

UNITED WISDOM

Result criteria instead of controlling every movement

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-23-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Result criteria instead of controlling every movement

Epigraph

But it is one thing to remember, another to know.

— Seneca, Moral letters to Lucilius 33.8; Richard M. Gummere translation

What this article is about

A result can be assigned while every movement remains someone else’s decision. Formally the task is delegated, but a drawing, letter or sequence of actions gradually becomes obedience to minute-by-minute directions. The other extreme is familiar too: “I only need the outcome” means no explanation, help or boundaries on acceptable means. Between these approaches lies work on intelligible criteria: what needs to emerge, what it will be used for, and which conditions must remain intact.

Using hypothetical illustrations for a local history album, we examine results, necessary restrictions and preferences. Checking belongs where the next step depends on a still-reversible decision; it need not accompany every trial. Seneca discusses independent understanding, while the Daoist text offers a particular image of rule. Their foundations cannot become one management technique. The practical proposals are editorial. They guarantee no efficacy and do not remove necessary instructions where particular requirements apply. The aim is genuine method choice alongside responsibility for the accepted shared undertaking.

I. An assigned result can remain someone else’s movement

Consider a hypothetical situation. Oleg is preparing a local history album and asks Vera for several illustrations. They discuss page size, subjects and file delivery. After the first trial, Oleg starts directing each stroke: where to shade, which order to draw in, and when to change pencils. Some remarks concern the result, others his habitual working method, which Vera does not use. The difference is unnamed. Oleg believes he is protecting quality; Vera increasingly doubts which part she genuinely owns and which decisions remain hers.

The presence of comments is not itself the problem. A wrong name or illegible detail needs correction. A direction about stroke order, however, need not explain a defect in the result. If another method produces a usable illustration without violating agreed conditions, copying the assigner’s movement adds a task. Oleg may genuinely want a teaching drawing made by his

method; that should be stated. Obtaining an illustration and reproducing a process can be different results. Mixing them makes someone both an executor of another’s method and the responsible author of final quality.

The first question is what is being requested. Vera might supply a print illustration, collaborate on a drawing, or learn a technique under Oleg’s guidance. Each arrangement is possible by agreement, but offers different decision space. Co-authorship needs coordination, instruction needs explanation, and independent execution needs a clear result with boundaries. Calling all three the same assignment is convenient only until disagreement. Clarifying the arrangement allows discussion without claiming every comment suppresses freedom or every resistance to another’s movements shows unwillingness to work and receive feedback.

II. A criterion connects quality with use

A criterion identifies how participants judge usability. For the album, relevant conditions include legibility at print size, correspondence with the chosen episode, caption space and files usable for subsequent work. Oleg should explain these before the final drawing. “Make it beautiful” leaves much unknown, while a long list of movements may not improve understanding. Identifying use and defects that would obstruct it provides a basis for comments that both parties can discuss and examine.

Not every quality fits a number. An illustration’s mood may be discussed through examples and comparisons. That remains judgement rather than pretending to be exact measurement. Two works can clarify a difference: one is ceremonial, another everyday, while the album concerns ordinary family histories. An example helps identify direction; it should not secretly demand every feature be copied. An evaluative word needs discussion of relevant signs and acceptable variations. Complete certainty is not promised, but the remaining area of interpretation can be named honestly.

A later file recipient can have a significant condition too. The designer may know that a fine line disappears on reduction; Vera and Oleg should hear that beforehand. Specialist input should not become an invented rule that every drawing needs identical line thickness. The condition concerns particular use and can be examined at the appropriate size. This article establishes no printing standard. It explains why criteria should relate to an actual next operation, rather than the assigner’s habit or a general formula nobody can explain in application.

III. A restriction on means differs from preference

Assigning a result does not make every method acceptable. An image cannot be borrowed without the necessary basis, nor an unverified detail presented as historical fact merely because the page looks convincing. Oleg and Vera should identify restrictions: material origins, permissions, hypothetical elements and details requiring accuracy. Checking means here concerns obligations to other people and the album’s substance. It differs from wanting every stroke to follow a familiar method. Method freedom exists within accepted ethical and subject boundaries, rather than replacing them.

