

UNITED WISDOM

Personal Consumption and Collective Environmental Responsibility

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-20-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Personal Consumption and Collective Environmental Responsibility

Epigraph

> *For the body is not one member, but many.*

First Corinthians 12:14, King James Version. A religious image of a body with different members, rather than a scientific account of environmental relationships.

What this article is about

Alina brings her own cup to a meeting. She wants to use disposable tableware less often, but the conversation quickly becomes an argument about whose contribution matters. One colleague suggests that everyone begin with themselves. Another objects: while organisers buy supplies by the box, a personal cup solves nothing. A third asks why care for a shared concern again requires unnoticed work from people who already clean the room. All three touch on real aspects of the question, yet each answer becomes too simple when it treats the others as unnecessary.

This hypothetical scene cannot establish the environmental impact of particular tableware. It reveals something else: personal choices take place within shared conditions, and those conditions are maintained by people with different powers. A customer, organiser, supplier and cleaner do not control the same part of the process. Requiring identical actions from them would be inaccurate.

How can everyday consumption connect with collective responsibility without becoming a contest in virtue or hiding personal choices behind the problem's scale? A starting point is to describe an available action, its limits and the change in arrangements it needs. Agreement, resources and work can then be discussed.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. A Personal Cup and a Shared Order Answer Different Questions

Alina may decide what to use herself, provided her choice is compatible with the meeting's conditions. She can notice a habit, decline an unnecessary purchase or use something she already owns. Yet this does not establish that the organiser has changed an order or that service staff have suitable working arrangements. One action concerns personal participation; the other concerns the organisation of a shared process. They should be distinguished before their moral worth is compared or they are treated as interchangeable.

The colleague discussing purchasing identifies an important limit. If the meeting is organised in the same way regardless of how many people bring cups, an individual refusal may not change the order. Yet this limit does not make the personal choice meaningless in every respect. Alina may not wish to sustain the habit through her participation, may prepare a question for the organiser or may demonstrate an available alternative. Each meaning needs a separate explanation. Intention cannot be turned into a claim about an actual outcome without checking.

The reverse mistake occurs when a visible personal gesture is treated as a sufficient collective policy. Cups look persuasive in a photograph, while purchasing, water, storage and work after the meeting may remain outside the frame. We need not assume in advance that every option is better or worse. We need to identify what the photograph does not show. Questions about the process require information, and questions about moral intention cannot replace it. Honest care can sustain this distinction.

The conversation might therefore begin modestly: I am changing this part of my participation; we still need to establish this about the shared arrangements. Such wording does not diminish the action's dignity. It frees it from having to solve everything symbolically at once. It also prevents a manager from using personal initiative as proof that the shared question has been settled. The two levels connect through a continuation that can be checked: who can change the next link, what proposal have they received and when will their answer become clear?

II. The Problem's Scale Does Not Erase the Nearest Choice

Thinking about the larger scale can be sobering. An individual certainly does not control all production, transport and waste handling. They cannot be required to understand every chain and personally correct every deficiency within it. Yet between everything and nothing lies an area of real participation. When we refuse to notice it, discussion of the system changes from an explanation of limits into permission to disregard even what is within our hands. These are two different uses of the same argument.

Alina might ask whether she needs a new item to join the initiative when she already has something suitable at home. This question concerns her decision, independently of the organiser's willingness to change purchasing. She need not proclaim her refusal a significant environmental achievement. It is enough to say honestly that she does not wish to create an unnecessary need for the sake of portraying responsible consumption. Her personal choice is grounded in an actual purpose, rather than an assumption that one customer can govern an entire market.

However, even the nearest choice has limits. Someone may lack storage space, time for additional preparation or the ability to use the suggested arrangement. A participant for whom shared tableware remains the only available option is not therefore indifferent. The moral question begins with access, rather than the outward similarity of actions. Sometimes reasonable participation means supporting a collective change that will allow a different choice later. Sometimes it means reporting an obstacle that organisers have not yet noticed.

