

UNITED WISDOM

Independence and the Ability to Cooperate

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-11-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Independence and the Ability to Cooperate

Epigraph

> *the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee*
>
> — 1 Corinthians 12:21, exact interior fragment; displayed King James Version.

What this article is about

Independence is easily pictured as managing without help, and cooperation as abandoning your decision for a shared one. Asking someone then appears insufficiently independent, while disagreement appears an obstacle to joint work. This article examines more particular relations: what you understand, what you consent to, which part you answer for, and what participation you actually request from another person. An independent participant can need others' knowledge and actions; a shared result does not thereby become their sole property. Selected passages from Nicomachean Ethics, First Corinthians, and the Analects provide different grounds for discussing advice, varied contributions, and goodwill without flattery. Their ethical and religious frames remain. This is an original account of ordinary cooperation, not universal team management, a personality ranking, or an established way to avoid conflict. The centre is consent, an intelligible task, and responsibility that neither disappears through help nor becomes authority over another person's whole life.

I. Independence concerns participation rather than others' absence

Consider an invented task: you want to prepare a small public talk about familiar work. You understand the subject but cannot check the sound or organise the venue. Refusing help preserves an image of doing everything yourself without necessarily making the talk happen. Asking someone does not automatically hand them your decision about content. Distinguish your task and the needed contribution: what you want to say, which conditions are unknown, and what specific help you propose discussing. Independence here means participating with your own consent and grounds. It does not require personally producing every element, knowing everything beforehand, or treating inexperience as a virtue merely because it is yours.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Help itself does not certify independence either. Someone can formally request advice and then demand that the adviser answer for every consequence of their decision. They can accept another’s response without asking which question it addresses, then call participation inevitable. In both cases their own relation to the accepted part disappears. Understand enough for your consent: what is proposed, what remains unknown, and where the other’s answer ends. This does not require becoming a specialist in every field. Your accurate action may be asking a question or acknowledging insufficient information. Uncertainty can remain, but should not quietly turn into a promise whose content you have not accepted.

Limit the initial question. Instead of asking whether you can live independently of everyone, ask what you answer for in this activity and under which conditions you participate. This description promises no final verdict on your personality. It leaves an examinable subject: an accepted promise, available time, known information, and relation to the task. Others retain conditions of their own rather than becoming resources for your independence. If needed help is unavailable, the plan can change, another route be sought, or this form declined. None should be declared proof of strength or weakness in advance. Its significance depends on the situation; independence concerns participation in an answer you can actually call your own, including acknowledging another’s ability to decline.

II. Different contributions need not rank people

In First Corinthians 12:12–27, an image of the body relates different members and mutual care within a Christian community. Spirit, Christ, and God’s ordering remain in the passage’s foundation. A contemporary work group is not declared the same community, and the bodily image does not become a statement about readers’ health. The article asks a limited question about varied contributions: different functions do not make participation unnecessary. If one person frames content, another organises a meeting, and a third checks the invitation’s clarity, the shared activity’s usefulness does not depend on their actions being alike. Identify which parts are actually needed and who accepted them rather than expecting everyone to do everything in the same way and amount.

Dividing tasks may make sense, but it does not determine a whole person’s value through one function. A participant can complete a part and still need changed conditions. Someone not involved in this task does not become generally useless. An invented organiser may know the venue best without becoming the final authority on the talk’s content. An author can offer significant material without acquiring a right to everyone else’s time. Differences in competence concern particular subjects. Respect for a person and accurate assessment of their availability can coexist when contribution is described through content and conditions rather than a general rank governing every later conversation.

The biblical passage also attends to parts regarded as less honourable. The article derives no universal scheme for distributing roles. Its limited application asks whether a needed contribution disappears from attention because it is less visible. A prepared room, clear address, or timely warning can be conditions of a particular event. If you depend on that work, check its availability rather than merely welcoming the attractive central idea. Recognising necessity does not oblige someone to perform without consent. Your need for help remains your need until an actual agreement exists. An image of interrelation can therefore support attention to participation without creating an automatic right to demand any part of shared work from whoever can perform it.

III. Advice supports deliberation without taking over the decision

In Nicomachean Ethics III.3, Aristotle notes calling others into deliberation on important questions. Help appears within reasoning about action the person can undertake. For a modern situation this offers limited support: your knowledge may be insufficient, while discussion need not cancel your ability to choose. Advice supplies information, proposes grounds, or helps reveal a condition. Distinguish its content from confirmation of an outcome. Knowing one field does not make a listener’s answer a universal decision about your life. Ask which question a recommendation addresses, on what it rests, and what remains beyond their competence or the information they actually examined.

