

THE FREEDOM TO EXIST

Volume III

Less Is More

Self-Sufficiency, Simplicity, and Freedom

Juan Segurola

First edition · v1.0 · EN

© 2026 Juan Segurola
All Rights Reserved

Contents

Part I • The Meaning of Enough	3
Chapter 1. Enough as a Deliberate Choice	3
Chapter 2. Needs, Desires, and Expectations	4
Chapter 3. Freedom from Consumption	5
Part II • Dependence and Practical Autonomy	6
Chapter 4. Practical Skills and Everyday Autonomy	6
Chapter 5. Delegating Without Losing Agency	7
Chapter 6. Time of Our Own and Commitments	8
Chapter 7. Simplicity Without Imposition	9
Chapter 8. Choosing What Deserves to Remain	10
Part III • Security, Work, and Tools	10
Chapter 9. Security, Uncertainty, and the Desire to Accumulate	10
Chapter 10. Comfort, Dependence, and Resilience	11
Chapter 11. Work, Money, and a Sense of Enough	12
Chapter 12. Technology as a Tool, Not a Master	12
Part IV • Places, Relationships, and Responsibility	13
Chapter 13. The Home as a Practice of Freedom	13
Chapter 14. Relationships Beyond Possession	13
Chapter 15. Ecological Limits and Unequal Responsibility	14
Chapter 16. Care and Material Interdependence	15
Part V • Limits and Synthesis	15
Chapter 17. Voluntary Simplicity and Social Injustice	15
Chapter 18. When Less Is Not Better	16
Chapter 19. Building a Sustainable Personal Practice	17
Chapter 20. Sufficiency, Autonomy, and a Life of One's Own	17
Epilogue • A Sufficiency That Can Be Revised	18
Bibliographic context	18
Additional bibliography	19

Part I · The Meaning of Enough

Chapter 1. Enough as a Deliberate Choice

The phrase “less is more” is useful only if it remains a question rather than becoming a command. Less of what, for whom, under which circumstances, and at what cost? A person who has no reliable access to shelter, food, healthcare, or time is not made freer simply by being asked to want less. The question of sufficiency becomes meaningful when it starts from actual needs and opportunities instead of an aesthetic ideal of emptiness.

To say “this is enough for me” can be an act of self-government. It is a way of identifying the point at which an additional purchase, obligation, achievement, or possession ceases to contribute meaningfully to one’s life. But that point cannot be specified once and for all: it changes with age, disability, caregiving, employment, community, and unforeseen events. The freedom to judge what is enough includes the freedom to revise the judgment.

Sufficiency is not the same as deprivation. Deprivation names an absence of goods or opportunities that are needed to live with dignity; sufficiency names a considered relationship to goods and opportunities once their role has been examined. The distinction matters because a voluntary decision to reduce one’s possessions cannot be equated with involuntary poverty. Their outward appearance may resemble each other while their conditions of choice are radically different.

Nor does deciding what is enough entail withdrawing from shared responsibility. A lighter private life may coexist with extensive commitments to children, relatives, neighbors, or a profession. It may even make those commitments more sustainable by reducing avoidable demands. The relevant measure is not the number of objects left on a shelf but whether the resulting arrangement increases the capacity to act with integrity, attention, and fairness.

Consider two households that choose to own fewer objects. One has strong public services, secure income, and convenient access to repairs; the other has unstable employment and must travel far for basic services. What looks like the same lifestyle choice will involve different degrees of risk and effort. A philosophy of simplicity must be sufficiently attentive to context to avoid treating privilege as universal wisdom.

A useful first practice is therefore descriptive, not moralizing: identify what is essential, what brings genuine pleasure, what supports relationships, what is held only out of habit, and what creates burdens that exceed its value. The aim is not to produce the smallest possible life but one that can be inhabited more deliberately. Enough is a revisable boundary drawn in service of living, never a verdict on the worth of those who draw it elsewhere.

