

UNITED WISDOM

Ambition: What Do I Want to Increase in My Life?

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A48 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Ambition: What Do I Want to Increase in My Life?

Epigraph

> *“Rather than love, than money, than fame, give me truth.”*

Henry David Thoreau, Walden, Conclusion, original English.

What this article is about

Ambition is often discussed as quantity: too much or too little. Yet a subject comes before measurement. Someone may want better work, greater income, more capacity to help, influence, audience numbers, or recognition. These desires differ and do not always increase together. This article asks what should actually change and which daily activity supports it. We distinguish a summit's image from the activity, results from capacity, personal willingness from others' participation, and useful visibility from exaggeration. Bounded passages from Aristotle, Epictetus, and Thoreau offer different grounds, not a unified success theory. No strong desire or precise exercise is promised to produce career, financial, or emotional results. Instead, an ethical examination concerns the goal, its cost, and its limits. Reducing scale may preserve the subject; expansion may require new support and consent. Revising ambition meanwhile does not erase particular promises on which other people already rely.

I. “More” Needs a Subject

Wanting more seems clear until choosing between different kinds of increase. More clients may mean more income but less time for each. More recognition can provide access to an audience while requiring an activity the person dislikes. Greater responsibility can expand influence and reduce opportunities to do beloved work personally. Ambition therefore needs a subject as well as strength. What should increase: outcomes, capacity, security, participant numbers, or others' recognition? The question forbids no plurality of desires. It shows that a single word cannot ensure their compatibility, especially when increasing one changes another's conditions and requires participation from people who have not yet agreed.

Consider a hypothetical craftsperson wanting to expand an undertaking. They might mean improving complex work, training assistants, securing income, or becoming the most visible person in the field. Each intention requires different actions. New advertising may help visibility but cannot replace training. A large order may increase revenue while making promised attentiveness impossible. If the goal is merely “growth,” the conflict may emerge only after

commitment. Name the result to increase and the capacity needed to support it. The actual path and cost then become discussable, rather than only expansion's pleasant feeling. This scene proves no management decision effective and recommends no particular business.

Ambition need not appear on a public ladder. Someone may want to understand a subject more precisely, speak another language more freely, care better for relatives, or make useful work accessible. These desires also increase possibilities. They should not be called less serious because they resist ranking. Yet a quiet intention is not ethically good merely through lacking spectators. It can remain undefined or require others' effort without consent. The same examination applies: can one name a change in the activity, conditions for carrying it out, and a limit on acceptable cost? Scale offers neither justification nor accusation here; the subject of expansion is examined.

II. Seeking Recognition Has No Single Ethical Meaning

In Nicomachean Ethics IV.4, Aristotle specifically considers seeking honor. Ambition and lack of ambition can receive both praise and blame; amount, source, and manner matter. This is no complete theory of contemporary life goals or formula for an average quantity of success. The relevant point is that naming a desire does not settle its ethical value. Recognition can enable an undertaking or become an end that empties the undertaking of content. Historical hierarchy in neighboring chapters should not determine people's worth. Asking how to strive appropriately remains a question about action, not one social group's right to greater human significance.

Wanting work to be noticed can be specific. A text needs readers' attention; a professional needs a client's trust to act. Rejecting all visibility does not necessarily express freedom from vanity; it may obstruct the task. Yet visibility should connect with what it enables. When that connection disappears, increasing effort may confirm status without developing the subject. Ask which action recognition would make possible and whether it requires this scale of attention. The answer gives no universal rule for promotion. It helps distinguish access to work from an endless requirement that work prove its author's importance.

Recognition depends on other people and their grounds. I can make work clearer, present results, and answer questions, but cannot honestly promise myself admiration as a completed action. This dependence makes no desire meaningless. It requires distinguishing my participation from an audience's response. If every insufficient reaction counts as a violation, ambition makes others debtors to my effort. One may want a prize, position, or invitation without declaring it owed through the inward force of intention. Real unfair rules and obstacles should not meanwhile be blamed on the person's attitude. Examine external conditions separately; inward precision cannot replace changing a procedure where that is needed.

