

UNITED WISDOM

A Business of Your Own: A Desire for Freedom and a Source of Dependence

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-30-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A Business of Your Own: A Desire for Freedom and a Source of Dependence

Epigraph

> *Some things are in our control and others not.*

Epictetus, The Enchiridion, section 1; checked Elizabeth Carter translation. A Stoic boundary of action, not a guarantee of economic independence.

What this article is about

A business of your own may promise choice over tasks, time, people, and direction. Different freedoms do not automatically arrive with ownership. Activity connects a person with others' needs, resources, participation conditions, and promises' consequences. This article examines both sides: which possibility you want and which dependencies arise to obtain it. Adam Smith helps frame exchange, Epictetus distinguishes one's action from external outcomes, and Ecclesiastes questions enough. Their grounds retain historical differences; the contemporary application belongs to this article. No particular launch or closure, financial strategy, or legal template is recommended. Reflection aims to make independence's subject more precise without romanticizing ownership or declining it. Freedom can be limited and meaningful when its conditions are visible, other people's costs are not hidden, and a person understands where they may decide and where agreement or another contribution is needed.

I. Which Freedom Does a Business of Your Own Promise?

The desire for a business of one's own often begins with a recognizable restriction: someone else's schedule, unsuitable tasks, dependence on one decision, or no choice over how work is done. “Freedom” can collect these into one promise: become an owner and every restriction disappears. Give the desire a particular subject. Do you want to choose clients, time, product, people, or your level of involvement? These differ and can conflict. Choosing a product may require attention to those willing to use it; arranging your schedule may still depend on commitments. In a hypothetical situation, someone leaves a meeting-filled job to open a small studio. The first question concerns more than the right to schedule meetings: which form of work would actually reduce them without promising clients constant availability?

Here a business of one's own means activity for whose organization someone accepts defined responsibility. This article selects no legal form and does not treat every undertaking alike. The important transition is from an overall image to visible conditions. “I want more choice over

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

tasks” is a workable question. “I want to depend on nobody” may have no feasible arrangement when activity requires people, exchange, materials, and shared rules. This does not devalue the desire. It distinguishes independence over a particular decision from the disappearance of every connection. A business becomes a possible way to change dependence's structure rather than escape it altogether. This scale leaves room for choice, checking conditions, and recognizing the price someone will or will not pay for a particular freedom.

II. Authority to Decide Is Not the Ability to Deliver

An owner may gain authority to choose a direction while delivery still depends on conditions. Offering a service does not ensure demand; naming a deadline does not supply materials; choosing a collaborator does not create suitable participation conditions. This distinction does not accuse an entrepreneur of weakness. It separates parts of action. In a hypothetical workshop, someone may refuse an unsuitable order, but refusal may reduce available income or affect commitments to participants. The freedom to refuse is real; freedom from consequences does not follow. Decision authority does not remove the need to consider results. Independence gains a workable form when authority, external conditions, and consequences to accept or negotiate become visible, rather than assuming ownership ensures every desired change.

Distinguish what you may decide, what you can perform under current conditions, and what requires agreement. Mixing these turns an external obstacle into personal defeat and an intention into an obligation for others. You can choose a product, but not decide whether a client needs it. You can offer cooperation, but cannot perform a partner's agreement. You can change your working approach, but cannot cancel someone else's agreement through an internal decision. This is no invitation to abandon initiative beforehand. Initiative becomes clearer when it does not promise unavailable powers. Freedom gains a defined area, and action gains actual conditions. A restriction can then be examined through its subject rather than making every delay, refusal, or negotiation proof that a business of your own has no meaning.

III. Exchange Connects Independence with Another Person’s Need

When activity serves other people, their needs become part of its arrangement. In The Wealth of Nations, I.II, Adam Smith considers exchange and mutual assistance through participants' interests. The historical argument illuminates a connection but establishes no modern product's success and justifies no sale merely as such. Our narrower question asks whose need makes the proposed activity meaningful and whether participants accept the exchange's conditions. You may freely invent a service while depending on whether it suits a particular person. This is not a humiliating dependence to conceal behind “mission.” Different purposes meet: the business creator has an intention; the client has a task, constraints, and the right to decline. Their fit requires examination rather than following automatically from sincere intention.

