

UNITED WISDOM

Someone Else's Desire That Became My Project

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-11-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Someone Else's Desire That Became My Project

Epigraph

“Chooses his plan for himself.”

John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, Chapter III, pp.109–110 in the Walter Scott Publishing edition reproduced by Project Gutenberg. The Russian version renders this fragment editorially. It belongs to a philosophical argument about choice, not a demand for a life free of others' influence.

What this article is about

Imagine a hypothetical scene: for a long time you have prepared a project once suggested by someone close. You selected a program, gathered documents, and learned to describe the future result. Now explaining what matters to you within it is difficult. Perhaps someone else's desire was accepted without examination. Perhaps it became your own long ago. Perhaps only one part attracts you while an old promise supports the rest. The idea's origin alone supplies no final answer. People learn possibilities through others; someone else's thought can become a personally considered choice.

This article distinguishes the idea's source, present interest, commitments, and the right to change participation. We consider how gratitude differs from unlimited consent, why success does not settle ownership of a goal, and how to handle a project already affecting others. There is no assumption that loved ones necessarily suppress you or that a true path must begin alone. The task is to find your grounds for present action while respecting relationships and actual consequences.

I. An idea's source does not yet determine whose choice it is

Many possibilities first appear in someone else's speech. A teacher proposes a profession, a friend describes an activity, a partner shows another way of life. Trying it can reveal personal interest. A borrowed beginning then does not make the entire continuation foreign. In a hypothetical scene, someone attends a music gathering by invitation and later chooses training. An initial impulse free of every person need not be found to acknowledge present desire. What matters more is their current relation to the activity, their grounds, and their participation in considering conditions.

A project can remain external after years of work. Tasks are performed because continuation is expected while personal meaning is unclear. This is a possible account, not a conclusion drawn from time invested. It cannot be read from a success photograph or the word “must.” Consider present action: attractions, restraints, promises, and actually available options. Allow several motives. Interest, care, fear of consequences, and habit sometimes coexist; their presence does not make someone a simple illustration of one explanation.

Distinguishing origin and adoption avoids a fruitless trial of the past. Parents' suggestion proves neither a profession's rightness nor its foreignness. Earlier resistance does not prohibit later choice; enthusiastic agreement does not require permanence. History provides information rather than a ready verdict on present desire. Help and influence can be considered before examining an available life. The question becomes concrete: which part of what was offered will you continue on your own grounds now?

Sometimes origin cannot be reconstructed precisely. A decision developed gradually through conversations, circumstances, and several attempts. No single culprit or dream's author needs appointment before reconsidering participation. Describe the current project and its place among other important matters. Which result is needed, which action interests you, which cost is accepted, what remains unexamined? This is no scientific authenticity test. It keeps first influence from replacing today's right to participate in choice even when the beginning cannot be reconstructed in every detail.

II. Accepting influence and submitting to pressure are different possibilities

Ryan and Deci's 2000 review distinguishes regulation accepted under inner pressure from consciously endorsed personal significance. In this theory, an external source does not preclude subsequent autonomous adoption. This is a research distinction, not a diagnosis of your project. The internalization section, especially pp.72–74, was read; individual experiments listed there are not claimed as independently checked. The concept cannot reveal a reader's hidden history.

In a hypothetical example, you agree to organize a family celebration. In one version, care matters and you choose an available workload. In another, doing everything is the only permitted position; otherwise you are declared a bad relative. Actions can look identical while consent conditions differ. An observer cannot determine for you which meaning is genuine. Ask what you personally endorse, which part needs agreement, and how safely change can be discussed. Loved ones' influence deserves examination without automatically becoming accusation or justification of every demand.

Inner pressure sometimes sounds like your own voice: “If I stop, I am worth nothing.” This sentence can receive attention if you actually notice it. The article does not claim every reader has it or establish its origin. Distinguish assessment of a particular project from assessment of a whole person. A task can be performed well or poorly, revised, and you remain someone with other relationships and possibilities. When a state persistently causes significant distress or interferes with life, appropriate professional support is permissible; reflection need not solve everything alone.

Consent to a socially significant task can also be personal. Not every obligation must provide immediate pleasure. Help, work, or learning can be chosen for an outcome you endorse as important. Absent enthusiasm therefore does not prove an external goal. The issue is grounds and conditions rather than constant inspiration. Sometimes your own project includes difficult parts and remains accepted. Sometimes consent covered only the beginning while expansion needs another decision. Both answers deserve precise naming rather than a general examination of motives' purity.

III. Several goods can be distinguished within a visible project

Another's dream is often offered under a broad name: career, family business, relocation, successful life. Yet the name combines different goods. In a hypothetical professional choice, interest in content can coexist with income and parental approval. Consider them separately without declaring any motive unworthy in advance. Needed income is a real ground; family connection matters. The question is which part the project actually provides and which additional conditions you will accept for it.