Responsibility is usefully expressed here through verbs with a definite object: choose, ask, propose, agree and check. Saying that a person should care for the planet establishes a broad orientation, but does not yet assign specific work. If it leaves only an endless sense of obligation, action loses its boundaries. If it becomes these manageable steps, it becomes possible to distinguish what has been done, what awaits agreement and what is currently unavailable. This distinction allows participation to continue without pretending to possess unlimited power.

III. Collective Responsibility Needs Identifiable People

The word we can help, or it can conceal the absence of a decision. We must change our habits: who will change the order, approve expenses or check that space is available? Until these roles are named, a collective appeal easily returns to the most active person. They bring their cup again, draft an announcement and stay behind after the meeting. Everyone else agrees that care matters, but agreement with a value does not establish acceptance of a particular share of the work. Shared intention differs from shared participation.

In the selected passage from Chapter V of On Liberty, John Stuart Mill considers voluntary associations and involvement in shared affairs as part of developing citizens' capacity to act together. His question concerns political organisation and the limits of government interference. We do not transfer this historical argument wholesale into contemporary environmental policy. It helps us ask a narrower question: do participants gain experience of making a real joint decision, or do they merely hear an appeal that leaves the work to one person?

At the hypothetical meeting, an answer might begin with a brief division of tasks: the organiser investigates purchasing, the person responsible for the room explains its constraints and willing participants discuss their contributions. This is not yet evidence of a successful programme. Yet responsibility becomes identifiable, allowing the next step to be assessed. Someone without authority to alter an order can pass a proposal to an authorised organiser. Someone with that authority should not answer solely by advising them to reconsider their personal habits. Differences in power form part of responsibility itself.

However, naming a role does not authorise assigning it to somebody without their agreement. An invitation to take responsibility needs a clear scope, time commitment and opportunity to decline. A list of names drawn up by an initiator does not create a collective obligation by itself. Proposed distribution must be distinguished from accepted distribution. The first opens a conversation; the second permits reliance on work within agreed limits. If consent is absent, the plan must retain that fact rather than turn silence into a convenient confirmation.

IV. An Environmental Appearance Cannot Replace Information

A label on packaging may prompt a question without necessarily answering it. Judging a particular product requires information about its production, use and what happens when its use ends under actual conditions. We are not comparing materials here or identifying the best option. Moral accuracy means refusing to attribute merit merely because an object looks natural, expensive or consistent with a familiar image of environmental care. An image and an established property are different things.

Alina may discover that the proposed arrangement requires actions for which the room has no suitable facilities. Until this is checked, the question should remain open. There is no need to accuse the supplier in advance or declare the entire initiative fraudulent. Ask what claim is being made, what supports it and which conditions it concerns. If no intelligible answer is available, retain that absence in the decision. A confident manner does not turn the unknown into knowledge, even when the speaker shares our values.

In the United Nations' 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Goal 12 connects consumption with production; its targets also concern companies, purchasing, waste and information. This is an international normative document establishing directions for work. It does not prove the environmental effect of Alina's cup or a proposed local arrangement. Its relevance to our discussion is limited to how the question is structured: care includes several links, rather than only the character of an individual customer. Local implementation still requires its own checks.

It therefore helps to distinguish three entries: intention, a confirmed condition and something unknown. We want to change the shared pattern of consumption; the organiser really can alter

the next purchase; what subsequently happens to used materials has not yet been established. These entries do not yet yield a final assessment of environmental impact. They do prevent intention from being presented as a completed result. Participants can continue without a false guarantee and identify what additional knowledge would change their next choice.

V. Additional Work Belongs in the Conversation

An initiative may promise a shared benefit while leaving a private burden to people whose actions are seldom noticed. Who will bring, wash, dry, put away and monitor the return of items? These questions do not reveal a lack of idealism. They describe the conditions of participation. Treating them as trivial allows moral language to justify using other people's time without payment or agreement. Care for the environment does not require this arrangement of relationships. Attention to the whole process instead makes hidden work visible.

