

UNITED WISDOM

A common undertaking: cooperating with different interests

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A38 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A common undertaking: cooperating with different interests

Epigraph

> *The superior man is affable, but not adulatory;*

Confucius, Analects, XIII.23, the first clause of the contrast in James Legge's translation. The quotation concerns a moral ideal; its connection with contemporary cooperation is limited to friendliness without ingratiation.

What this article is about

A common undertaking often begins with a phrase in which everyone hears their own desired result. In a hypothetical story, neighbourhood residents, an archivist and a cafe owner arrange a temporary room for listening to recorded memories of older residents. Some want to preserve voices, another wants archival materials, and another wants visitors. Different interests do not themselves expose cooperation as deception. They matter when decisions assume that everyone already wants the same thing and will pay an equal price. We will examine what can be shared despite differing motives: a limited result, permissible methods, participation conditions and ways to reconsider them. Ancient texts help preserve questions about relationships and the limits of friendliness; they replace no contemporary agreement and guarantee no team success. This article's practical purpose is to make joint choices more intelligible while preserving participants' differences and attention to those affected by the undertaking.

I. A shared result is smaller than participants' whole lives

The temporary room does not require residents, the archivist and the cafe owner to understand neighbourhood memory identically. They can agree on a narrower result: over two weekends, visitors can hear selected recordings with intelligible provenance, listening conditions and an opportunity to offer a correction. This description does not exhaust personal hopes. It names something people actually make together, distinct from other desirable things. If one participant imagines a permanent museum while another has offered a room for four days, the difference needs to remain visible. A common undertaking's name does not automatically expand a promise to the largest hope anyone brings to it.

A limited result can be examined through actual decisions. Should recordings feature only well-known residents, or also people with less striking memories? Are excerpts acceptable

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

when they cannot be understood without a long explanation? Will the room support quiet listening or belong to a noisy celebration? If answers change what visitors are promised, these concern the shared subject rather than minor tastes. One description may conceal two incompatible projects. Participants then need to choose an arrangement, separate events or recognise that they have not agreed. An attractive shared name removes no contradiction between the conditions that make the result possible at all.

Agreement need not require disclosure of a person's entire history. A resident can want recognition for their family without giving the group a detailed account of the past; the cafe owner can openly name an interest in attendance. What matters is revealing whatever affects joint decisions, obligations and limits on using materials. Joining one project gives others no right to judge a person's whole life. This limited scope does not impoverish common work. It lets cooperation have a clear subject instead of making every practical choice a test of profound personal dedication to someone else's values.

II. Different motives need intelligible expectations

In Nicomachean Ethics, VIII.3, Aristotle distinguishes grounds of friendship and notes that utility changes. His moral hierarchy does not make every limited collaboration an imperfect friendship needing urgent repair. Our narrower question is what supports this particular connection and what happens when that ground changes. The temporary room can remain worthwhile while participants receive benefits they accept and contribute to an agreed result. They need not promise lifelong intimacy to make several weekends together honestly. Outward cordiality must nevertheless not conceal conditions on which participation actually depends.

Suppose the cafe owner expects the invitation to mention his premises. The archivist understands the room as an unconditional contribution and plans no prominent acknowledgement. Both may be friendly, yet the same action represents a different exchange for each. A concrete discussion of expectations clarifies this better than asking who is more selfless. If acknowledgement is a condition, it needs naming before the room is chosen. If it is a hope others have not adopted, it cannot become a debt retrospectively. Distinguishing conditions from hopes preserves a chance to agree, find another room or decline before refusal damages an event already prepared.

Changed benefits also call for distinctions. The cafe has attracted few new visitors after the first day, but agreed obligations to the listening room remain. Disappointment does not automatically dissolve them. Equally, the owner cannot be required to continue indefinitely because he once showed goodwill. Participants need to examine the promised scope, what can still be done and available revisions. A connection can end without exposing earlier participation as false. Responsibility concerns an intelligible promise and the consequences of

changing it, rather than a demand always to derive the same inward meaning from a shared undertaking.

III. A benefit does not justify every means of obtaining it

Once different interests are recognised, methods become the next question. Wide publicity benefits the cafe, but creates no right to use any recorded voice in advertising. Residents may want attention to local history while declining to turn a family recording into a dramatic short video. The archivist can preserve material, but a desire for completeness does not automatically permit access to private passages. This article establishes no legal requirements for a particular country. Its editorial distinction is between a participant's interest and grounds for disposing of another's material. Actual conditions and applicable restrictions need establishing before use.

Common benefit becomes dangerously vague when it excuses costs borne mainly by someone else. A dramatic recording attracts visitors, but its speaker requested limited listening only. New permission can be discussed; a worthy undertaking does not mean permission already exists. The group has other options: choose a less striking excerpt, describe the general subject or publicise the event without a recorded voice. These alternatives may be less attractive. Losing an advantage does not prove that an earlier boundary was unreasonable and should disappear for a result valued by everyone else.