Aristotle distinguishes deliberation about means from deliberation about ends. The article retains this as a position in the selected ancient text, not a prohibition on revising a modern aim. Clarifying conditions may reveal that you no longer want the activity itself or cannot accept it. Further participation can then be discussed. In an invented example, you ask how to organise a meeting and learn that this format needs unavailable time. The answer does not compel acceptance; it identifies a condition under which the meeting could happen. Your action can involve changing the aim, seeking another option, or declining. But an actual limit cannot be removed merely by wishing to preserve the initial plan and treating it as already possible.

Help with examination does not transfer all responsibility to the adviser, but neither does it make their words indifferent. A message has content of its own: what they know, suppose, and promise to do. Avoid declaring a guess verified or treating another’s confidence as information nobody checked. If an answer proves mistaken, return to its grounds and particular consequences. The article determines no professional legal responsibility and does not suggest replacing professional help with informal advice. It asks a narrower question: what participation actually happened between you? An intelligible limit allows received help to be valued without gratitude becoming a duty to accept every conclusion, or independence becoming a duty to discover everything alone.

IV. Shared work needs an intelligible object of consent

Wanting to cooperate does not yet determine what was accepted. You can agree with an idea without being ready for its date, or support a meeting without accepting the presenter’s role. Express consent through a particular part: what you will do, under which conditions, and for how long you can answer for participation. This need not require a complex document or special language. An intelligible message that another can discuss may suffice. If each yes quietly means accepting every later request, participants lose the ability to plan. An appealing shared idea makes it especially significant not to treat emotional affiliation as agreed actions, resources, and indefinite availability.

Imagine an invented agreement for a small exhibition. You can select material, and an acquaintance offers to invite guests. That does not yet mean they will arrange the space, cover every cost, or remain available at all times. Discuss those parts separately if needed. Each person’s independence is preserved through understanding their part and answering a new offer, rather than rejecting everything shared. They can accept, alter a condition, or decline. Initial participation remains real without becoming an indefinite obligation. The plan gains a more accurate form when necessary actions are named, unknown conditions remain visible, and an absent participant is not concealed behind a collective we for which nobody has actually consented.

An accepted part does not disappear through a later wish for freedom. If you confirmed an action, others may build their steps on that message. Changed availability needs clarity: what is no longer confirmed, what is completed, and which consequences need discussion. This guarantees no acceptance of revision. The limited aim is not to require another to guess circumstances from your inward change. Interdependence here means real relations between particular actions, not shared ownership of participants’ lives. Declining control over the whole does not cancel responsibility for your message. A private area can remain while necessary information about accepted work is given, without a full personal history becoming compulsory payment for the right to request changed participation.

V. Disagreement can remain part of cooperation

In Analects XIII.23, Legge distinguishes affability from flattery. This gives the article limited support: goodwill need not confirm each proposal. You can want a shared result and disagree with one means of attaining it. A specific objection becomes discussable: insufficient time, an unclear task, or necessary participation missing. This does not automatically prove the objector right. It separates a question about means from a test of someone's entire loyalty. Cooperation loses content when every clarification counts as abandoning the shared activity and agreement appears only to preserve apparent calm. A pleasant conversation does not establish that participants understood and accepted the same task. An objection can concern the conditions for doing something together rather than a wish that the undertaking fail.

An invented group discusses a meeting time. One participant cannot attend then but can prepare needed material beforehand. Refusing one condition does not mean offering no contribution. Others may find the offer insufficient for this task; discuss that content. The time might change, a different part be accepted, or this particular cooperation recognised as currently impossible. None must become a verdict on the relationship. Do not present consent as established or turn difference into moral accusation. A person remains an independent participant when their response is really considered rather than awaited as formal confirmation of a decision already made for everyone in the name of shared interest. The need for a particular role can be real without creating someone's readiness to occupy it.

Disagreement is useful through clarifying a subject rather than the strength of opposition. Your own objection therefore needs grounds too. Do you know a condition is impossible or merely suppose so? Are you describing your availability or assigning someone else's possibilities? New information can change an assessment without destroying independence. The Confucian distinction becomes neither a universal discussion protocol nor a promise that courtesy will remove conflict. It draws attention to the difference between relating and flattering confirmation. Your response remains examinable and a shared step remains subject to actual agreement. Cooperation can then include different positions without requiring either acceptance of everything or objection to every suggestion as proof of independence. A considered change of mind retains the responsibility to communicate what was changed.