The cleaner in our hypothetical scene may support the purpose while objecting to the proposed division of tasks. Their objection should not become an argument about whether they love nature. They are reporting that the existing plan overlooks the actual burden. Perhaps some work can be reduced, shared or incorporated into paid duties by agreement. Perhaps the proposed arrangement is currently impractical. In either case, the question of means remains independent and cannot be settled by declaring the purpose valuable.

An honest assessment includes time, money, space, access and the need for training. Everything need not be converted into one monetary figure. Significant costs simply must not remain outside the conversation. An organiser relying on volunteers must recognise that voluntary participation may end. A shared process should not depend on one person's continuing willingness to expand their duties. For a recurring meeting, an arrangement that survives their absence is particularly important.

The collective decision becomes more accurate when a proposal about conditions accompanies the desired change: here is the anticipated scope, here are available resources and here is the part I can undertake. The remainder cannot be declared already secured. If no one accepts necessary work, that is a limit of the present plan, rather than grounds for blaming the last person to decline. Sometimes a smaller agreed step is more honest than an impressive collective programme. Its modesty concerns its scale, rather than the quality of its attention to people.

VI. Different Opportunities Require Different Contributions

Equal respect for participants does not mean giving them identical tasks. One person can alter purchasing for an entire season, another only their own choice, and a third can explain an obstacle they know through daily work. Their actions cannot be compared solely by outward visibility. Access to decisions, influence and dependencies previously created all matter. Someone who organised a shared process is responsible for its conditions differently from a person invited to use an already prepared service. This distinction does not evaluate people's dignity.

Requiring everyone to make the same purchase or refusal may exclude precisely those with fewer resources. Moreover, an alternative available to one person is not necessarily available to all their neighbours. Personal experience is therefore helpful as a proposal, rather than conclusive evidence of somebody else's opportunity. The statement I managed needs a continuation: under what conditions, and do those conditions fit another person? Attending to them allows change to be discussed without condescension or demands to disclose an entire private life.

A participant may explain an obstacle to the extent needed for a shared decision. They do not need to submit a detailed account of income, health or family obligations to deserve respect. An organiser can ask which form of participation would be accessible and acknowledge that an answer may be absent. Some constraints can be removed by reorganising the process; others remain personal. In either case, participation should not become a test of moral reliability that people must pass before the group.

Different contributions can connect when their relationship to the task is known. Supporting an accessible shared purchase, declining an unnecessary object and providing information about actual material handling are distinct actions. They do not automatically become equally effective environmentally. Yet each may have an intelligible place in a collective decision. Comparing them requires facts about outcomes; distributing work requires consent. Confusing these questions produces either an attractive equality without a process or a process that forgets the people within it.

VII. Interdependence Does Not Authorise Erasing Difference

In First Corinthians, the image of a body concerns the community and the diversity of its members. The selected verses emphasise that belonging to a whole does not turn everyone into the same organ. This is a Christian religious context, rather than an account of contemporary production. For our article, the image serves only as an invitation to consider how differences can connect: participation in a common undertaking need not require identical positions, experiences or ways of expressing the value of care.

Someone may act from religious conviction, attachment to a place, concern for children or a wish to avoid unnecessary expenses. An agreed undertaking does not always require these reasons to be reduced to one formula. Understanding the shared task and the limits of participation may be enough. Demanding that others first adopt the initiator's entire worldview often closes off cooperation. A conversation can be profound, but practical agreement should not depend on compulsory descriptions of each person's spiritual identity.

Nor does a shared connection make every proposed plan binding. A participant can agree with the purpose and reject a means that transfers an unacceptable burden to them or requires an unsupported assertion. Recognising this distinction protects the quality of the decision. The initiator can hear a substantive objection instead of receiving formal agreement followed by work that never happens. A polite we all support this may conceal more uncertainty than a precise I support this part but cannot undertake the next.

Interdependence gains moral significance through attention to consequences for particular people and conditions. It does not prove that every teaching says the same thing or that personal boundaries obstruct unity. The original question for United Wisdom here is whether we can participate in something shared without appropriating other people's voices. The answer is tested through the manner of conversation, the right to ask for clarification and actual consent. A common undertaking that can withstand difference permits work to continue without enforced resemblance.

