

UNITED WISDOM

The Non-Transferability of One’s Own Choice

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-04-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Non-Transferability of One’s Own Choice

Epigraph

> *“Without counsel purposes are disappointed: but in the multitude of counsellors they are established.” — Proverbs15:22, King James Version.*

What this article is about

Others can provide information, suggest alternatives, carry out an assigned task, and help examine consequences. Their participation nevertheless does not always answer which alternative someone actually accepts for their own action. Non-transferability of choice here means that boundary of acceptance, not a prohibition on consultation, representation, or professional work. This article concerns ordinary voluntary decisions; it determines no legal capacity, clinical assessment, or freedom under coercion. Aristotle's deliberation, Epictetus's Stoic distinction, and biblical counsel retain different foundations. They form no proven procedure for infallible decisions. Original distinctions identify accessible action, missing information, relevant competence, and whose consent is needed. Responsibility does not mean controlling every outcome or deciding everything alone. It calls for a more honest account of one's own participation while retaining uncertainty, actual constraints, and the independence of other people potentially affected by a decision.

I. Advice and acceptance are different actions

Imagine someone invited into a small shared project. One acquaintance lists benefits, another highlights workload, and a third offers help with materials. Different responses have been received in this hypothetical case, but the invited person's participation remains unagreed. Advice does not become a decision simply by sounding persuasive or coming from someone close. Information about an offer, an adviser's evaluation, and one's own acceptance of particular conditions need distinction. A good argument can be accepted without accepting the entire alternative. Part of an offer can be welcomed while the rest remains uncertain. This requires no distrust of everyone; it preserves what was communicated, considered, and actually accepted.

“I was told to do this” explains part of a history without necessarily describing participation's entire form. Was it a suggestion, request, professional instruction within a particular field, or pressure? Which conditions were understood and what information was absent? Facts decide

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

the answer rather than a general idea of complete independence. This article resolves neither coercion nor restricted decision-making capacity. In an ordinary voluntary question, the passage from a heard response to accepted action matters. It can be discussed with others without pretending everything was considered alone. Yet consent cannot be treated as already given merely because advice was received and its author feels certain of being right.

II. Choice concerns an accessible subject

In Book III of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle connects deliberation with what can be done and retains others' help for substantial questions. His account of means is neither a modern theory of every life goal nor a legal responsibility rule. The relevant subject here is accessible action. In our project, someone may clarify an offer, accept a known part, or communicate an inability to participate. They cannot choose another's readiness to cooperate or establish future success through desire alone. A possible response needs consideration within actual means and conditions, without turning every imagined desirable circumstance into an already accessible alternative.

Currently impossible action does not make inquiry meaningless. A missing condition can be identified and its clarification's accessibility examined. Yet decision's boldness cannot conceal absent conditions. An invitation may depend on access to materials nobody has confirmed. Agreeing to consider participation differs from promising a completed result. This preserves interest without excessive certainty and requires no endless search around every constraint. An honest outcome may acknowledge that a form is currently inaccessible. Choice's non-transferability concerns what someone actually accepts and does within their accessible part, rather than an obligation to create the entire external world required for a desired outcome.

III. Delegation does not remove independence

A material check or technical preparation can be assigned to another. The performer accepts their task, while the person retains a question about its purpose and the terms on which it was requested. This is no mandatory arrangement for every relationship, but a distinction among possible subjects. Delegating action can be reasonable because a performer has relevant expertise. Non-transferability requires neither doing every operation personally, checking everything unaided, nor rejecting representation. Yet an assignment needs clear content. What has been entrusted, what may be decided within the performer's field, and which changes require discussion? Actual conditions and agreements determine these questions.

In our project, someone can be asked to prepare accessible material on an agreed topic without becoming the author of every life goal of the person requesting it. Nor does the

requester gain a right to treat professional judgment as a button to be pressed on demand. A participant may say a task exceeds competence or needs different conditions. This is an independent person's answer. If fulfillment is impossible, the actual situation needs examination rather than accusation that someone inadequately supports our choice. Both retain independence: one accepts participation, another a particular task. Each person's agreement concerns a subject of its own and replaces no consent of the other.