A preference can also enter an agreement when it matters to the commissioned result. Oleg wants black-and-white drawings because the whole album follows that choice; it needs stating beforehand. Demanding a particular order for applying black without relation to usability is different. A preference is honest when the choice and its scope are clear. The executor may accept it or propose another arrangement. Calling every preference a “standard” creates false objectivity, obstructs discussion of alternatives and makes disagreement resemble refusal of quality.

If method itself belongs to the result, it should be identified separately. A teaching appendix may need a drawing sequence readers can repeat. Action order then has a substantive basis, and Vera accepts an additional task alongside the illustration. An ordinary finished page may lack that basis. The distinction follows purpose rather than an ideology of total control or total freedom. Participants may agree a detailed procedure that fits the undertaking. They can also reject an unnecessary procedure without rejecting quality, checking or responsibility for the outcome.

IV. Understanding permits another route

In Letter 33.7–11, Seneca distinguishes remembered words from independent understanding, treating predecessors as guides while allowing new routes. This concerns philosophical learning, rather than measured creative performance. His age-related shaming is not adopted as a way to address an executor. Our editorial question is whether Vera understands a requirement’s grounds sufficiently to suggest a suitable method. Legibility might call for enlarging a detail or altering composition. Blindly repeating a demonstrated movement offers fewer ways to address a changed drawing, though instruction can sometimes be necessary.

Leaving choice requires more than Oleg stopping messages. Grounds, materials and decision space need sharing. Vera can ask why a caption needs that much room and receive an explanation of its placement. She then chooses composition within the condition. Without an answer, freedom becomes guessing someone else’s intention. Independent understanding does not mean knowing unshared information. The assigner retains explanation of significant

conditions; the executor identifies what remains unclear. Their participation differs by action, rather than dividing one person who thinks from another who merely executes.

Vera should check that her new method preserves the accepted condition. Rejecting the demonstrated technique without explaining legibility does not yet answer the task. A reduced-size trial or another available check can help. The new route need not be defended as best for everyone; suitability here suffices. Oleg, in turn, assesses the result against agreed grounds without demanding his habit be recognised as uniquely reasonable. Different methods become a work question, rather than a contest of personal worth or entitlement to the last word.

V. Checking should precede difficult revision

Some decisions warrant checking before change becomes costly for both. If the first drawing determines the series' mood, a small trial can be agreed first. If line usability depends on reduction, one page can be checked before the rest. The moment relates to the next step's consequences, rather than continuous observation of Vera's hand. Oleg can identify a significant difference while Vera can address it before producing many final files. This is a proposal for the situation, not an empirical guarantee that a certain number of intermediate reviews always reduces costs or ensures quality.

A review should match what can still change. A draft may show composition without final line density. Judging absent details means examining the wrong object. Vera should state the trial's stage and the question it is intended to resolve. Oleg may request another check if the next step has a real unresolved risk, with its scope and deadline effect discussed. A trial serves a particular uncertainty, rather than proving the executor's constant readiness to provide evidence of every movement on demand.

After a trial is approved, its meaning needs clarity. Confirmed composition does not certify captions not yet made, but should not reopen arbitrarily with every new thought. Oleg may change the concept; that is a change affecting work and time. Vera can identify revision as a separate action. Clarity protects both: Oleg receives no false guarantee of the entire drawing, while Vera avoids an endless task under its former name. Provisional approval should be known as provisional before anyone relies on it, rather than defined that way afterwards.

VI. Feedback should identify the difference

Feedback becomes usable when it identifies a difference between the result and an accepted condition. Oleg can explain that the caption obscures a significant detail at print size. Vera gains grounds for revision. “Wrong again” identifies nothing to check; “Draw it like me” can conceal several requirements. Observation, significance for the album and desired correction can be separated. Vera may propose another way to remove the same defect if it preserves agreed boundaries without creating an unknown problem for the next participant.

Dissatisfaction need not have an immediate explanation. Oleg may feel the drawing does not fit the album’s mood without knowing why. Naming uncertain judgement is more honest than presenting an obvious technical error. Comparison with an agreed example or the accompanying text can help both identify the difference. This takes work time and guarantees no immediate agreement. Participation in an open question is clearer than defending against an allegedly established defect that nobody can describe and that changes with each clarification.