In a hypothetical studio, its creator wants only complex individual projects while prospective participants need a simple, intelligible result. Choices differ: retain the complex format and seek a matching need, change the offer, or preserve the idea for another form of activity. The mismatch alone determines none of these choices. Dependence is nevertheless visible: freedom of intention meets another person's freedom to choose. Concealing that connection makes refusal look like poor understanding and adaptation look like self-betrayal. A more precise view preserves both people's standing: the creator may have an intention; another may not need it. A business does not require abandoning convictions for every preference. It requires distinguishing what you want to offer from what has actually received agreement under particular conditions, rather than replacing one with the other to feel independent.

IV. Invisible Supports Become Visible Commitments

Familiar work may already organize premises, tools, communication, information, and task distribution. Some supports may remain when starting a business; others must be established anew. We cannot assume ownership always creates more or less burden because arrangements differ. Ask what makes action possible. In a hypothetical workshop, choosing orders depends on equipment, materials, and people performing their parts. Losing one element changes not only convenience but the promise to a client. Mapping dependence is not a pessimistic test of an idea. It reveals relationships and conditions needed to make independence actual rather than merely a story about finally becoming your own boss.

A support and a commitment are related but different. Someone else's resource is available under conditions; your promise may lead another person to rely on you. Unclear conditions cannot be treated as a free, permanent element of freedom. A friend's help may be temporary, premises available until a stated date, or a tool supplied for one task. Independence cannot be

gained by turning willingness to help into an unlimited duty. Identify what has been agreed and what is only assumed. This reveals a material gap before further promises rest on it. The article determines no legal consequences of agreements; consequential arrangements need competent examination. The philosophical distinction is enough here: freedom to use a support is limited by actual conditions, and gratitude or trust cannot replace understanding those conditions.

V. A Schedule of Your Own May Have Many Recipients

Having no single manager does not necessarily remove demands on time. Cooperation with several participants can make a schedule depend on several expectations. In a hypothetical studio, someone chooses when the day begins but has promised client replies, materials for a partner, and a joint meeting. These commitments do not represent authority in the same sense as a manager's instruction. Some were freely chosen and can be discussed. Yet voluntariness does not erase consequences. Freedom's question changes: can I establish and keep an intelligible availability arrangement rather than respond constantly to every request? Different work allows different arrangements. This article promises none universally. Examine actual conditions rather than derive a convenient schedule from ownership alone.

A time boundary is substantive when participants know it and it fits the promised result. Declining evening replies cannot silently cancel a promise of evening support. Without such a promise, clarify communication and unavailability. This protects both parties. A hypothetical owner replaces constant urgent messages with a defined question window. Discuss that change with those relying on the earlier format. It neither proves selfishness nor guarantees agreement. Freedom over time includes naming the change's price: which tasks remain available, which need another approach, and which relationships may not continue. A schedule becomes an intelligible arrangement of participation rather than a symbol of independence, keeping your limit visible without treating every expectation as an unconditional duty.

VI. Financial Independence Has a Particular Subject

A business can change where money comes from without removing the need to compare available resources with commitments. Distinguish personal means, resources for activity, and obligations to others within your actual arrangement. This article prescribes no financial strategy, reserve amount, tax treatment, or investment. Its philosophical and practical question asks which freedom you associate with money and on what known grounds. In a hypothetical workshop, payment appears to confirm independence, but some funds concern materials and another participant's agreed work. Not every received resource becomes a free personal choice merely because you hold it. Exact consequences require relevant documents and expertise. Reflection can already avoid confusing receipt of money with vanished dependence, or resource management with unconditional disposal.