Even automated technical assistance cannot itself decide acceptance of a result. A prepared list or calculation has provenance, conditions, and limits that need understanding. This requires no repeated checking of every simple operation; verification should match the question's significance and known constraints. A tool should not be credited with authority to decide what it cannot know about someone's circumstances. When a result enters shared work, participants need its actual status understood. Provisional material does not become agreed action because it looks complete. Technical delegation can reduce operations while retaining the need to name what someone accepts for their own participation.

IV. Epictetus's distinction grants no power over everything

At the Enchiridion's beginning, Epictetus distinguishes one's own actions from what is not within one's power. This is a Stoic normative grounding, not a claim that everyone can completely control every feeling or circumstance. Here it frames a narrower question: which part of proposed action is actually mine? In our project, consent or refusal can be communicated without assigning another a desire to participate. Accessible information can be checked without making an unknown result already known. The source supplies no clinical or legal ruling and permits no explanation of another's difficulty solely through an inadequate attitude. Actual constraints remain relevant while someone identifies their part more clearly.

An ability to act should also be distinguished from a guaranteed consequence. An honest clarification may receive no answer. An agreed task may be fulfilled while shared work misses an expected outcome. Whether the action was appropriate still requires its subject, conditions, and facts. Yet an unwanted outcome does not automatically prove that everything should have been done differently. Responsibility for one's part means no authorship of every circumstance. This contemporary distinction beside the Stoic text excuses no indifference to consequences. Known effects on another need consideration; unknown effects cannot become guaranteed benefit or already realized harm through assumption alone.

V. An adviser's competence has limits

Advice can be valuable on one subject while answering no others. A participant understands the project's technical conditions but not an invitee's personal commitments. A friend knows their history but lacks information about the new task. Neither adviser becomes useless. Their limits clarify which answer can be obtained. Material accessibility needs one set of grounds, consent to workload another. No person's certainty should be sought as an automatic closure of every unknown. Necessary information can come from different participants while what none has established remains visible, without someone claiming it established on everyone else's behalf.

For substantial medical, legal, financial, or other specialized consequences, a feeling of independence replaces no relevant expertise. This article decides no specific action in those fields. It preserves a distinction between a professional question and one's participation in discussing it. Someone can clarify what was explained, which information is missing, and what needs further examination. A professional likewise retains responsibilities within their field; these cannot be transferred entirely to a recipient through talk of personal choice. Non-transferability removes no actual rules, agreements, or participant duties. A difficult question first needs its conditions known rather than a philosophical phrase used as ready permission for any step.

For example, in an ordinary technical task someone may ask whether material suits an intended use. A professional's answer concerns the material's condition and task criteria, not whether joining a project is the only correct life choice. Conversely, uncertainty about personal participation makes no factual check unnecessary where others will already use a result. These assessments can differ in clarity. A definite technical answer can coexist with an open personal decision. This is no logical mistake. It shows that different subjects need different grounds and one answer's completeness does not automatically extend to the entire discussion of someone's future action.

VI. Many advisers do not vote on our life

Proverbs15:22 connects counsel with establishing purposes; understanding and a timely word remain nearby. This is biblical wisdom within a religious book, not a prescribed expert group size or a majority-vote guarantee of success. Here consultation can be retained without treating it as abandonment of one's choice. Yet identical answers' number cannot replace examination of grounds. Advisers may repeat one unverified evaluation, know equally little, or discuss different questions. In our project, five confident approvals establish no material access if nobody checked it. One particular fact may concern action more directly than a general chorus of support or concern.