Feedback should retain human scale. One unsuitable composition does not make Vera generally incapable; one file correction does not erase her contribution. Suggesting another method does not make Oleg unnecessary. When every comment becomes a personal judgement, agreeing the result grows difficult. Discussion can return to the page, condition and next action. Recurring cooperation problems can still be discussed separately through their facts, rather than making a drawing the stage for accumulated grievances the executor cannot understand or repair with one stroke.

VII. Independence does not mean absent support

Ceasing to observe every movement does not release Oleg from answering significant questions. Vera finds two accounts of a historical episode and asks which the album adopts. That choice may remain editorial. If Oleg does not answer and later blames the depiction, the criterion was not an available basis. Vera can pause the dependent part and continue unaffected work. The assigner should recognise their participation in the uncertainty. Independence means a defined decision area, rather than guessing missing information or resolving every external dependency alone.

Support can provide material, explain a limit or compare options without taking over method. Oleg may identify a required object while leaving composition to Vera. She may request a technique demonstration without surrendering all subsequent decisions. Temporary instruction has a beginning, subject and ending. Expansion needs recognition as a changed arrangement. Help can remain available without permanent subordination: requesting explanation does not abandon independence, and explaining does not make someone the permanent author of another person’s every movement.

A novice may need more explanation than an experienced participant. Age or title alone does not justify controlling everything. The particular action not yet understood and assistance the person can accept need identifying. Decision space may expand after one step is learned and need reconsideration for unfamiliar work. No universal learning ladder or independence deadline is prescribed here. Instruction should fit actual need; criteria should fit available understanding and resources. Otherwise, outcomes become unsupported demands, while control becomes a way of overlooking development.

VIII. Less intervention guarantees no success

Tao Teh King 17 ends its image of restrained rule with people attributing their condition to themselves. Its foundation is Daoist and political, rather than a verified law of illustration work. Successful undertakings are not adopted as a universal modern prediction. Our editorial connection is narrower: an assigner can support work without centring their own movements continually. Oleg still contributes the concept, materials and answers. The absence of directions in every stroke does not erase his contribution or require hiding it when album authorship is acknowledged.

Letting go of method is insufficient when the task is unclear or necessary means are missing. Vera may gain freedom yet face absent materials, an impossible deadline or contradictory requirements. Each difficulty should not be called the price of independence. Result conditions need examination as carefully as under detailed instruction. Help, reduced scope or abandoning an unavailable part may be appropriate. Intervention should decrease where unnecessary; absent significant participation does not become admirable simply by being called trust and accompanied by a responsible role.

Some actions have procedures protecting significant obligations or safety. This article does not advise replacing such requirements with a final outcome alone. An obligatory checking order needs identification and compliance on the appropriate basis. The example concerns ordinary shared creative work with genuine method choices; even there, material-use restrictions remain. Results, means and procedures can have different grounds. Distinguishing them prevents necessary conditions being cancelled in freedom’s name or unnecessary ones retained under a vague quality slogan. The particular undertaking determines the discussion’s scope.

IX. Acceptance should not invent a past condition

At completion, Oleg receives usable page illustrations but realises he prefers more detailed faces. If detail was not required and its absence does not obstruct agreed use, that is a new preference. It can be discussed, but not declared an original error Vera should have guessed. Acceptance examines agreed conditions, rather than every wish arising from the finished work. Otherwise, independence is unreal: any difference from a later imagined model becomes a debt. Oleg can retain the possibility of change while acknowledging its cost and novelty.

Vera should not use “preference” to dismiss every inconvenient defect. Mixed-up names, an unusable file or an important line disappearing at the agreed size concern accepted conditions. A particular difference and its grounds are more useful than general dispute. An ambiguous condition may require discussion of its origin and available repair. Acceptance need not end in instant agreement. The disagreement’s subject can nevertheless be identified before it expands to every drawing and global judgements about independence or trust.

After acceptance, identify what travels to the next participant: final files, captions, usage restrictions and open parts. A usable drawing with one outstanding permission still has an unresolved condition. Oleg should know what can be used and what cannot yet enter print. Method freedom does not remove complete handover. Vera may compose independently, but completes the agreement with the person using the result. This final conversation differs from observing the process: it enables intelligible use of finished work rather than control of every movement during creation.

