an understandable conversational situation.

Replaces synthetic conflict values with describable observations; assesses no people or relationships with a balance value.

Explicitly considers boundaries, unequal possibilities for action, and voluntary participation in a discussion.

An independent adaptation of selected passages with new examples and context. This is not a complete reprint of the source texts. Examples are fictional; ADL interpretations are editorial applications. External sources do not establish ADL’s effectiveness.

Sources

Mücahid Selman Yildizhan: AdL – Architektur des Lebens, Endfassung 1.0
12 October 2026 · Chapter 15.5, p. 72; chapters 17.3–17.4, p. 77; chapter 44, pp. 130–131. The conflict values stipulated there are demonstration data, not collected assessments of relationships.