Disagreement need not signal that choosing is forbidden for now. It can reflect different grounds and available information. The precise divergence can be clarified: facts, workload, relation to a goal, or an assumed future result. Sometimes more information is needed; sometimes an actual difference of preferences remains. This article offers no counting mechanism for correct advice. It preserves the subject so that acceptance does not disappear behind others' votes. Consultation remains real even where no answer can emerge as a vote's outcome. Others contribute knowledge and judgments rather than becoming collective owners of the entire future life of the person seeking help.

VII. Another's consent is not part of our choice

Someone may decide to join a project with a friend. Desire establishes neither the friend's readiness nor already shared conditions. An actual response is needed. Another can support a goal while declining workload, accept part of a task, or require more information. These cannot be replaced by a confident account of cooperation's benefits. Non-transferability works mutually: personal acceptance does not possess another's independence. Our example distinguishes “I am ready under these conditions” from “we are already participating.” The second needs grounds the first cannot supply, even between close people acting with good intentions.

Consent also concerns a particular subject. Permission for one material does not necessarily include every record; help with one task means no continual availability. Changed conditions prevent automatic transfer of an earlier answer. This is a boundary of ordinary discussion, not a universal legal rule. Actual consequences depend on agreements and the field of action. Someone can acknowledge that a form remains impossible without another's participation. This preserves a right to personal interest while showing that shared-world action involves several independent people. Honest acceptance of one's part includes another's response rather than a promise that choosing alone must make every remaining condition agree.

VIII. Postponement also needs a precise account

Sometimes an answer cannot yet be given. Information, time, or clarity about conditions may be missing. Postponement can be stated without pretending consent or declaring permanent refusal. Another participant needs the actual state. If shared work relies on a response, silence may leave uncertainty affecting their action. Yet not every request requires an immediate decision. Conversational conditions and existing agreements matter. This article sets no universal deadline. It distinguishes an open personal question, communicated delay, and an unsupported promise to answer, so that uncertainty is not concealed behind the appearance of already accepted participation.

What exactly is being awaited: facts, explanation of conditions, another's response, or complete certainty? These have different subjects. Further information can matter while final certainty remains unavailable after it arrives. This excuses no haste against facts. It clarifies the missing answer and whether the chosen means can obtain it. If postponement's condition is unknown even to the person, that uncertainty can be named. No compulsory sequence of steps needs invention. A provisional state remains permissible while it is neither presented as consent nor used to conceal changed conditions from people already relying on participation.

Not all inaction is a clearly chosen refusal. Circumstances outside someone's control can restrict action, so every missing step cannot be assigned complete freedom followed by blame for all consequences. In an ordinary voluntary question, accessible action can be identified: communicate that no answer exists yet, clarify a missing fact, or acknowledge an inaccessible form. This makes no general difficulty a simple task. It separates a particular possibility from an all-encompassing demand to manage life immediately. If that possibility is absent, the account must retain its limit. Philosophical discussion replaces no information about coercion, condition, rules, or actual circumstances defining a situation.

IX. Responsibility is not power over the outcome

A particular action can be accepted with incomplete knowledge of the future. This makes no risk automatically permissible and removes no consideration of known effects. Yet responsibility should not be described as advance control of the entire outcome. In our project, someone can state work's limits honestly, fulfill an agreement, and report an obstacle. Other circumstances may still change the shared outcome. Action, its known grounds, and later information need distinction. Factual assessment requires neither advance self-justification nor blame for everything. It preserves one's part without possessing all that occurs in a shared undertaking or other participants' lives.

“I chose it myself” likewise makes no consequence exclusively personal. Effects on another's work, materials, or time retain a shared side. What was agreed and has changed needs examination. Personal acceptance grants no right to ignore another's response. Yet nobody should be required to guarantee what known conditions make unguaranteeable. Honest description, suitable competence, and actual participation matter rather than a promise of an invulnerable decision. This determines neither legal fault nor immunity. Specialized consequences need relevant rules and information; a philosophical article retains its competence boundary even when discussing human responsibility.