III. The Summit’s Image Differs from Daily Activity

Enchiridion 29 contrasts wanting an Olympic victory with preparation, rules, difficulty, and possible defeat. The contemporary question is whether someone accepts the activity or only its attractive result. Historical bodily discipline, contest hazards, harsh comparisons, and an exclusive philosopher-versus-others division become no reader instructions. The passage proves neither guaranteed success through persistence nor that changing paths is always shameful. It supplies the need to consider what precedes and follows. Before promising a large result, see an ordinary working day, not only an award. Ethical examination of cost authorizes neither danger as proof of serious intention nor disregard of changed circumstances.

Writing a book involves selecting a subject, checking claims, revising unsuccessful pages, and possibly receiving less attention than hoped. Wanting the title of author differs from willingness to do that work. Initial incomplete knowledge is nevertheless ordinary: every stage cannot be experienced beforehand. Investigate the accessible material part without calling that knowledge a full guarantee. Conversation with someone experienced, reading about the process, or a safe limited task can clarify the subject where suitable. This is no compulsory risky trial or promise of precise prediction. Learn enough for the decision to concern an activity, rather than exclusively its attractive name on a future business card.

An ordinary day should not humiliate a desire. One may love the result without liking every difficulty. What matters is willingness to accept the necessary work and the existence of real conditions for it. Time, support, access, and bodily limits cannot be replaced by instructions to want harder. If the cost is presently unavailable, reducing scale may preserve the intention's content. A single text, limited learning, or one intelligible stage can replace promising an entire new lifestyle. This proves no lesser personal worth and guarantees no future growth. A proportionate step clarifies what increases before obligations to others and one's success image exceed available capacity.

IV. Greater Results Require Supporting Capacity

Result quantity does not always show changed capacity. Someone may complete more tasks through help, available resources, or temporarily greater strain. This can be useful without meaning the previous working method sustainably supports the new scale. Ambition needs to ask what supports continuation, correction, and responsibility for accepted work. If growth rests on others' hidden effort, name their participation and consent. If it rests on sacrificing necessary recovery, see that cost rather than proof of merit. The article sets no medical or organizational workload norm. It distinguishes visible results from conditions without which those results remain a one-time event or an unspoken demand on others.

A hypothetical leader wants more projects because each seems useful. A useful aim creates no infinite team time. Before expansion, decide who will work, what will stop, and which promises remain performable. These questions are not minor obstacles to noble intention; they constitute its practical content. Influence without capacity to listen and examine can increase consequences without improving decisions. Connect scale with correction: can an error be noticed, who can object, and what will stop when harm is discovered? These are ethical responsibility questions, not research assurance that a proposed arrangement makes every project successful.

Capacity sometimes grows more slowly than visibility. Others already see someone as capable of more, tempting them to sustain the image with new promises. Refusal then feels like retreat. Acknowledging a present limit may nevertheless be necessary for growth, preserving the ability to fulfill what was accepted. Further learning, redistribution, or a changed arrangement need separate discussion; confidence alone cannot solve the problem. A limit need not be permanent. Name conditions for revisiting it later. Honesty means grounding today's commitment in today's support, while future capacity remains a working aim rather than an already appropriated result without sufficient grounds.

V. Scale Cannot Replace Truth About the Work

Selected paragraphs in Walden's Conclusion contrast conspicuousness and luxurious hospitality with foundations, sincerity, and truth. This is literary reflection on the author's life, not a productivity measurement. His emphatic preference becomes no demand to reject love, income, or material assistance. The contemporary question is whether I enlarge a success symbol while leaving its content unchecked. Poverty is not a useful substitute for resources, and historical generalizations about peoples or civilization are not adopted as fact. The bounded distinction concerns external presentation and what can be trusted in work and relationships. Truth about current results may be less impressive, but it is needed for the next honest decision.