X. Trust is supported by clarity and response

Trust can mean willingness to rely on a particular promise under known conditions. It need not assume an infallible executor or an assigner with no right to ask. Oleg entrusts artistic decisions to Vera; she relies on accurate materials and timely answers. These expectations may survive an error that is identified and repaired. A clear agreement is not guaranteed to create trust. It provides grounds for honest reliance: what was accepted, what is available, and how changes become known. Without that, “trust” can conceal an unknown scope.

Afterwards, one necessary intervention and one dispensable intervention can be identified. A legibility check clarified a condition, while pencil-order directions did not affect usability. The first basis can remain and the second be reconsidered. This establishes neither an eternal prohibition on detailed explanation nor a duty to use criteria exclusively. Technique, experience or error costs may change next time. The transferable element is the question, rather than a ready answer: why is this participation required, and what decision remains available to the person assigned the result?

Result criteria matter when they distinguish requirements from possible variations. They should become neither attractive wording for absent explanation nor hidden demands around every step. Vera gains space for understanding and choice; Oleg gains grounds to examine usability and support necessary work. Both retain ethical boundaries and the ability to change agreements openly. Quality then concerns the particular undertaking, and independence exists as genuine action space. Difficulty is still possible, but can be met without demanding an exact copy of another person’s method or guessing an unknown intention.

What this means in practice

Choose a task in which you want to check every movement. Identify its user and three significant usability signs. For judgement-based quality, show an example and explain the important difference without demanding every feature be copied. State means restrictions separately: accuracy, permitted material use and agreements with others. Do not present a preference as an obligatory standard.

Examine one process direction. Which result condition does it protect? Without a substantive basis, invite method choice. If method belongs to the result or an obligatory procedure, identify that beforehand. Clarify information and support needed for independent decisions. Fewer minute-by-minute messages cannot replace context or answers to dependent questions.

Agree a review where the next step makes significant revision difficult. Identify the trial’s stage and the question it answers. Feedback should name an observed difference, its significance and necessary change while allowing another suitable method. Recognise uncertain judgement as uncertain; discuss new work and time when a new wish appears.

At completion, examine accepted signs, receive usable files and identify open conditions. Discuss one useful and one unnecessary intervention. This is an editorial proposal for ordinary shared undertakings. It replaces no obligatory technical, legal or safety procedure and promises no universal efficacy from reduced control.

Key quotation

> *We are as we are, of ourselves!*

— Tao Teh King 17.2, excerpt from the people’s concluding speech; James Legge translation

Connections between traditions

Seneca, Letter 33 — understanding differs from memorisation and allows one’s own path within philosophical inquiry.

Tao Teh King 17 — restrained rule appears in a political image grounded in the Tao.

Editorial bridge — participation can support an undertaking while leaving another person real action space.

Boundary — Stoic learning and Daoist rule cannot become one management method.

Practical distinction — method freedom retains criteria, ethical limits and necessary support.

Primary sources

1. Seneca. Moral letters to Lucilius 33.7–11. Richard M. Gummere English translation; Wikisource. Selected continuous section read; epigraph is a sentence from 33.8. Collection metadata was previously checked; this letter-volume's exact imprint is not independently asserted. Age-related shaming is not adopted as a communication rule.

2. Lao-Tse. Tao Teh King, chapter 17. James Legge translation; Project Gutenberg 216. Complete selected chapter and title/translator metadata read; no full-work read or independent Chinese check claimed. Key quotation is the people's concluding speech in 17.2. Exact print imprint of the transcription is not independently established.

Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations of the named English texts. Rights outside USA remain unverified; no worldwide unrestricted licence is asserted. Full sources are neither imported nor vectorised. Historical foundations retain their differences; modern efficacy from reduced control is not derived from them.

Tags

result, criteria, control, independence, delegation, approach, method, quality, checking, feedback, agreement, support, understanding, learning, example, preference, restriction, means, responsibility, trust, change, acceptance, creativity, illustration, cooperation, Seneca, Lucilius, Tao Teh King, Lao-Tse, Tao, practical 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.