VIII. Shared Arrangements Must Allow Questions About Results

Once an initiative gains support, it is easy to defend it as part of our reputation. A question about results then sounds like doubt about people's honesty. Yet intention and execution require different confirmation. If purchasing has not changed, that is a fact about the process, rather than a final verdict on participants. If necessary work exceeds expectations, the plan needs clarification. The possibility of this conversation should be anticipated before the programme becomes a symbol of the group's moral belonging.

A check should match the claim that was made. If the next purchase was meant to change, establish whether the order changed and under which conditions. If a particular burden was supposed to decrease, examine that burden. Completing these steps does not automatically establish an overall environmental benefit: that may require other information and professional assessment. The more precise the initial wording, the less temptation there is to close uncertainty with an attractive final announcement. A modest, verifiable promise supports honest continuation.

Participants should also agree on how to respond to an unfavourable outcome. They may need to replace the proposed means, reduce the scope, redistribute work or stop the trial. Allowing

this does not devalue the original care. It keeps care connected to reality. If every correction is declared a betrayal of the value, the programme begins demanding loyalty to its own form even after significant obstacles emerge. Collective responsibility includes revising the means while retaining attention to the purpose and the people involved.

For the hypothetical meeting, a brief discussion can be scheduled after one agreed period: what actually changed, what work appeared and what remains unknown? This is neither a study of an exercise's efficacy nor a universal scheme for environmental management. It is an original way to remember the result of one's own decision. The record should distinguish observation, explanation and assumption. An error can then inform the next choice, instead of becoming a reason either to conceal it or to declare all participation useless.

IX. A Contest in Virtue Can Obscure the Shared Task

When conversation concentrates on who consumes most correctly, its subject changes. Instead of purchasing, access and the distribution of work, the group evaluates people. The winner is whoever can present the most persuasive personal story. Yet the ability to tell and display does not equal the ability to change a shared process. Someone with a less visible contribution may know a significant obstacle; someone with a striking initiative may overlook it. The common task needs room for both voices.

Shame sometimes produces outward agreement, but such agreement tells us little about whether the work is possible. A participant promises to bring tableware without knowing how to fit this into their circumstances; the organiser reports support that does not actually exist. We are not asserting a universal psychological law here. We are identifying a straightforward limit of a decision: a promise obtained without discussing conditions does not establish that those conditions are secured. Moral pressure can conceal precisely the information needed for genuine agreement.

It is more useful to return to the subject: what change are we discussing, who can make it and which question remains open? A personal story can be an example when it does not become a measure of somebody else's dignity. Criticism of a purchase can concern its claimed properties or the lack of need for it without becoming an evaluation of the whole person. This does not prohibit moral judgement. It requires proportion: the action under discussion has a definite scope, while a human life is not exhausted by a chosen pattern of consumption.

Even declining a purchase should not become a certificate of general innocence. It concerns one decision, rather than every connection a person has with production and nature. Recognising this limit can make participation easier: perfection is not a prerequisite for asking a useful question. It also prevents a good action from becoming permission to disregard subsequent choices. Responsibility continues within available limits, without a promise of

purity, constant self-condemnation or claiming authority to instruct others solely on the basis of one's own choice.

X. A Concrete Continuation Connects the Levels

By the end of the conversation, Alina can retain her personal cup while declining to claim that she has already solved the shared question. The organiser can agree to examine purchasing and acknowledge that the subsequent path of materials remains unknown. The person responsible for the room can state their working conditions without accepting an additional duty before agreement. This outcome is less ceremonial than a collective promise to live environmentally. Yet it establishes intelligible responsibilities and room for honest clarification.

The next step connects a personal decision to shared arrangements: a proposal reaches an identifiable recipient, a response date is set, and available resources and the trial's limits are named. Until agreement exists, it should not appear in a report as completed. If the answer is negative, the reason can be explored and another form of participation considered. If the question requires specialist information, that need should be acknowledged. Moral seriousness means both being willing to act and accurately identifying the status of one's action.