Limits need to be accessible to those doing the work. If conditions exist only in the archivist's memory, the invitation's designer may not know that a recording is allowed only inside the room. Intelligible information should accompany the material: what is available, for which use, which clarification is needed and who can confirm the grounds. This proposal concerns a particular arrangement, rather than a universal amount of documentation. A short note beside a file may suffice, or another agreed procedure may be necessary. The point is to avoid making the next participant guess a boundary, then treating their mistake as evidence of deficient moral sensitivity.

IV. Friendliness leaves room for disagreement

In Analects, XIII.23–25, Legge's translation contrasts affability with ingratiation and connects moral assessment with what is right. This is no ready-made description of a contemporary team. A limited connection invites a question: can friendly conversation still accommodate a substantive objection? A resident who says that music makes recorded speech unintelligible need not first prove devotion to the project. The observation can be examined by listening in the room. Respect means giving it a subject for discussion, rather than automatically agreeing with the most confident organiser or always preserving pleasant appearances.

A disagreement can be separated from total refusal. The archivist may dislike entertainment but accept a separate programme after listening finishes. The owner need not share the archivist’s preference for quiet to recognise a condition recordings require. People can change an event’s arrangement without promising to change their personal tastes. If the limited option fails, that too needs recognising. Competing activities may occupy the same room and time so that they cannot coexist. A priority or separate project is then needed, rather than another demand that everyone become more open and consequently cease noticing incompatibility.

Agreement obtained through pressure on relationships remains a questionable ground. “After everything I have done for you, you could stop arguing” changes the subject from acoustics to personal debt. Earlier help matters without making every new choice its giver’s right. A contribution can be acknowledged while asking whether a proposed method is suitable. Someone can also recognise their own sharp tone and restate the objection more precisely. Correcting tone does not require surrendering substance. That possibility preserves cooperation between acting people, rather than an exchange of silence for the kindness of a stronger or busier participant.

V. A decision needs an identified right to choose

Discussion does not automatically establish who chooses the final version. Participants may broadly agree on the aim while disputing a recording. If everyone considers themselves the final authority, materials remain undecided. If the person with the computer password quietly decides, technical ability replaces the right to choose. The temporary room needs distinctions between decisions belonging to speakers within their material, decisions assigned to selection, and those requiring collective reconsideration. Roles concern particular decisions. Being trusted with part of the work gives no permission to judge everything.

For example, the archivist checks a recording’s provenance and declines an unsupported caption. Organisers decide how much listening time visitors need. The owner identifies available opening hours. These facts connect without replacing one another. Selection can be entrusted to the archivist within an agreed theme, while changing the theme remains a group decision. This boundary lets the person act and preserves the shared purpose. If everyone discusses every detail again, the assignment loses substance; if “selection” silently transfers authority to change any condition, others cannot understand what they joined. Both limits deserve naming before disputed exceptions arise.

The arrangement must account for someone’s absence. Suppose a speaker is unavailable while the group wants broader use of an excerpt. A publicity deadline creates no new consent. Material with established conditions can be chosen, leaving the question for later. Internal decisions may have an agreed replacement for an absent responsible person, but that procedure cannot be invented when convenient. No answer also differs from an objection:

silence can reflect unavailability rather than approval. This article prescribes no single procedure for every group. It preserves the need to connect a choice with intelligible grounds when circumstances make a quick unilateral choice especially tempting.

VI. Unequal possibilities change an apparently equal request

“Everyone will bring one recording” looks equal until conditions are examined. One resident has a family archive and equipment; another must speak with an older relative, find a suitable time and organise recording. Equal file counts mean neither equal difficulty nor identical claims on the result. Difficulty alone also cannot prescribe a fair share. Participants need to understand required work, what someone can actually offer and the scope they agreed to carry out. Possibilities do not determine human worth, but affect participation arrangements and the honesty of expected dates.

Help can make participation possible, yet its terms also concern the common undertaking. The archivist may offer equipment and sound processing while the resident retains a choice about recording and handing over materials. Assistance does not turn the resident into a supplier wholly subordinate to someone else’s plan. Conversely, its recipient cannot promise the helper’s additional time without agreement. If a recording needs more processing, selection, distribution or dates need reconsideration. Discussing possibilities distinguishes declining participation from being unable to perform an earlier scope. Neither distinction requires public disclosure of personal circumstances beyond what a concrete decision needs.

Inequality is particularly visible in the ability to decline. Cancelling a weekend may inconvenience the cafe owner while costing a resident the only day available for telling a story. Consequences deserve examination without declaring one interest more important than all others in advance. Sometimes part of the event can remain, listening can move, or material can be transferred differently. Sometimes no alternatives exist. An honest decision identifies what is lost and who is affected, rather than promising everyone will be fine. The word “equality” alone makes no collaboration fair; fairness requires attention to conditions through which the same decision reaches different people differently.