Sometimes your own small desire exists inside another's proposal. A relative wanted a large business; particular craft work interests you. A mentor expected an academic career; a certain research question attracts you while the proposed life arrangement does not fit. Content can be preserved while form changes. Loss is not always avoidable: professional activity may need qualifications, resources, and obligations. Actual alternatives then require consideration. Still, the whole proposal need not be indivisible merely because someone important to you once pronounced it confidently.

In another case, interest emerges through participation itself. You agreed for someone close, then came to enjoy the activity and acquired personal reasons to continue. Its beginning need not be rewritten as though you always knew what you wanted. “Someone else suggested this; now something here matters to me” preserves both influence and personal choice. Not every change requires departure. Examination sometimes strengthens participation because continuation stops being automatic and the activity and conditions you endorse become clear.

Naming goods should not promise their receipt from one project alone. If the main hope is earning someone's respect, establish whether recognition is even clearly agreed. They may change requirements or judge differently. That does not prove their intentions; it prevents treating their response as a guaranteed result of your work. Personal interest can be examined alongside relationships, but relationships do not become controllable rewards for sufficiently correct execution of a plan. A project can deliver a result without delivering the answer you hoped to hear.

Imagine the project in an ordinary day when nobody evaluates it from outside. Which tasks do you perform, whom do you encounter, what receives attention? This does not demand wanting unpaid or unrecognized work. It places activity alongside its external image. In a hypothetical scene, describing a future profession is enjoyable while its everyday tasks remain largely unknown. Gather real information before a major commitment. Changed interest after acquaintance supplies new information rather than necessarily exposing earlier insincerity. Imagination had limited data; the decision now gains a more precise object.

IV. Philosophical choice does not require inventing yourself without history

In On Liberty, Chapter III, Mill defends a person's participation in choosing a life plan. Nearby discussion allows use of prior experience while examining its applicability. This is a normative philosophical argument, not a modern motivation experiment. We take the bounded question of personal consideration; harsh historical assessments of people and culture do not become descriptions of our reader.

In a hypothetical scene, a ready professional recommendation is offered. It may include useful program and employment information. Personal participation need not mean refusal: compare conditions, ask questions, and assess how the proposal fits your life. A positive answer coinciding with advice does not cancel choice. A negative answer need not prove the advice bad for everyone. Its unsuitability in particular circumstances is sufficient. This consideration preserves others' experience without granting it final authority over every future action.

Considered choice cannot be promised complete freedom from uncertainty. Information is limited, conditions change, interests develop. Philosophical defense of choice does not remove those circumstances. It asks who participates in consideration and whose grounds receive space. With scarce resources, an autonomous step may be small: obtaining information, changing part of a schedule, naming a limit, or preserving a later decision. Human worth is not diminished. Available action's scale depends on life, not how dramatically someone rejects another's dream.

V. Gratitude does not transfer decision indefinitely

Someone who helped you begin may deserve gratitude. They gave time, money, support, or knowledge. Gratitude differs from consent to every future version, however. In hypothetical education, parents helped pay for the first stage. Their help can be acknowledged while continuation in the original profession proves unsuitable. Particular agreements, if any, are not canceled and need separate consideration. Gratitude alone does not establish an unlimited duty to live another's plan in precisely the form that preserves their hope unchanged.

Do not invent an obligation afterward. A gift should not silently become a debt paid through an entire life. If conditions existed, establish their content and validity instead of replacing conversation with “I owe everyone everything.” Documents and appropriate professional assessment fit contracts and significant legal or financial consequences. This article does not establish your duties. It keeps different subjects distinct: gratitude, a promised action, money, and participation in future choice are not one endless bill.

Respect can be preserved through precise recognition: “Your help let me try; now I see that I want to continue differently.” This guarantees no calm response. Someone may be upset, disagree, or understand past help differently. Further conversation may be possible where safe and available. Their reaction does not automatically establish your revision as ungrateful. Equally, choice does not require denying help's usefulness. Both facts can remain: support mattered, and today's life needs your renewed participation and consideration.

VI. Success does not answer for a goal's ownership

Sometimes the question emerges after a good result. You succeeded, gained recognition, and fulfilled expectations without knowing whether to continue. Success establishes a particular outcome under particular conditions; it does not fully answer continuation's value for you. You can be capable and prefer something else. You can lack enthusiasm yet retain a considered choice. Absent joy cannot be declared proof of an external project in advance. Consider the activity, conditions, other interests, and actual expectations of the next stage.