VI. Respect does not make every answer equally informed

Cooperation often joins different knowledge, but respect does not require declaring each opinion equally grounded. For a question about sound in a venue, experience of checking that venue bears on the task. For the content of your talk, knowledge of equipment does not replace understanding the material. Distinguish an answer’s field, grounds, and checked limits. Independence does not mean rejecting informed help to preserve status, or accepting any confident voice. You can consider another’s knowledge and ask clarifying questions without first becoming a specialist. Your own response concerns what you understand sufficiently to participate and which unknown part needs to remain explicit. Respect for a person can coexist with finding that a particular answer does not address the question you asked.

In Aristotle III.3, others’ help appears for an important question when one’s own deliberative resources are insufficient. The article derives no rule requiring every adviser to be followed or every important choice to be collective. Ask someone familiar with a particular task and distinguish information, supposition, and personal preference in their response. If nothing was checked, that limit remains visible even in a close relationship. If examination occurred, an unwelcome result does not become less factual. Deliberation preserves your choice when the question is not replaced by competition over who appears more confident, but the grounds actually relevant to present action and conditions are considered. Another person’s contribution can be significant without acquiring authority over subjects they did not examine.

Some questions need appropriate professional help, and informal cooperation provides insufficient grounds for deciding. This article does not propose assessing treatment, legal obligations, or financial risks through these philosophical images. Its examples concern ordinary shared activity. Within that scale, do not extend established competence to an entire person: a good organiser need not know your life aims, and an engaging author need not be able to check a venue. Precision can respect each contribution better than general praise followed by an unsuitable task. A knowledge limit can be acknowledged while cooperation continues where participation is grounded. Someone need not be declared inadequate because they cannot answer for everything.

VII. Help can be limited and real

Limited help can be difficult to accept when compared with an image of complete support. Someone can check an invitation without hosting the event, or discuss a question today without accompanying the whole project. That limit does not make the contribution unreal. Ask whether it fits the actual task and examine the missing part separately. Interrelation does not create a right to indefinite availability. After one help is accepted, another request remains a new offer until consent exists. Gratitude concerns completed participation rather than an obligation to give the adviser your later decision. Both people’s independence is preserved when the received part is recognised through its content and not silently enlarged into general authority over a person. A helpful step may end while respect and the relationship remain.

In an invented case, an acquaintance helps prepare conditions for renting a room for a meeting. They do not promise to conclude an agreement or answer for each later organisational task. The list’s usefulness does not depend on becoming a permanent participant. Accept the help, clarify its limits, and decide which next step is possible. If the undertaking cannot happen without further contribution, recognise that condition. A good beginning is not confirmed readiness of every part. Cooperation remains particular: some actions are completed, others need new agreement, and the whole result is not established. Neither a strong wish to finish nor help already received removes the difference between possibility and actual participation. A completed contribution can be appreciated without declaring the unfinished undertaking certain.

Your own help needs an accurate offer too. If one part is available, you need not promise more to appear useful. Make the limit intelligible before another builds an entire plan on it. Name available time, needed information, and where the task ends. This need not make the conversation cold: the recipient can decide whether that help fits. Mutual care in First Corinthians has a religious ground; the article does not turn it into a duty to complete every request. An ordinary offer can retain care through honest content: what is promised can actually be accepted and completed, while an unavailable part is not concealed behind a general assurance of helping with everything. A smaller reliable offer differs from a larger promise whose conditions remain unknown.

VIII. A shared result does not become sole control

Cooperation links actions, but a shared result depends on conditions no participant controls completely. You can answer for prepared material without guaranteeing attendance, or for an invitation without guaranteeing every reply. This does not make an accepted part insignificant. Distinguish completed action, expected result, and what depends on others' consent. Presenting expectation as a promised fact makes a plan less accurate. Calling every unknown an absence of responsibility removes the already accepted part. An independent participant can name a contribution clearly enough to be examined and leave others a real ability to respond instead of attributing their future behaviour to the plan as a condition already obtained. Responsibility becomes more particular without becoming either total control or indifference to consequences.

In III.3, Aristotle includes possibilities involving friends' help. The article does not turn this account into a right to assign friends' actions as means of your choice. Each person's modern consent matters separately. The image of different members in First Corinthians does not establish a manager of everyday decisions either; its ground is a Christian community and the body of Christ. The original comparison distinguishes your part from the whole. Preparing a task does not oblige another to accept; refusal does not erase your completed part, but the whole result may become unavailable. Recognising this limit does not diminish independence. It allows a further step to rest on actual circumstances instead of imagined control over every participant.