VII. Contribution is not only its most visible part

A visitor sees a sign and hears a voice without necessarily noticing hours of caption checking or conversations about handing over material. Visibility matters to recognition but is no complete map of work. The group can identify participation forms beforehand: premises, selection, agreement, sound preparation, visitor explanation and preserving materials after closure. This list supplies no arithmetic price for each action. It makes a simple discussion error less likely: crediting the whole result to whoever stood at the entrance or first announced the idea. Recording contributions does not itself settle disputes about their significance either.

Recognition should concern particular contributions instead of one general thanks compensating for every unagreed expectation. A resident may want the speaker named beside an excerpt; the archivist may want to avoid implying factual verification he did not perform. The owner can request acknowledgement of the venue. These forms need not compete for one line, but each must be accurate. A pleasing description must not assign work someone did not do simply to preserve peace. A participant must also not disappear because their motive was more practical than the initiator’s. Different interests do not cancel an actual contribution.

Changed work may require updated recognition. An organiser withdrew from a task someone else completed, making the original list inaccurate. Reconsidering it before release can preserve earlier help without erasing that help because of a final disagreement. Acknowledgement does not purchase permission to keep disposing of material, however. Naming someone cannot replace necessary agreement to a new use. These questions may sit together but ask different things: who participated, what they did, and on what grounds material is used now. Confusing them supplies a convenient but false way to settle a difficult boundary through symbolic thanks.

VIII. Changed conditions reopen the question of agreement

The room was initially temporary, but after the first weekend someone proposes leaving the recordings in the cafe for a month. This may help while changing participation’s scope. The owner would need space, the archivist an arrangement for maintenance, and speakers a decision about longer access. Agreement to four days cannot count as universal permission to continue. Preserving what was made differs from extending its use. The group may discuss a new arrangement, and each participant may reconsider their conditions. Declining expansion does not prove insufficient earlier belief in the undertaking or obstruction of its supposedly natural growth.

In Nicomachean Ethics, VIII.13, complaints are connected with differing understandings of the relationship in which help was given. That historical argument settles no contemporary dispute about premises or recordings. Its limited reminder is to establish the ground of an exchange.

An owner who accepted a short event does not acquire an obligation to provide a month through earlier generosity. An archivist who prepared temporary listening materials should not silently be expected to maintain them permanently. A change can need fresh agreement even when everyone supports the general purpose of continuing.

Reconsideration should precede binding promises to outsiders. Announcing a month-long programme before discussion creates pressure: declining is now embarrassing because visitors expect it. This is not equivalent to actual agreement. A premature promise needs its limits acknowledged and its message corrected. A smaller scope or different venue may be possible. That requires work while preserving the distinction between a proposal and a decision. An undertaking has no right to grow by silently enlarging other people’s obligations. An organiser’s responsibility includes correcting their own announcement rather than transferring the cost of haste to people who have not yet chosen to participate.

IX. Leaving can preserve what was shared

Cooperation need not continue indefinitely. After the room closes, the archivist moves to another undertaking, the owner returns the premises to ordinary visitors, and residents choose which recordings to pass on. Ending a shared form does not make its earlier result unreal. Participants can identify what remains available, who receives materials and which promises still need closing. Where grounds for further use are absent, retaining a copy does not itself settle access. A list of recordings and future contact conditions can remain without turning a finished event into permanent uncertainty for which the whole group is supposedly responsible.

Leaving before completion is harder. A participant may no longer have time or accept the chosen method. Ending future participation differs from the consequences of an existing promise. Where possible, they explain what is done, what remains and what information a successor needs. The group examines replacement, reduction or cancellation. This establishes no equal obligation under every circumstance: actual availability and conditions matter. Yet the right to change a decision does not make expectations already passed to others nonexistent. Departure can be made intelligible without demanding public confession or casting everyone who leaves as a betrayer of shared meaning.

Departure must not justify appropriating a contribution or retrospectively rewriting motives. An owner who declined a month still provided four days. An archivist who opposed further display still prepared recordings. Accurate thanks can coexist with current disagreement. If someone sought an impermissible advantage, the specific action deserves examination without automatically forgetting their entire contribution. Cooperation leaves both a result and information about how it was made. Accurate memory of that process matters whether or not participants undertake another project together or become personally close.

X. A common undertaking is examined through those it affects

Participants can agree among themselves and still overlook listeners or people whose voices are presented. A visitor does not know internal compromises; they need to understand what they hear and where uncertainty remains. A speaker may take no organisational role yet be affected by excerpt selection. The group’s satisfaction therefore cannot be the result’s only measure. Presented claims, access conditions and use boundaries need examination. This editorial proposal is no complete ethical model or legal assessment. It preserves a concrete question: whose overlooked situation made our convenient way of agreeing possible?