Presenting work attractively need not hide its state. An achievement can be communicated clearly while limits are named: what was checked, what remains assumed, and what is unfinished. Ambition becomes questionable when expanding trust requires removing a substantial qualification. People then participate on the basis of an image the work cannot yet support. This concerns personal promises as well as promotion: I may claim future ability as present to gain an opportunity. Truthfulness requires no account of every failure. It requires not hiding what materially affects another's decision. Useful visibility makes the subject accessible instead of replacing grounds with attractive confidence requiring further exaggeration.

Someone may fear that accuracy reduces opportunity. Sometimes it does change another's decision: an honest offer becomes less attractive. Accuracy is not thereby meaningless. An opportunity gained through substantial misunderstanding can create unperformable obligations and costs for those who trusted. Instead of silence or exaggeration, resize the offer: name a limited result available now and conditions for expansion. This guarantees no reward for honesty. It avoids making others' mistaken understanding a necessary part of one's ambition. Ask whether the undertaking can continue if its starting state becomes clear to everyone for whose consent that state materially matters.

VI. Who Bears the Cost of My Increase?

An intention can appear personal while its cost is shared. More work for me may mean less participation in care that someone must replace. More public influence may require others' stories, attention, or constant availability. More income may depend on terms changing a shared undertaking. Add “who else participates?” to “am I willing?” My willingness to face difficulty cannot prescribe willingness for others. Their consent concerns a separate subject and may be absent. A useful goal does not make refusal an ethical defect. Resize the undertaking or find another path if it relies on unaccepted participation and cannot be carried out through available means.

A hypothetical person takes extra work for future family stability. This can be a serious ground without making household responsibilities already agreed. Discuss duration, amount, and present changes. Another person may support the aim but lack capacity to accept its entire proposed cost. The dispute then concerns organizing the present, not love for a shared future. A worthy goal's label sometimes hides that distinction. Participants may choose a limited period, smaller amount, or different sequence; none promises ideal results. Ethical clarity avoids casting a relative as an obstacle merely because their real capacity differs from my intention's scale and I failed to ask beforehand.

Cost is not only time or money. Someone may be asked to attach a reputation to work, disclose personal experience, or bear uncertainty. These are not minor incidental expenses if material to that participant. Name them accessibly without demanding public disclosure of every reason for refusal. If ambition claims to serve people, do not make people material for that service. They may reject the offered form of help. This disproves no possible benefit, but limits how the project proceeds. Service's scale is considered alongside treatment of recipients, not solely numbers reached. The article supplies no universal metric; it retains an answer from those for whose sake expansion is called desirable.

VII. Comparison Can Quietly Change the Aim

Another person's result can reveal a possibility I did not know. Comparison need not be hostility or error. It can teach a working method and disclose a personal limit. Yet another's ranking does not say which task my life needs. If the reference changes with every success elsewhere, expansion loses its own subject: I must merely restore a position relative to someone. Even an achievement can then quickly seem insufficient. This is no diagnosis or source-proven psychological law. It is a possible structure to examine: what changed in my task upon seeing their result? If only relative position changed, discuss recognition separately instead of automatically expanding the earlier plan.

Distinguish learning from someone from appropriating their route. A useful method may be available at smaller scale while the whole path requires conditions I lack or do not accept. A visible summit conceals support, costs, and history. Imitation should return to action: what can I learn, what will I examine, and which differences in circumstances remain? The answer need not abandon the goal. It may clarify sequence and remove false comparison. Respecting another's success does not require making it my measure. This promises no disappearance of envy or anxiety; it prevents those feelings from solely selecting the next commitment, particularly where its cost concerns others.