The question of what counts as enough has an established philosophical context. Harry Frankfurt’s argument that economic equality lacks intrinsic moral importance and that sufficiency is morally central distinguishes the moral

importance of having enough from comparisons between persons. This book similarly asks about thresholds, but insists that a threshold must remain sensitive to access, caregiving obligations and the capacity to refuse exploitation. This is a thematic dialogue, not a claim that its argument derives from Frankfurt. [1]

A choice is not fully autonomous merely because nobody commands it. The relevant counterfactual is whether a person could reject the option without losing housing, health care, or social standing. A sufficiency threshold must therefore be revisable and protected by institutions, not only by individual resolve.

Chapter 2. Needs, Desires, and Expectations

Human needs, desires, and expectations overlap, but they are not interchangeable. A need concerns conditions whose absence can seriously impair life or agency; a desire identifies something attractive; an expectation adds a prediction or felt entitlement about what should occur. Distinguishing them does not belittle pleasure or aspiration. It makes visible the very different reasons that can lie behind the same impulse to obtain something.

A desire does not become illegitimate merely because it is not necessary. Music, travel, beauty, tools, celebrations, and play may enlarge human experience beyond mere survival. The difficulty emerges when a desirable possibility hardens into a condition for self-respect: “unless I obtain this, my life is incomplete.” That transition can turn an optional good into a continuing source of pressure.

Expectations are especially powerful because they often remain unexamined. We may expect our income to rise every year, our home to resemble those we see online, or our free time to be filled with memorable experiences. None of these predictions is guaranteed, and many depend on conditions outside individual control. Disappointment becomes more manageable when we ask whether an expectation was a promise, a reasonable plan, a social comparison, or merely a habit of thought.

The categories must nevertheless remain open to individual circumstances. A device that is a luxury for one person may be indispensable for someone who relies on assistive technology. Reliable transport may be essential where accessible public services are absent. It would be careless to classify goods from their appearance alone, without examining how they contribute to the practical freedom of a particular person.

Imagine wanting a larger home. The desire might reflect social comparison, a legitimate need for accessibility, a crowded family, or the wish for a quiet workspace. Advice to “simplify” given before understanding those reasons is shallow. A more responsible inquiry asks what problem the additional space would solve, whether alternatives exist, and which financial and relational commitments the change would create.

A practical distinction is to formulate each wish in three sentences: what I need to protect, what I would enjoy, and what I am assuming will happen. The exercise will not always yield a neat answer. Its value lies in preventing all three kinds of reason

from merging into an unquestionable demand. We can remain ambitious and appreciative while declining to let every passing wish govern our decisions.

The ancient discussion of desires, especially in Epicurus' Letter to Menoeceus, offers a useful comparison: distinguishing desires can support judgment without condemning pleasure. The distinction proposed here between needs, desires and expectations is a contemporary working tool, not a reconstruction of Epicurus' categories. Its test is whether it clarifies individual situations rather than prescribing a single austere life. [2]

Desires cannot be sorted permanently into authentic and manufactured categories. A wish acquired through imitation can mature into a valued project; an apparently spontaneous preference can conceal pressure. The better test asks whether the desire survives reflection on its costs, alternatives, and impact on others.

Chapter 3. Freedom from Consumption

Consumer societies do not merely provide objects; they also circulate stories about what objects say about their owners. A purchase may promise status, security, novelty, belonging, or a temporary reprieve from discomfort. Those meanings are not wholly imaginary—goods can genuinely enable work, communication, and pleasure—but their symbolic promises deserve scrutiny when they begin to define personal worth.

Freedom from consumption does not require hostility to commerce, invention, or material comfort. It means retaining the ability to distinguish a purchase that serves a chosen purpose from one that mainly answers manufactured urgency. Advertising can inform and manipulate; both possibilities should be acknowledged without imagining that consumers are entirely passive or that all choices are equally unconstrained.

Price is only one dimension of a decision. There is also the cost of maintenance, storage, attention, disposal, debt, and the time needed to earn the purchase price. An inexpensive object can become costly when it breaks quickly; an expensive but durable tool can be sensible when it is used often and repaired. Simplicity asks us to evaluate the total relationship rather than obey a rule of always spending less.