In a hypothetical career, promotion follows successful work. Others see natural continuation; you notice the new role moves away from the most interesting content. This concerns a particular change rather than obligatory rejection of the entire profession. A different scope can be accepted, another format sought, or promotion chosen with its price understood. Alternatives may be limited. Before deciding, distinguish the previous activity from the new expectation. Past results should not conceal different actions and consent required by the next stage.

Failure also gives no final answer about desire's ownership. A personal project can encounter external conditions or poor preparation; a borrowed one can succeed beautifully. Assess work quality and present grounds separately. If the goal still matters, methods can improve. If not, continuation can change without presenting stopping as proof of incapacity. This is more precise than reading authenticity from one outcome affected by many circumstances and unable to reveal the entire history of choice.

VII. A project can remain yours with altered conditions

Examination sometimes reveals a personal core within an overly broad external scenario. Learning matters, but not at the prescribed pace; supporting the family business, but not leading it; proximity to people, but not the entire proposed lifestyle. Describe your version through ordinary actions. What continues, what changes, which responsibility is accepted? “I want my own way” is difficult to discuss. Concrete scope distinguishes revised participation from a hidden promise eventually to fulfill the original plan entirely and without additional conditions.

In a hypothetical family project, you will work on product content but not sales. Others must assess whether this role is feasible. They can propose distribution, refuse, or name change's cost. Autonomy does not guarantee acceptance of any arrangement. Discussion reveals compatibility. Sometimes the project survives with other duties. Sometimes your activity needs to be found separately. Both answers concern cooperation's conditions rather than requiring one side be declared good and the other guilty merely because roles differ.

A new version needs signs of actual endorsement. You understand its content, accept a particular contribution, see limits, and can explain continuation. These are reflective guides, not a diagnostic scale. A single pure motive or complete certainty is unnecessary. Old history must not replace every consideration. If a project matters for your reasons too, it can remain after strong influence is recognized. Choice includes agreeing with a proposal; otherwise autonomy becomes another external demand, now the demand obligatorily to refuse.

VIII. Changing a project requires attention to existing relationships

A project can connect people through promises and actual expectations. In changing participation, name who relies on which actions, what was accepted, and what consequences will occur. This differs from perpetually preserving another's dream. In a hypothetical team, you leave an unsuitable direction. Materials transfer, a stage's completion deadline, and available help for a successor can be discussed. Professional information about obligations is sometimes needed. A specific transition respects actual dependence on work without turning past consent into a lifelong prohibition of change.

Expectations in personal relationships may be less clear. Someone believed a shared plan would continue while you discussed only a trial. Before accusation, clarify what was said and understood. This guarantees no agreement. An expectation mistake may have occurred; a genuine promise may now be difficult to fulfill. Consequences then require discussion. Responsibility need not automatically be denied through “My choice.” Another's disappointment also establishes no unlimited debt. An obligation's object remains specific despite surrounding strong feelings.

Allow someone else's desire to remain theirs. You can decline being its principal implementer without demanding that they stop valuing it. They may find another form, participant, or retain hope. That is their subsequent action. If limited help is available, name its boundary; otherwise avoid promising help merely to soften conversation. Distinguishing authorship need not destroy relationships. Sometimes it lets people discuss what each actually wants and can offer without secretly appointing someone else to fulfill their life.

Sometimes the public account of the project needs change too. You presented it to friends as final and now fear appearing inconsistent. A concrete change can be communicated without a complete confession of motives: “After this stage I am choosing another format.” Where shared work needs information, provide enough about timing and role. Personal grounds can be revealed to the extent appropriate to the relationship. Clarification needs no approval from every acquaintance. Where earlier words created actual expectations, however, silence may preserve a mistaken picture; clear communication returns discussion to real conditions.

IX. Strong dependence means choice needs support

Revising a project sometimes affects income, housing, family access, or safety. “Just say it is not yours” may then be unaffordable or dangerous. Consider power and resources, appropriate local support, and verified professional information for the particular risk. This article does not determine a safe sequence for your situation. Inner clarity and ability to act differ. Even after recognizing that a plan is not endorsed, absent immediate exit does not prove agreement or render reflection meaningless.

Less dangerous dependence may still need preparation and time. Work continues for income while information about another direction is gathered. This can be named temporary participation on economic grounds if that is the actual decision. You need not pretend to love the entire present undertaking or declare every completed task a betrayal of autonomy. Preserving resources and expanding options may be the available task. Assess timing and promises realistically; an inner plan alone does not guarantee external opportunities exactly when needed.

When desire, fear, and obligation are difficult to distinguish, a trusted person capable of listening without prescribing a ready path may help. One director need not be replaced with another. Useful support retains space for your examination and actual conditions. Professional help fits significant distress. Not every uncertainty requires therapy; not every situation is resolved through personal reflection. Support's scale depends on difficulty, access, and safety, not proving maturity through a completely solitary decision without people or necessary information.