Comparison can expose actual unfair access: similar work receives different opportunities through rules or prejudice. Someone should not simply be told to stop comparing and accept this as spiritual freedom. Fair access retains separate grounds and may require collective action. Yet changing rules also needs an intelligible aim: what should become available, to whom, and on what grounds? Wanting another's place and wanting a fairer procedure do not always coincide. Distinguishing them clarifies rather than weakens justice. The article specifies no legal remedy. It suggests not merging personal expansion and a general principle so that every individual refusal automatically proves unfairness.

VIII. A Limit Distinguishes Growth from Endless Proof

A goal needs a sign of sufficient completion for the present stage. Otherwise “more” can mean any continuation and stopping any failure. Better language ability can be connected with an accessible action: understanding specified material or joining a particular conversation. Expanding help can name a task and capacity to sustain it. This is no final ceiling on life. A limit concerns the present subject and can change with a new task. It distinguishes a completed stage from endless proof of personal importance. No universal numerical norm is proposed. Sufficiency needs content, conditions, and consent where required, rather than a feeling that others finally consider me large enough.

Name unacceptable costs too. No desirable increase warrants every means. One can decide not to promise unchecked results, use stories without consent, shift hidden burdens, or continue after finding substantial harm without revision. This is no checklist proving flawlessness. A specific limit helps notice when means alter a goal's ethical content. Participants need access to it; an attractive private formulation is insufficient. Acknowledging a crossed limit need not destroy the whole intention. Continuing nevertheless requires correction and a new decision, not justification that a future benefit's scale automatically compensates for today's unaccepted cost to another person.

A limit also identifies what growth should preserve. Someone may want more income without losing attention to the subject, or a larger audience without abandoning responsibility for accuracy. The named quality must then participate in scale decisions. If compatibility fails, acknowledge the choice rather than claim expansion improves everything together. Temporarily smaller reach can retain quality; another arrangement can distribute work; new support can enable later expansion. None is universal. Sacrificing a substantial quality should remain visible as a choice, rather than disappear from the success account because a numerical result is easier to display.

IX. Changing Ambition Does Not Erase Earlier Responsibility

After beginning, someone may discover a different desire. They sought recognition but find interest in the activity, or loved its image but reject the cost. This does not necessarily expose insincerity. New knowledge can change intention. Yet changing a personal goal does not cancel promises already affecting others' decisions. Ask separately what was accepted, what changed, and how completion or revision should be discussed. The article demands no dangerous or unacceptable continuation for loyalty to an image. It distinguishes ending one's path from responsibility for accessible notice, handover, or other specific actions whose grounds and possibility must be examined in the situation.

Revision can sharpen intention: quality rather than task numbers, learning rather than status, stability rather than constant visibility. But a new label does not carry out that change. Show which action changes, what will no longer be promised, and which participants need to know. Otherwise “depth matters to me now” can conveniently explain nonperformance of a particular agreement. The new aim deserves its own place and the earlier commitment its own honest memory. Neither accusations of betrayal nor automatic release need merge them. A new path can coexist with a limited, accessible, permissible transition; another necessary boundary can also emerge without being presented as an ending everyone already accepted.

Keep an account of reasons, not only the word “quit.” The reason may be new knowledge, changed conditions, unacceptable cost, or a mismatch between wanting and doing. This account need not become public confession. It can prevent repeating ambiguity in the next

choice and clarify relevant changes for participants. Explanation guarantees no approval and need not obtain it at every cost. Others may remain unconvinced. Responsibility concerns accessible clarity and proportionate action, not control over everyone's final feelings. Ambition can change without one completed stage making someone a final winner or a final failure.

X. A Named Increase Becomes a Subject of Choice

Instead of demanding more ambition or eliminating it entirely, formulate a desire specifically. I want to increase this capacity to do this work; I need these conditions and will not use these means. This removes no uncertainty and promises no success. It makes intention examinable: does the path fit the subject, is support available, and whose participation remains unaccepted? Missing answers may call for investigating a material question before strengthening a promise. Accessible answers may permit a proportionate beginning without calling an initial step an achieved result. Desire's strength remains part of choice without replacing knowledge, conditions, ethical grounds, or others' freedom to answer.