Social comparison intensifies the problem when another person's visible possessions become the standard for our unseen lives. Yet the reverse comparison is equally suspect: treating a sparse household or a low expenditure as evidence of moral superiority. One may buy too much out of insecurity or display austerity for the same reason. Neither exterior establishes the quality of judgment or care.

Consider replacing a working phone. It may be reasonable if security updates end, accessibility needs change, or the device obstructs work; it may also be an impulse driven by novelty. The important question is not whether replacing it is virtuous or sinful, but what reasons one can actually defend after allowing the initial excitement to fade. A short delay is sometimes enough to reveal the difference.

This freedom is also collective. Product design, consumer protection, repair rights, labor conditions, and the availability of public alternatives shape which options are

realistically accessible. Personal reflection matters, but it should not conceal the responsibilities of institutions and firms. A less extractive life is not created by individual restraint alone; it also requires conditions that make responsible choices feasible.

An external point of comparison helps clarify the distinction between consumption and a good life. The OECD's How's Life? 2024 framework treats well-being as multidimensional: income and wealth matter, but so do housing, health, social relationships, work-life balance, environmental quality, and inequality. This is empirical context, not proof that any particular minimalist lifestyle is preferable. The philosophical claim made here is narrower: purchases should be assessed by the functions and freedoms they support, rather than treated as reliable measures of personal worth. [3]

A consumer can refuse a product yet remain locked into an infrastructure built around it. Owning fewer devices does not remove requirements imposed by employers, schools, banks, or public administrations. Consequently, personal restraint and collective redesign answer different parts of the problem.

Part II · Dependence and Practical Autonomy

Chapter 4. Practical Skills and Everyday Autonomy

Practical self-sufficiency begins with a simple question: what can I learn to do that would give me more reliable choices? Cooking a few meals, maintaining basic equipment, understanding a bill, organizing documents, or recognizing when a professional is needed can reduce unnecessary helplessness. The objective is not to become expert at everything, but to avoid losing all judgment whenever a task is unfamiliar.

Knowing how to do something differs from being obliged to do it alone. A person may understand a repair and still sensibly hire a technician because of safety, cost, disability, available time, or legal requirements. Competence supports informed delegation; it does not require heroic independence. The freedom gained may consist precisely in recognizing the limits of one's expertise.

Learning is most durable when linked to actual purposes. Memorizing a list of household skills to satisfy an ideal of self-sufficiency can become another burden. Understanding how to prepare food for one's needs, manage a modest budget, or ask informed questions about a service has a clearer connection to agency. Each skill should be judged by the options it opens, not by whether it belongs to a traditional image of domestic virtue.

The division of practical work also has ethical dimensions. If one member of a household is celebrated as independent while another performs the invisible cleaning, planning, childcare, or emotional coordination, the apparent independence may rest on an unequal distribution of labor. A credible practice of simplicity makes those contributions visible and distributes duties with attention to capacities and consent.

A useful exercise is to map three types of dependence: the skills we can reasonably acquire, the services we should keep using, and the relationships of mutual support we ought to protect. This map reveals that autonomy is never the absence of dependence. It is a way of organizing dependencies so that they remain intelligible, negotiable, and compatible with dignity.

Practical learning can itself be pleasurable. Repairing a small object, growing a plant, preparing a meal, or understanding a process may offer satisfaction independent of measurable efficiency. Yet an activity does not have to become a hobby, a source of income, or a duty to improve oneself. Freedom includes the possibility of learning slowly, resting, and deciding that a particular skill is not worth acquiring.

Learning every domestic skill can itself become an expensive hobby of the privileged. The opportunity cost of time must enter the calculation: repairing an appliance may be worthwhile for one household and unsafe or financially irrational for another.

Chapter 5. Delegating Without Losing Agency

Delegation is often treated as the opposite of self-sufficiency, but this contrast confuses doing everything oneself with remaining capable of choice. An autonomous person can ask for expertise, share responsibilities, and rely on public institutions without surrendering the right to understand, question, or reconsider the arrangement. Dependence becomes domination when alternatives are concealed, decisions are imposed, or the cost of leaving is made intolerable.