X. Revision can be one's own action

After participation begins, conditions may prove misunderstood or substantially changed. Revision need not abandon independence. It can retain acceptance when information is considered honestly and affected participants are told of change. Yet dissatisfaction with an outcome alone establishes no pointlessness of the earlier decision. What was accessible then, what is known now, and what needs alteration matter. In our project, missing material can change a promised form of work. Changed personal interest is also possible but concerns something else. These cannot be merged merely because both leave someone unwilling to continue exactly as before.

A newly accepted answer can be stated without renaming history retrospectively. Earlier participation had its own conditions; a new decision needs grounds. Changed promises retain discussion of specific consequences. This requires no justification of every private thought before everyone. It concerns actual effects and agreements. Revision also requires no proof of a final alternative found forever. Part of an inquiry can remain open while an accessible change is accepted. Independence appears not only in an initially confident answer but in acknowledging error, clarifying conditions, and avoiding presentation of new understanding as knowledge supposedly possessed from the beginning.

For example, someone may have accepted material preparation believing access to sources was obtained. Later it emerges that permission remains under discussion. Honest revision names the difference: willingness remains while a promised form is unconfirmed. A good purpose grants no authority to decide that the material owner's permission is unnecessary. Nor must an earlier interest become false through a newly discovered boundary. Information changes action's accessibility without automatically changing every ground. Here independent acceptance means avoiding desire's presentation as a fulfilled condition or continuation of a promise as though a factual obstacle disappeared without another participant's response.

XI. One's own part requires no isolation

Someone can choose with others' participation and retain connection afterward. Advisers need not disappear once an answer is accepted; participants need not share every ground to perform an accessible common task. Consequences can be discussed, clarification requested, and other people's information acknowledged. Non-transferability requires no performance of being thought's sole source. In our project, many conversations may prepare a good answer. Acceptance of participation under known conditions remains personal. This retains gratitude and boundaries together: assistance matters without turning a recipient's entire life into a debt to follow every later recommendation from a once helpful and attentive listener.

A decision differing from a loved one's recommendation need not destroy a relationship. Its subject can be explained without demanding total approval or demeaning an adviser for incomplete coincidence. Another can retain their evaluation. This guarantees no calm discussion and instructs nobody to endure pressure. Actual treatment and relationship conditions matter. Independence is not proved by compulsory conflict, nor closeness by identical choices. Different answers and accessible participation can coexist. If cooperation becomes impossible, its subject should be named. Every divergence need not become final proof that someone either cannot decide independently or can never remain connected with others.

XII. Accept one's part without a final guarantee

Non-transferable choice supplies no single answer to every life question. It marks a boundary: advice, fulfilled assignments, and professional evaluation matter without always replacing acceptance of accessible action. This operates among constraints and relationships rather than outside the world. Established conditions, unknowns, and whose consent is needed must remain visible. Someone can accept limited participation, acknowledge an inaccessible form, or retain an open question through honest notice. Each answer needs a subject. Neither independence nor help should become an attractive label hiding actual circumstances from oneself or people arranging their actions around a response.

A quiet formulation is possible: this information came from others; these conditions are understood; this participation is accepted now; that outcome cannot yet be promised. It may not reveal an infallible way of living but retains grounds, limits, and room for change. Historical sources consider action, limits of power, and counsel differently; no compulsory common doctrine is formed. Further decisions remain connected to particular people, conditions, and appropriate competence. One's part can be small without disappearing between dependence on another's voice and a demand to decide everything alone. Accepting it means participating more clearly in an actual question while retaining honesty toward unknowns and other people's independence.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary voluntary question on which advice has already been received. Do not use this practice to decide a substantial medical, legal, or financial matter independently without relevant expertise. It describes participation rather than determining capacity, health, or a correct life path. Where coercion or inaccessible conditions matter, do not label the situation freely chosen merely to fit the exercise.

Record the decision's subject as an action. What is being accepted, communicated, or performed? Name known conditions and unknowns separately. Wanting an outcome does not establish accessibility. Another's response or access to materials remains a separate condition that personal consent alone cannot create. Every question need not be closed immediately.