Consequences can affect others even when a result was not fully controllable. An invitation with the wrong time needs correction; if material will not be ready, participants need warning. Absence of guaranteed success does not justify an inaccurate promise. Responsibility remains through actual participation: information, accepted actions, available communication, and revision. The article sets no exhaustive legal measure of that responsibility. Within an ordinary task, avoid replacing it with two extremes: answering for everything, or answering for nothing because others participate too. Between them remains a particular part that can be named, examined, and corrected with affected people where necessary. Acknowledging limits concerns accuracy of responsibility rather than removing the significance of your own words or actions.

IX. Declining a new task can preserve clarity about an earlier one

Shared activity sometimes expands gradually. First you agreed to prepare one text; then meetings, correspondence, and a new part appeared without separate discussion. Independence allows noticing that initial consent and expansion are different circumstances. Confirm the earlier part and decline the new one. If the parts cannot practically be separated, discuss what is now possible instead of pretending the difference is absent. Refusal is neither justified nor condemned in advance: the promise and conditions matter. It can clarify participation actually accepted when communicated in time and not used to disappear from responsibility for a result others reasonably expected. Your earlier agreement need not include every subsequent request, while a later limit still needs an intelligible relation to what you already promised.

An invented participant prepared a guest list but cannot host the entire event. They can state this without fully explaining personal reasons. The organiser can seek another form and say that a meeting cannot happen without a host. Yet needing a host does not turn the person who prepared the list into an already appointed participant. Cooperation preserves agency when a new response has force and the plan can account for its consequences. If refusal makes this format impossible, recognise that result without demanding one person remove every difficulty as proof of goodwill. The handed-over list remains a result of its own. It need not be called useless merely because further participation did not arise. Limits can change the whole plan without rewriting the history of completed help.

Another’s ability to decline matters even after you invested heavily in a plan. Your work can be significant without establishing someone else’s consent. Existing agreements and consequences of revision can be discussed; participation never accepted cannot silently be added. Here the Confucian distinction between goodwill and flattery supports the original question of a genuine response, while Aristotle’s attention to possible action supports examining conditions for a further step. The sources retain different grounds. The article derives no way to guarantee fair distribution of every difficulty. Its limited aim is preserving the difference between request, promise, and fact, so cooperation does not demand confirmation of every expansion to retain a relationship and an appearance of unity. A real shared task includes responses that can alter its possible form.

X. Particular results remain after shared action

When an activity ends, cooperation invites a single assessment: it worked or it did not. Yet one word may hide several results. Material was prepared, a meeting happened, some invitees stayed away, and a participant changed future availability. Distinguish completed, unknown, and unobtained aspects. This avoids attributing shared success to one person or distributing failure without checking circumstances. Independence after action involves naming your part and hearing others' information. You can value a contribution and notice an error, appreciate help and decline the same conditions next time. None of these responses needs to become a general judgement of each participant's ability to cooperate in every later activity. Accurate assessment concerns the task that happened, not a total verdict on a person's relational worth.

A further agreement does not arise automatically from an earlier task done well. Offer continuation, name new conditions, and hear a response. Gratitude for the shared result cannot replace that agreement. If the earlier form was difficult, discuss a particular subject: time, extent, division of tasks, or missing information. Change need not mean cooperation was mistaken; it can consider what became visible only through action. But an appealing new plan is not yet confirmed either. Independence and cooperation meet where a next step remains an offer actual participants can examine, instead of continuation of an indefinite obligation. A once-accepted promise does not permanently remove their ability to clarify availability and consent. Completed work can be acknowledged without assigning future work in its name.

The article's main question remains proportionate: can you name what you accepted and what depends on another's actual response? Help does not erase independence when your participation retains grounds and clear consent. Independence does not exclude cooperation when another remains a participant rather than a way to certify your independence. Different sources reveal particular distinctions; their religious and ethical frames do not merge into a shared team doctrine. The original conclusion concerns ordinary activity: understand a task sufficiently to answer, respect knowledge and help limits, communicate changes, and recognise completed parts. A shared result can then matter without promising identical positions or giving one participant authority over everyone else's later choices. Cooperation remains a relation between actual responses rather than an appearance of agreement covering unexamined conditions.

What this means in practice

Take one ordinary shared task. Name your accepted contribution and the needed contribution of another person. Separately identify what is agreed, what is merely proposed, and which information is missing. No general ranking of yourself as independent or dependent is required. Distinguish your consent, knowledge of conditions, and particular help without which this form cannot happen. Needing help does not appoint its performer or make another's participation an established fact.

Formulate one clarification for a participant: which part they can accept, on what grounds they answer, or until when the offer remains available. Communicate your own availability equally clearly where your part is involved. New conditions need actual agreement. When revising an accepted promise, name what is completed, what is no longer confirmed, and consequences needing discussion. A complete personal history is not required to communicate a particular change.