Good delegation requires clarity about the result, the limits of authority, and the information that must remain available. When hiring a professional, it can be reasonable to ask what the proposed work includes, what could go wrong, which alternatives exist, and how success will be evaluated. Such questions are not a refusal of expertise. They are a way of cooperating with expertise while retaining responsibility for decisions that properly belong to us.

Of course, not everyone has equal bargaining power. Age, disability, poverty, language, fatigue, and the urgency of a situation may make independent scrutiny difficult. In those circumstances trustworthy assistance, accessible explanations, shared decision-making, and enforceable rights matter more than advice to “be independent.” A philosophy of sufficiency must account for the supports that make agency possible.

Imagine an older person delegating online banking to a relative. Convenience may be real, yet safeguards are needed: understandable records, defined permissions, safeguards against coercion, and the possibility of changing the arrangement. Delegation is successful not when the relative controls everything efficiently, but when the older person receives appropriate support and retains as much effective authority as possible.

We can therefore distinguish between delegation that expands options and delegation that quietly removes them. The relevant question is not simply “Can I do this alone?” It is “Can I understand the arrangement, make meaningful choices

within it, and obtain help or leave without unfair penalty?" Self-sufficiency often grows through trustworthy interdependence.

Delegation has at least three dimensions: competence to specify a goal, authority to change the instruction, and practical access to an alternative provider. Contracts can preserve the first two while fees or geography remove the third.

Chapter 6. Time of Our Own and Commitments

Time is not merely a container to fill efficiently. It is also the condition in which attention, affection, rest, practical tasks, and projects become possible. A life with fewer possessions can still be overwhelmed by obligations; conversely, a full schedule may express freely chosen care or meaningful work. The issue is not the number of appointments but whether the pattern of commitments remains understandable, proportionate, and revisable.

Personal time is never entirely detached from others. Parenting, disability support, paid employment, and collective responsibilities place demands that cannot simply be canceled by declaring a preference for simplicity. This is precisely why a fair distribution of labor matters. Leisure secured through another person's invisible work is not a complete achievement of autonomy; it may merely move the burden elsewhere.

Expectations can multiply without explicit consent: an immediate answer to every message, an extra task because we are competent, or an ongoing favor that becomes a permanent duty. Identifying such patterns does not mean treating every request as an intrusion. It allows us to distinguish urgent needs from convenience, mutual commitments from one-sided assumptions, and genuine solidarity from habitual overextension.

Consider someone who tries to protect one evening a week for reading or walking. A rigid rule that never yields would ignore emergencies; a boundary that always yields would cease to exist. The more useful practice is to explain the commitment, make room for legitimate exceptions, and review whether responsibilities are shared fairly. Boundaries can be firm without becoming hostile or absolute.

To recover time, one might remove an unnecessary subscription, combine routine errands, decline a recurring obligation, or seek assistance. Yet efficiency is not the only measure. Conversation, contemplation, play, and simply being present are not failures of productivity. A sufficient life includes time that does not need to justify itself through measurable output.

Protecting personal time creates a distribution question: whose work expands when someone else declines a commitment? An individual boundary is justified when it corrects exploitation, but not automatically when its cost is transferred to an already overburdened caregiver.

Chapter 7. Simplicity Without Imposition

Simplicity is most defensible as an invitation to examine one's own needs, not as a standard by which to rank other people. A small home, few possessions, or a repetitive routine can be liberating for one person and restrictive for another. Access needs, family structures, histories of scarcity, climate, culture, and personal pleasure all change what a reasonable life requires.

A principle becomes dogmatic when its followers stop noticing circumstances. Someone who has experienced deprivation may understandably value reserves, decoration, or the security of ownership. Someone caring for children or relatives may need equipment that appears excessive to an outsider. To interpret every additional object as moral weakness would convert a practice of freedom into a new pressure to conform.

Nor should simplicity become a disguise for withdrawing from social obligations. Using less can reduce some environmental burdens, but collective problems also require fair institutions, durable products, accessible transport, and public infrastructure. Individuals differ greatly in their power to change these conditions. Responsibility should be proportionate to capability, influence, and available alternatives.