Examine the advice. Which part is verifiable information, which the adviser's judgment, and which a proposed action? What grounds are accessible, and where does competence end? If people answered different subjects, do not combine responses as votes on an entire life. One substantial fact can be clarified, or a needed answer acknowledged as unavailable. Another's certainty replaces no information; one's doubt makes no known fact automatically false.

Distinguish assistance from acceptance next. What task may be entrusted to another under actual conditions? What may a performer decide in their field? Which participation do you accept, and whose consent remains necessary? Doing everything unaided is no required proof of independence. Professional work also means no transfer of every personal goal and circumstance to its performer. Shared action retains several participants with limits of their own.

Finally state a current response without promising every future outcome. It may accept a known part, decline an inaccessible form, or communicate postponement with uncertainty identified honestly. If an existing commitment changes, name who needs discussion of consequences. Retain the information grounding the response so new facts can be distinguished from earlier ones. This practice guarantees no success and removes no specialized duties. It clarifies one's part in choosing without possessing another's independence or requiring power over every circumstance.

Key quotation

> *“We deliberate about things that are in our power and can be done;” — Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics III.3, exact opening clause at displayed68, W.D.Ross English translation.*

Connections between traditions

1. **Accessible action: Aristotle and Epictetus.** III.3 concerns deliberation about the possible; Enchiridion1 distinguishes one's own from external things. Both clarify action's subject. Boundary: Aristotelian choice of means and Stoic power have different grounds and prove no complete freedom under coercion.

2. **Counsel remains: Aristotle and Proverbs.** III.3 invites help in substantial deliberation;15:22 values counsel. Both preserve assistance alongside independence. Boundary: normative ethics and religious wisdom differ; neither specifies expert numbers or guarantees success.

3. **One's part and the outcome: Epictetus and contemporary acceptance.** Distinguishing actions from external things helps avoid possessing every circumstance. Both delimit power's subject. Boundary: this article promises no emotional control, supplies no clinical assessment, and removes no known consequences.

4. **Advice and assignment: Aristotle and contemporary shared work.** III.3 retains deliberation and others' help; here information, professional action, and acceptance of participation are distinguished. Both concern action among relationships. Boundary: this original extension is no Aristotelian rule of modern representation or legal liability.

5. **Several grounds without ownership of a life: three sources and an original boundary.** Possible action, power's limits, and counsel's value clarify one's part through attention to subjects. Boundary: reading them together forms no single doctrine, proven decision technique, or permission to choose for another.

Primary sources

1. Aristotle, Nicomachean EthicsIII, W.D.Ross translation. Earlier actual III.1–3 reading retained; complete III.3 displayed65–80 reread for the new quote. Possible action, deliberation, and consultation71 adopted; key opening clause68 checked exactly. Adjacent III.5 claims about illness and blame not adopted. Greek and print edition not collated.

2. Epictetus, Enchiridion, Elizabeth Carter translation.1 and29 previously actually read; only1 on one's actions and external things used here.29 supplies no additional grounding. No clinical rule, unlimited freedom, or complete emotional control inferred. Greek and print edition not collated.

3. Proverbs15, KJV. Earlier21–23 reading retained; displayed1–33 checked freshly for the epigraph, with only21–23 adopted.15:22 checked exactly. Modern commentary excluded; Hebrew and a1611 facsimile not collated.

Named English translations used; Russian quotations rendered by United Wisdom. Short attributed quotation establishes no worldwide rights clearance, source import, or vectorization permission. Historical grounds prove neither exercise efficacy, infallible choice, nor specialized medical, legal, or financial decisions.

Tags

personal choice, non-transferability, advice, acceptance, independence, responsibility, competence, assistance, assignment, representation, decision, deliberation, conditions, means, consent, boundaries, constraints, uncertainty, consequences, revision, postponement, shared work, action, information, Aristotle, Epictetus, Proverbs, philosophy, religious foundations, United Wisdom

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.