“A certain level is enough” also needs a subject. Enough for current life, chosen activity, known obligations, or further expansion? If the answer changes after every achievement, the business may serve a growing promise of freedom perpetually postponed. This is neither diagnosis nor a law of owners' behavior. It questions your intention. Name the condition that currently matters and distinguish it from endless superiority. With unknown data, retain uncertainty rather than insert a universal norm from someone else's success story. Money can support choice but cannot decide which life is meaningful or which relationships you want to preserve. A business becomes clearer when its financial condition is specific rather than a promise that the next income level will finally remove every fear, limit, or need to discuss consequences with others.

VII. Other Participants Do Not Become Extensions of the Owner

Organizational independence can tempt someone to treat people as conditions of a personal project. After agreeing to participate, they may seem obliged to share the owner's urgency, risk, and the intention's personal meaning. Yet everyone retains a life and a particular consent. In a hypothetical studio, a partner agreed to defined tasks rather than constant availability; an assistant accepted a scope rather than every future idea. These distinctions need not indicate poor engagement. They show participation's boundaries. Your freedom is not honestly enlarged by silently transferring its price to unavailable time, unpaid resources, or a duty to guess expectations. Distinguish agreed work from an owner's hope for broader involvement. Hope can be discussed, but cannot retrospectively become an existing commitment.

Participation does create responsibility. Neither an owner nor another participant can disregard consequences when revising an agreed contribution merely to retain complete freedom. Name revision conditions, how difficulties will be communicated, and what each may rely on. This article supplies no contractual template or allocation of legal rights. It preserves ethical clarity:

people remain participants rather than components of your independence. Growth requiring broader involvement creates a new question needing new consent and suitable conditions. Freedom then concerns arranging shared action with distinguishable authority and commitments rather than eliminating others' boundaries. This independence looks less like power over every circumstance, but does not conceal who bears the chosen direction's costs and which costs they actually accepted.

VIII. A Stoic Boundary Does Not Abolish External Conditions

In The Enchiridion, section 1, Epictetus distinguishes what is within our control from what is not. This offers no promise of economic independence. The ancient Stoic ground concerns one's relation to action and external things, not a modern enterprise's organization. Our limited bridge avoids claiming power over another person's need, decision, or circumstance. It does not make external conditions irrelevant. An unavailable workplace or unfulfilled commitment requires appropriate action, not merely an internal choice. Recognizing a limit identifies where agreement, another approach, or revised intention is needed. It does not reduce suffering, material need, or promises' consequences to a mistaken attitude someone must overcome through philosophical effort.

Suppose a client declines an offered format. You cannot perform their consent, but can explore the refusal's grounds within permissible limits, revise the offer, or accept the refusal. These belong to your side of participation. Refusal still has actual consequences for the business; a Stoic boundary does not erase them. Nor does it require enduring unsafe or unacceptable conditions to maintain an image of inward freedom. This contemporary article preserves safety, competence, and the right to change course. Two things become clear: I do not own the entire outcome, but I remain responsible for my proposal and available next step. This is less heroic than being absolute master of one's fate. It permits action without demanding confirmation from the whole world and without abandoning responsibility that actually remains yours.

IX. The Desire for Freedom Can Keep Moving Enough Away

Ecclesiastes 5:10 connects love of silver with remaining unsatisfied by silver. This religious and philosophical judgment belongs to the book's context, not a modern income formula or accusation against every owner. It invites asking whether the desire for freedom has a visible meaning of enough. A business begun to reduce dependence on another schedule can require constant expansion for future peace. Expansion is neither inherently good nor bad. Does it still serve the original purpose, or has it become an unquestioned demand of its own? If every achievement immediately becomes inadequate, identify what is missing. Actual conditions may have changed. The original promise may also have been so general that no achievement could fulfil it.