An argument about simplicity can be offered without contempt: describe the concrete benefit, acknowledge the trade-offs, and leave room for disagreement. A friend may choose to travel frequently because it sustains relationships; another may prefer a quieter local life. Their choices can be discussed in terms of effects and obligations without assuming that a single lifestyle embodies wisdom for everyone.

The test of voluntary simplicity is whether it leaves us more attentive, capable of care, and able to choose again. When it produces shame, fear of enjoyment, or an obsession with counting possessions, it may have become another form of dependence. The freedom to have less includes the freedom to decide that, in a particular circumstance, more is genuinely needed.

Voluntary simplicity also belongs to a documented intellectual tradition: Richard Gregg used the expression in the twentieth century, and Duane Elgin developed the theme further. The present argument does not infer a moral duty to simplify from either work. It asks instead under which conditions a freely chosen reduction actually enlarges autonomy and protects those who cannot choose deprivation away. [4, 5]

A simple life can be aesthetically attractive and ethically demanding without becoming a badge of virtue. The danger arises when observers infer character from visible possessions while ignoring invisible dependencies, such as outsourced cleaning or family wealth.

Chapter 8. Choosing What Deserves to Remain

Removing objects is easy compared with deciding what deserves a lasting place in one's life. The important question is not how much we can discard, but what we wish to preserve: tools that enable action, books that sustain thought, relationships of mutual care, meaningful rituals, reliable records, and spaces where attention can settle. Sufficiency includes maintenance and commitment as well as subtraction.

An object may be valuable through repeated use, emotional meaning, accessibility, or its role in a shared history. We should not assume that sentimental value is irrational. Nor must we preserve everything associated with the past. Memory can survive through selected objects, stories, photographs, or relationships; choice matters more than a universal rule about what should be kept.

Possessions also carry future obligations. A purchase needs storage, repair, insurance, energy, and eventually disposal. Conversely, keeping a well-functioning tool may be more responsible than replacing it with a supposedly simpler alternative. A coherent decision considers the full life of an item, including environmental and financial costs that are not immediately visible.

Imagine deciding whether to retain equipment for an occasional activity. Selling it might free space, but renting may be expensive, inaccessible, or impractical; keeping it might enable an independent practice. The decision requires attention to frequency, resources, alternatives, and the pleasure or security involved. Minimalism offers no automatic answer.

What deserves to remain changes over time. Health, relationships, work, interests, and material conditions develop. Reviewing commitments periodically should therefore be gentle rather than punitive. The point is not to finish life with the fewest possible things, but to create room for what is worth doing, understanding, sharing, and experiencing.

Retention and disposal have asymmetric consequences. Discarding an object may create waste now; keeping it can impose a continuing attention cost; replacing it later can be expensive or impossible. A rule based solely on present use therefore fails.

Part III · Security, Work, and Tools

Chapter 9. Security, Uncertainty, and the Desire to Accumulate

Accumulating resources can be a reasonable response to uncertainty. An emergency fund, essential medicines, or regularly used tools can protect our capacity to choose. The problem cannot be identified simply by counting objects, but by examining when an adequate reserve becomes an unlimited search for certainty: no inventory can remove illness, loss, or change entirely.

Security is also social. It depends on access to housing, income, health care, reliable relationships, and enforceable rights. Telling someone with precarious

resources to own less confuses voluntary simplicity with involuntary exposure to risk. An ethics of sufficiency must begin by asking what risks actually exist and who has the means to face them.

We can ask how large a reserve covers an identified risk, for how long, and at what maintenance cost. This helps distinguish proportionate preparation from accumulation that consumes time, attention, and space without appreciably improving security. Thresholds will differ for someone living alone, a family dependent on one wage, or a person with ongoing care needs.

Sufficiency does not require indifference to the future. It proposes preparing for what we can and acknowledging the limits of control. Learning to revise plans when facts change is a sounder form of prudence than obeying a fixed target for savings, possessions, or consumption.

The demand for security is rational when risks are correlated: job loss, illness, and housing costs can rise together. Accumulation becomes counterproductive when an ever-higher private buffer substitutes for any discussion of insurance, mutual support, or public safeguards.