Ask what remains meaningful if recognition arrives later or in smaller amount. The answer need not prove total selflessness. Income and visibility can be necessary conditions, and lack of access may genuinely stop work. But understand which part of the goal depends on the activity's results and which on social response. Success and disappointment can then be discussed more honestly. No one must welcome inadequate pay or an unfair refusal. They can name these as separate conditions without making every setback evidence of worthlessness. This is a philosophical distinction, not promised emotional relief guaranteed by reading or completing an exercise.

Ambition becomes clearer when “increase” stops meaning “prove everything about myself.” A person retains tasks, relations, and forms of participation no single ladder measures. Large work can coexist with precision in a small promise; smaller scale need not condemn another's larger aim. See what grows and what becomes harder to preserve. Increase has no uniquely correct size outside its subject and circumstances. It requires naming result, capacity, cost, and boundary. Wanting more then has a place in life without making the whole life material for one proof. The next step follows available grounds while leaving room to learn, correct, and honestly revise direction.

What this means in practice

Write one intention to increase something in life. Name its subject without “success”: capacity, a specific result, resources, reach, or recognition. Separate multiple subjects and note where increasing one may change another.

Describe an ordinary day in the activity leading toward the goal. What must be done, examined, and corrected? Name accessible material knowledge and what remains unknown. Test seriousness neither through danger nor by rejecting necessary assistance.

Distinguish visible results from support: time, learning, resources, collaboration. Who else bears costs? Name participation requiring separate consent. Your willingness to face difficulty cannot prescribe it for others.

Define sufficient completion for the current stage, a quality to preserve, and an unacceptable means. This is no final ceiling on life. A new task can justify revisiting a limit; earlier accepted promises need separate discussion.

Choose one next step: clarify the subject, obtain missing knowledge, agree participation, reduce scale, or begin an accessible part. Record what would let you revisit the decision. The exercise guarantees neither success nor relief; it makes choice specific while preserving honest correction.

Key quotation

> *“In every affair consider what precedes and follows, and then undertake it.”*

Epictetus, The Enchiridion, 29, Elizabeth Carter translation.

Connections between traditions

Aristotle considers honor's amount, source, and manner; “ambition” supplies no single verdict. Epictetus examines the path and consequences; historical regimen and hazards become no instructions. Thoreau contrasts external presentation with sincerity and truth; poverty replaces no needed resource. The article's bridge names what increases, support, participants' costs, and limits on means. A shared question creates no unified success theory, guaranteed result, or universal goal size.

Primary sources

1. Epictetus, The Enchiridion, complete 29, displayed lines 76–83; quote at 76. Elizabeth Carter explicitly named at 21, checked earlier in this batch. Print impression unspecified, no Greek collation. Hazards, historical slavery, and an exclusive philosopher/others division become no instructions.

2. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, complete IV.4, lines 108–113. W. D. Ross named at 21; print impression unspecified. No Greek collation. Honor is the subject, not all contemporary ambition; line 110 typos not quoted. Neighboring IV.3 hierarchy not adopted.

3. Henry David Thoreau, Walden, Conclusion, continuous paragraphs 1813–1822; quote is 1820's first sentence. PG 205, original English, exact print impression unidentified. Adjacent poverty claims and historical generalizations become no contemporary norm.

Contemporary distinctions and hypothetical scenes are original argument. No worldwide clearance asserted for historical texts or website layouts; raw ingestion and vectorization not authorized. No financial, medical, or legal advice, diagnosis, or research guarantee of practice success.

Tags

ambition, growth, goal, success, capacity, result, recognition, honor, influence, scale, quality, income, learning, work, participation, consent, cost, limit, responsibility, promise, comparison, justice, visibility, truth, revision, Aristotle, Epictetus, Thoreau, philosophy, ethics

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.