In a hypothetical workshop, an owner wanted a few suitable orders but now accepts everything to “finally choose later.” Continue if its grounds and cost are understood, change the scope, or recognize a changed purpose. Avoid presenting movement toward a new aim as unchanged fidelity to an earlier one. This distinction requires no rejection of prosperity and romanticizes no deprivation. Material conditions matter, but cannot automatically determine life's meaning. Enough concerns a named purpose and known obligations, not a universal number for everyone. This article does not calculate it without facts. It asks when “a little more” has lost connection with a particular condition. Freedom's question then returns: what do I want to be able to do now, and which part of the business serves that possibility rather than endlessly accumulating a future right to begin my own life?

X. Dependence Can Be Arranged More Clearly

Every connection cannot be removed, but some dependencies can become more definite: availability conditions, work scope, the difference between necessary and desired, and assumptions about continuing help. This is neither a universal recipe for business resilience nor a promise that wording is sufficient. In a hypothetical studio, one clarification reveals a shared deadline; another reveals incompatible expectations and an unsuitable format. Both inform a decision. Clarity can reduce difficulty or expose its actual size. It guarantees no reconciliation. Incompatible interests cannot be removed by a better sentence, but can be named before another promise rests on them. Choose participation from actual conditions rather than portray agreement nobody gave.

Begin with one material dependence, such as requiring the owner for every action. What really needs their decision, what could be agreed differently, and what cannot currently be transferred? Delegation does not arise from a wish for freedom and cannot be assigned without suitable conditions. Clarity may show that the present scale depends on you more than you can accept. Discuss its scope or arrangement rather than promise an immediate exit. This

article designs no management system; it preserves freedom's subject: which connection limits the needed possibility and what you may change. Partial clarification matters without exaggeration. Freedom may increase unevenly: more choice of tasks with less control of time, or more independent decisions with greater responsibility to participants. Naming the exchange lets you assess your arrangement rather than match another person's image of successful ownership.

XI. Independence Has More Than One Form

Desiring freedom does not establish ownership as the only suitable route. A different role, changed employment conditions, a limited independent project, or another scale may provide the needed possibility. These form no mandatory development ladder. Smaller scale is not necessarily safer, nor employment necessarily less independent; conditions differ. Compare arrangements against a particular purpose rather than the status of a “real boss.” Choosing how to perform a task may not require owning the whole project. Responsibility for its entire direction may require another arrangement. In a hypothetical situation, someone discovers they wanted professional discretion without constant involvement in organizing sales and resources. This does not make them a failed owner. It identifies the independence that matters to them.

Choosing a form still requires facts. Which conditions exist, which are promised, and which remain unknown? Compare actual offers and constraints rather than general success or disappointment stories. Consequential choices need appropriate information and expertise. This article recommends no particular resignation, launch, investment, or closure. It explains why one appealing word cannot determine the decision. You may accept more external conditions for greater freedom over content, decline expansion for another possibility, or retain the current arrangement while naming its cost. Dignity is not determined by employment form. Responsibility concerns chosen participation and agreed commitments. Ownership then becomes one possible organization of work and exchange to assess, alter, or decline on substantive grounds rather than an examination of courage or independence.

XII. Freedom Becomes Clear Within Connections

A business can provide meaningful independence while creating new dependencies. These do not contradict each other. Choosing direction may coexist with responding to another person's need; arranging time with meeting agreed deadlines; refusing with bearing refusal's costs. Preserve both sides when assessing the arrangement. In a hypothetical workshop, an owner selects suitable orders while recognizing dependence on participants' agreed conditions. This exposes no merely imaginary freedom; it describes its actual form. Someone else discovers that the desired possibility remains absent despite ownership, requiring changed conditions or another route rather than claiming freedom to justify an earlier decision. This distinction avoids both romantic promises and the sweeping conclusion that independent activity simply replaces one captivity with another.