Organisers may like concise captions while one turns a disputed memory into established fact. Clarification may lengthen the card and reduce its impact. Aesthetic convenience does not change information’s status. Participants can identify a personal account, explain verification’s limits or remove an unsupported formulation. Some visitors will want more explanation; the room need not answer every question. It does need to present its scope honestly. A limited result becomes more available for discussion when its boundaries are visible, rather than when participants jointly sustain an impression of completeness they did not provide.

After the temporary event, residents, the archivist and the owner may assess its meaning differently. Someone obtained materials, another a new conversation, another fewer visits than expected. These assessments need not be forced into one success story. Participants can name what was done, what remains unresolved and conditions making another undertaking worthwhile. Commonality lies in a particular shared action and intelligible grounds, rather than identical experiences of the result. Differences remain visible without destroying cooperation’s possibility. If boundaries are incompatible, recognising that is an honest result of discussion, rather than a personal defeat for those unable to want exactly the same thing.

What this means in practice

Write one result participants are prepared to present to others. Separately identify expected benefits, actual participation conditions and hopes others have not yet adopted. In the hypothetical room, this means four days of listening, intelligible captions and agreed access, rather than an indefinite promise to preserve all neighbourhood memory forever. Examine the description through one disputed choice: loud entertainment, an advertising excerpt or an extended duration. If it does not reveal what changes, refine it. A note serves discussion’s subject; it guarantees no agreement and cannot turn insufficient discussion time into agreement by default.

Identify who may choose within each part of the work and which changes require another discussion. Make restrictions accessible to those using materials. Separately consider people outside the organising group: what they will receive, which conditions they accepted and

where the team might mistakenly speak for them. Name specific contributions, including less visible ones, and check final acknowledgements for accuracy. When discussion concerns another subject, general thanks or appeals for a pleasant atmosphere cannot replace it. Friendliness permits clearer speech without removing the need to answer an uncomfortable substantive question.

Before continuation, expansion or departure, return to the limits of earlier agreement. Preserve completed work and information needed for another choice without appropriating others' obligations alongside useful results. Incompatible conditions may call for reducing scope, separating undertakings or declining a joint option. These choices require no unified judgement of everyone's motives. This article offers a limited way to make cooperation intelligible: a shared subject, differing expectations, permissible methods and room for reconsideration. It promises no freedom from conflict. Its value is giving conflict a precise subject and freeing agreement from a silent demand to want, feel and give identically.

Key quotation

> *Now the useful is not permanent but is always changing.*

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, VIII.3, a complete sentence in W. D. Ross's translation, Internet Classics Archive. Its original context concerns friendship grounded in utility, rather than the inevitable collapse of every contemporary project.

Connections between traditions

Question	Historical bearing	Editorial connection	Boundary
Different grounds of association	Aristotle, VIII.3	Participants may benefit differently	Cooperation is not complete friendship
A limited shared subject	Aristotle, VIII.9	A common undertaking has a particular scope	Ancient political hierarchy is not adopted wholesale
Expected return	Aristotle, VIII.13	A condition differs from an unadopted hope	This is no contemporary legal rule
Friendliness and objection	Confucius, XIII.23	Affability need not mean ingratiation	A moral ideal is not a negotiation technique
Relation to what is right	Confucius, XIII.24–25	Group approval settles fewer than all questions	Team success is not guaranteed

The map connects Aristotelian relational ethics and a Confucian moral ideal with a contemporary editorial question. It preserves their differences and asserts no unified doctrine of cooperation.

Primary sources

1. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, Book VIII. Internet Classics Archive, W. D. Ross translation. Continuous VIII.3, VIII.9 and VIII.13 were read: grounds of friendship, association's scope and differing expectations surrounding assistance. The electronic text's exact print source is independently unverified. This is philosophical comparison, without empirical negotiation evidence or contemporary legal conclusions.

2. Confucius. The Analects, XIII.23–25. Project Gutenberg 3330, the English translation portion of James Legge's The Chinese Classics. Complete selected chapters and the digitiser's note were read. XIII.23 follows the actual affable/not adulatory wording, without substituting another translation about harmony and uniformity. The edition catalogue reports release on 1 July 2002, update on 8 January 2021 and public domain status in the USA; non-US rights and the precise print original are independently unverified.

Tags

common undertaking, cooperation, different interests, shared result, expectations, agreement, condition, hope, utility, participation limits, friendliness, disagreement, decision, authority, responsibility, contribution, recognition, equality, possibilities, reconsideration, departure, material provenance, oral history, neighbourhood memory, Aristotle, Aristotelian ethics, Confucius, Analects, consent boundaries, community work

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.