Some questions extend beyond one meeting. Participants can support a wider discussion of rules, approach authorised organisers or join efforts with other groups in ways available to them. This article does not prescribe a political route or replace knowledge of local conditions. Something else matters here: collective work need not remain the indefinite word system. It can have a recipient, a subject and a form of participation, even though none of its participants controls all its consequences.

Personal responsibility and collective organisation connect without cancelling each other. The first need not be inflated into the ability to repair the entire world; the second need not erase the nearest choice. Between them lies the work of agreement: notice a dependency, ask about authority, identify the work, obtain consent and check the promise. Through this work, care becomes more than a private sign and enters relationships. Its quality depends on accurate attention to what people actually do together, rather than their moral perfection.

What this means in practice

Choose one recurring consumption decision in a place where you participate: a meeting, shared kitchen or small event. Do not begin by evaluating every participant. Describe what currently happens and which part you can actually change yourself. Beside it, record a shared condition affecting the result and who has authority to discuss changing it. If the recipient remains unknown, finding them is a separate task, rather than grounds for treating the proposal as accepted.

Formulate one limited proposal. Identify its purpose, anticipated work, necessary resources and a significant unknown. Ask people who would bear a new burden about accessible conditions for participation. Do not list them as responsible before intelligible agreement. Separately retain a personal step that remains possible independently of the collective decision. It may be modest; do not attribute an unsupported environmental effect to it.

Agree when to revisit the specific promise: an altered order, an accepted distribution of work or an authorised person's response. After this period, separate what was done, what remains unagreed and what is unknown. If the means needs revision, explain why through conditions and observations while respecting participants. This exercise is offered as a way to discuss one's decision more attentively. Its efficacy has not been established by research, and technical environmental conclusions require appropriate data.

Key quotation

> *aims which unite instead of isolating them from one another.*

John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, Chapter V, discussion of joint interests and voluntary associations; a short literal fragment. A historical political argument, rather than a ready-made environmental programme.

Connections between traditions

Source or perspective	What it helps us notice	Limit of comparison
Mill, On Liberty, V	Shared affairs require actual experience of cooperation	Political reasoning does not establish contemporary environmental rules
First Corinthians 12:12–27	The image of a whole retains the diversity of its parts	A Christian community is not identical to a production system
UN Agenda, Goal 12	Consumption connects with production, purchasing and information	Normative targets do not prove a local initiative's effect
United Wisdom	Connecting a personal step with an identifiable shared agreement	Original argument and practice, rather than established efficacy

Sources and notes

1. John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, Chapter V: continuous selected passage from the question of governmental help through the third objection to expanding government power, displayed lines 885–898; key fragment at 892. The entire specified passage was read. Project Gutenberg 34901 electronic text: publisher Walter Scott Publishing Co.; W. L. Courtney's introduction is dated 5 July 1901, while the printed basis's publication year was not separately established. Not used as contemporary evidence of environmental outcomes.

2. First Corinthians, King James Version, 12:12–27, continuous passage read; epigraph at 12:14. Its context of the body, Spirit and Christian community remains religious. The Russian quotation is our translation of the named English version, rather than a quotation from the Russian Synodal Bible.

3. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, official United Nations text, Goal 12, targets 12.1–12.c; the whole selected block was read. The structure of normative targets is used, without a claim about their fulfilment or quantitative effects. Other goals and the entire document are not claimed as read.

Reading checked on 10 October 2026. Full source texts are neither imported nor vectorised. Worldwide rights for specific versions have not been established; only brief quotations, links and limited paraphrase are used. The hypothetical scene and practical questions are original. An attempt to open official IPCC material did not yield an accessible full text; it is not used as a read basis for this article.

Tags

personal consumption, collective responsibility, environmental ethics, joint action, shared conditions, purchasing, voluntary participation, consent, accessibility, distribution of work, hidden labour, everyday choice, sustainable consumption, information, uncertainty, limits of influence, authority, shared interests, interdependence, respect, cooperation, moral competition, checking results, civic participation, diversity, organiser responsibility, unnecessary purchases, practical ethics, United Wisdom, environmental care

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.