Finish with a brief statement: “This possibility matters to me; the business provides it under these conditions; these commitments arise; this remains unknown.” A record replaces no action and guarantees no result. It connects desire with reality. New circumstances reveal which part of the choice needs revision; unchanged conditions need not prompt complete reassessment after every difficult day. Freedom need not be complete to matter. Nor should it be exaggerated through invisible costs imposed on others or a perpetual promise of future liberation. A business becomes more intelligible when someone sees where they may decide, where agreement is needed, and which consequences they accept. Initiative, boundaries, and changed direction remain possible within those connections without requiring mastery of the whole world before an action can count as free.

What this means in practice

Name one possibility for which you are considering ownership, such as choosing work content or preserving defined unavailable time. Do not merge every desire into complete independence. Identify what currently limits that possibility and whether facts establish it rather than an overall story of dissatisfaction.

Describe decisions the new arrangement actually places with you. Beside them, state delivery conditions: other people's needs, resources, participation, availability, and existing commitments. Separate agreements from assumptions. Keep an unconfirmed support unknown rather than making further promises on its basis.

Ask who bears freedom's price. Your time, others' participation, changed availability, refusal's consequences, and added responsibility belong in the assessment. Do not turn voluntary assistance into a permanent duty or treat all received money as a free personal resource without examining actual conditions.

Choose one material dependence that a permissible action could clarify: agreed scope, communication format, or authority to decide. Clarification guarantees no agreement and may reveal incompatible conditions. Consequential financial or legal questions require relevant documents and competent assistance; this article assigns no independent calculation or contractual decision.

Compare the activity's form with your purpose. Ownership, another scale, another role, or the current route should be assessed through actual conditions rather than ranked for courage. Finish briefly: “This possibility matters; it is available under these conditions; I accept these commitments; this remains unknown.” This original exercise guarantees no result. It helps see freedom within connections and preserves the right to change an arrangement without devaluing earlier experience or participants' dignity.

Key quotation

> *He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver*

Ecclesiastes 5:10, opening clause; exact checked KJV fragment. A religious and philosophical judgment in the book’s context, prescribing no financial norm.

Connections between traditions

1. **Exchange and control:** Smith (I.II) considers mutual assistance through exchange; Epictetus (section 1) distinguishes one's own from external things. Our bridge separates making an offer from performing consent. Historical political economy is not Stoic discipline.

2. **Enough and an undertaking:** Ecclesiastes 5:10 questions unsatisfied desire for silver; Epictetus (section 29) attends to an undertaking's price. Both limit future promises. Religious wisdom is no income model, and Stoic counsel no business forecast.

3. **Another's need and one's intention:** Smith (I.II) reveals another participant's purpose; Ecclesiastes 5:10 does not derive enough from love of accumulation. The comparison asks two questions without identifying their answers or prescribing rejection of prosperity.

4. **Conditions and responsibility:** Epictetus (sections 1, 29) limits power over outcomes; Smith reveals exchange's connections. Our distinction between agreed participation and hidden costs is a contemporary ethical bridge, replacing no contractual or financial expertise.

5. **Freedom within connections:** All three grounds limit a broad promise of independence. Economic, Stoic, and biblical meanings remain distinct. The article questions a business arrangement rather than supplying a validated algorithm of entrepreneurial success.

Primary sources

1. Epictetus. Enchiridion, sections 1, 29 — primary philosophical text in Elizabeth Carter's translation; both sections actually read. No promise of controlling external outcomes, treatment, or enduring danger.

2. Adam Smith. The Wealth of Nations, I.II — primary historical political economy; the exchange chapter fully read in the available English edition. No contemporary business-model validation or financial recommendation.

3. Ecclesiastes 5:1–12, KJV — primary biblical text; surrounding context read and opening of 5:10 checked. No Hebrew collation; modern commentary excluded.

Tags

business ownership, freedom, independence, dependence, choice, authority, delivery, exchange, need, client, resource, support, time, schedule, availability, promise, commitment, consent, participation, money, enough, scale, role, boundary, responsibility, Epictetus, Smith, Ecclesiastes, philosophy, entrepreneurship

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.