After action, distinguish contribution and shared result. What was actually done, what remains unknown, and which next step needs a new response? You can thank someone without giving them authority over your later life choices. You can recognise your error without attributing control over every other action to yourself. Such examination guarantees neither agreement nor success. It preserves the object of responsibility and each side's agency within an actual agreement.

Key quotation

> *We call in others to aid us in deliberation*

— Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics III.3, exact interior fragment; W. D. Ross translation.

Connections between traditions

1. **Different parts and one's own action.** First Corinthians 12:14–21 relates different members in a body; Aristotle in Nicomachean Ethics III.3 examines action available to an agent, including others' help. The original comparison distinguishes needed contribution and one's participation: help may be necessary without turning the entire result into one person's action. The boundary is that Christ's body and the Spirit's action differ from ancient deliberation about means and a modern project. The bodily image does not appoint work roles; Aristotle's mention of friends does not establish their consent. Each modern contribution needs a separate response. Needing help does not make it another's already accepted obligation or determine their availability.

2. **Discussion and a response without flattery.** Nicomachean Ethics III.3 includes others' help with important deliberation; Analects XIII.23 in Legge distinguishes affability from flattery. The article's common mechanism allows advice to matter without requiring acceptance for the relationship's sake. A participant clarifies grounds and retains the ability to disagree. The boundary is that ancient deliberation about means and a Confucian quality of relating form neither a shared consultation protocol nor a correctness guarantee. The article does not prohibit revising a modern aim or make every objection grounded. Competence, checked information, and one's own consent remain different conditions for a further action. Warmth can coexist with examining an answer's scope rather than treating it as a total decision.

3. **Care without sameness.** First Corinthians 12:22–26 considers attention to less honourable members and mutual care; Analects XIII.23 distinguishes affability from flattery. The original map's shared field is that relating to a participant need not depend on an identical function or confirmation of each suggestion. Less visible contributions can be recognised and disagreement discussed specifically. The boundary is that the Christian ground of community differs from the Confucian distinction in relating; neither text establishes modern agreements or promises no conflict. Care does not become a duty to fulfil every request. Goodwill does not make each answer equally informed or already accepted. Necessary contribution and consent remain separate rather than being supplied by an image of shared belonging.

4. **Possibility and the whole.** Nicomachean Ethics III.3 relates deliberation to what can be done and mentions friends' help; First Corinthians 12:12–21 retains many distinct members within one body. The article's common mechanism distinguishes your completed contribution from an attained shared result. Prepared material does not guarantee attendance, and another's help does not give you complete control. The boundary is that ancient action classification and unity in Christ differ from modern organisation; friends' consent cannot be derived from needing their help. Comparison removes no particular promises or necessary notices of changed conditions, but gives one participant no authority over every other response. Contribution retains significance without being enlarged into a guarantee of the whole.

5. **A new task and a genuine response.** Analects XIII.23 separates affability from flattery; Nicomachean Ethics III.3 examines grounds for possible action and help with deliberation. The map's common mechanism keeps continuation a new offer where it expands accepted participation. Goodwill can remain while a limit is named and another form considered. The boundary is that the texts give neither a modern contract theory nor a universal distribution of difficulties. Refusal is not justified automatically, and agreement is not correct merely because the tone is pleasant. Earlier promises, new information, and consequences for participants need separate clarity. A completed part remains real without establishing indefinite participation. A genuine response can change a plan without erasing the history of help.

Primary sources

1. **1 Corinthians 12:12–27.** Checked verses, KJV. All 16 verses and version labels read; epigraph: interior 12:21 fragment. Christian body of Christ/Spirit foundations remain; the image appoints no work roles or health claim.

2. **Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics III.3.** Checked W. D. Ross translation. Complete chapter read; key quotation: an interior fragment on calling others into deliberation. Translator header reused from actual reading of the same URL in this continuing task. Underlying print date not established; historical medical and other examples are not professional recommendations.

3. **Analects XIII.23.** Checked James Legge translation. Complete episode reopened; translator/digitizer header truthfully reused from actual prior reading in this task. Chinese/separate notes unused. English quotations retain shown KJV/Ross; RU renderings are United Wisdom's own translations through those versions, not a claimed published Russian edition.

Tags

independence, cooperation, participation, consent, responsibility, help, advice, competence, knowledge, conditions, shared work, shared result, contribution, promise, request, refusal, revision, limits, goodwill, disagreement, clarity, relationships, Aristotle, Confucius, Corinthians, Analects, Nicomachean Ethics, mutual care, particular task, 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.