X. Your answer can be provisional and clear enough

Examination permits different answers: continue, change form, gather information, finish a stage, or leave. Sometimes uncertainty remains. A limited decision actually allowed by conditions can then be made. In hypothetical learning, the current module is completed before the next is considered separately. Actual commitments and costs matter. An action already creating major irreversible demands should not be called a trial. Your answer need not immediately encompass a whole life; it needs enough precision for the next significant participation and clarity for those relying upon it.

A project can remain with mixed motives: interest, gratitude, income, belonging. The opportunity to assess them matters more than purifying life of connection. If you now choose a route for understandable reasons, its origin does not prohibit calling the decision yours. New information may reopen the question without necessarily showing failed authenticity. Participation in choice continues over time because person, circumstances, and task change. A ready-made story about ownership must not cancel today's examination.

The point is not compulsory separation from whoever suggested the dream. Sometimes you thank them and continue; sometimes agree on another role; sometimes leave and preserve connection differently; sometimes relationships change painfully. No identical good outcome can be promised. You can name more precisely what belongs to you now: action, grounds, consent's scope, obligation, and the next question. Another's desire stops directing a project without consideration. It remains part of a history you may account for in a present decision within actual life.

What this means in practice

Choose one project whose origin you want to examine. Describe present content first without labeling it “foreign”: actions, result, conditions, participants. Name the idea's source separately if known, without turning origin into the answer. Record what matters now: content, income, care, connection, recognition, another good. Several grounds and uncertainty can remain. Neither pure desire nor one person responsible for your entire history needs to be established.

Consider obligations separately. What did you actually promise, to whom, for how long? What is assumed without clear agreement? Which resources depend on continuation? If safety, rights, health, or finances matter, use appropriate support and verified professional information. Do not conduct an unsafe conversation for an exercise. Where feasible, clarify one point: “I agreed to this stage and want to discuss the next separately.” This guarantees no agreement but makes consideration's subject visible.

Describe your possible version: what remains, changes, and is not promised. Compare it with actual conditions and others' answers. If unavailable, the next step can be information gathering, transition preparation, or limited continuation on clear grounds. Every prior decision need not be canceled immediately. The practice is voluntary, not a diagnostic test, and promises no discovery of one true vocation.

After your step, ask whether present participation is clearer. One clarified obligation, revised role, personal consent, or honestly named uncertainty can suffice. A project remaining yours need not be rejected for autonomy's sake. If no longer suitable, examine consequences and change possibilities. You can accept influence, thank people, care for them, and participate in choosing how an idea once offered will inhabit your life now.

Key quotation

> *“Not fully accepting it as one's own.”*

Richard M. Ryan and Edward L. Deci, 2000, p.72, a fragment of the definition of introjection. The Russian rendering is editorial. It identifies a concept within self-determination theory without establishing your motive or declaring every socially proposed goal foreign.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Proximity and boundary
Mill ↔ participation in a life plan	Personal consideration matters; the philosophical argument is not a motivation experiment.
Self-determination theory ↔ adopting influence	External origin does not preclude considered adoption; the concept does not diagnose readers.
Gratitude ↔ revision	Support deserves recognition; particular obligations differ from an indefinite debt of an entire life.
Personal choice ↔ reciprocity	Project changes affect others; their desire can remain without assigning you its sole implementation.

This map is an authored comparison. The approaches are not declared identical; no healing effects or unified scientific law of authenticity follows.

Sources

1. John Stuart Mill. On Liberty, Chapter III. Project Gutenberg #34901 reproduces the Walter Scott Publishing edition with an introduction by W. L. Courtney. Relevant paragraphs on choice and experience, pp.108–111, were read. This printed edition's date was not established; electronic release is not presented as the original book's date.

2. Ryan R. M., Deci E. L. Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being, 2000. American Psychologist55(1),68–78. The relevant internalization section, pp.72–74, was read. Individual cited studies are not claimed as independently read; concepts retain their limits.

John Stuart Mill is a British philosopher presenting normative reasoning about liberty and individuality. Richard M. Ryan and Edward L. Deci are psychologists and developers of self-determination theory; roles are described through this work without claims about current positions. Biography does not substitute for argument or ground a diagnosis of the reader.

Tags

desire, another's project, personal choice, influence, internalization, personal significance, life plan, family, profession, gratitude, commitments, expectations, success, role, reciprocity, resources, revision, Mill, Ryan, Deci, autonomy, uncertainty, support, participation, everyday work, cost of a decision, refusal, family dream, extrinsic motivation, voluntary participation.

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.