Chapter 10. Comfort, Dependence, and Resilience

Comfort frees energy and time; it is therefore not automatically an enemy of autonomy. A washing machine, a ramp, or a transport service can expand the activities available to us. Condemning all technological or social dependence would ignore that human capabilities rely on shared infrastructures.

Resilience does not mean doing everything without help. It consists partly in retaining alternatives when a provider, connection, or routine fails. Knowing how to repair a simple object, keeping information accessible, and building cooperative relationships are complementary resources, not proof of absolute self-sufficiency.

Alternatives have costs. Maintaining every skill, duplicating equipment, or distrusting every service can consume more resources than such measures protect. The useful question is not whether we depend on others, but whether dependence is transparent, revisable, and consistent with our dignity.

Shared resilience includes neighbors, public services, and professional networks able to respond to a crisis. Mature simplicity does not glorify isolation: it seeks to reduce avoidable vulnerabilities without turning self-sufficiency into an obligation that excludes people who need support.

Resilience is often praised as a personal quality, yet redundant infrastructure and reliable institutions may matter more than heroic improvisation. A person without savings cannot simply choose resilience by adopting a better attitude.

Chapter 11. Work, Money, and a Sense of Enough

Money expands options, but its value also depends on how it is earned and used. Higher income may provide security, health care, or education; it may also demand working hours that erode rest and relationships. A sufficient life is defined neither by maximizing income nor by renouncing it.

Work deserves examination along several dimensions: pay, social usefulness, safety, autonomy, learning, and available time. Some indispensable occupations receive unfair compensation. Presenting precarious employment as an opportunity to practice simplicity would confuse inequality with personal preference.

In a concrete decision we can compare additional income with commuting costs, health, caring duties, and opportunities to negotiate conditions. There is no universal formula: changing jobs, reducing hours, or accepting demanding responsibilities may each be reasonable in different circumstances. The aim is to make visible the trade-offs that abstract notions of success often conceal.

The meaning of enough must also be allowed to change with age, obligations, and uncertainty. It is not a moral figure we can impose on others. It is a reflective practice that recognizes both material needs and the value of time not sold.

Questions about earning and time cannot be resolved by assuming that less paid work always means more freedom. The OECD identifies work and job quality, income and wealth (including financial insecurity), housing, and work-life balance as distinct dimensions of well-being. Reducing hours may be a genuine gain when income and caring duties remain sustainable, but it can also increase precarity or transfer uncompensated labor to someone else. The relevant test is not a single number of working hours; it is whether the arrangement preserves meaningful choice and fair participation. [3]

Paid work buys security while also consuming scarce time and attention. A decision to reduce hours should therefore be evaluated against future pension rights, career penalties, care obligations, and bargaining power, rather than against present income alone.

Chapter 12. Technology as a Tool, Not a Master

Technology can simplify daily life while quietly shaping our choices. An application that streamlines a task may also demand constant attention, collect data, or prevent the use of alternative services. Evaluating a tool requires looking beyond novelty and considering who sets its rules.

Not every delegation of memory, calculation, or coordination impoverishes thought. Outsourcing repetitive tasks can free resources for learning and caring. Risk arises when we lose the capacity to understand a consequential decision, correct an error, or reject an automated recommendation.

Four questions can help us decide whether a technology serves us: what problem it solves, what resources it consumes, what data it requires, and what happens if it stops working. People may choose different solutions according to accessibility,

disability, costs, and technical skills. Simplicity does not always mean choosing the analog option.

Maintaining a free relationship with technology also requires accountability from manufacturers, platforms, and public authorities. User protection cannot rest on individual decisions when designs, monopolies, and incentives shape the available options.

Ivan Illich's account of convivial tools supplies a relevant comparison for judging technology by what it enables people to do for themselves and with others. That comparison does not establish that every complex tool is oppressive. The practical distinction pursued here is whether a technology remains intelligible, contestable, repairable or replaceable in the circumstances in which it is used. [6]

An efficient digital service can reduce friction while increasing surveillance or concentrating decision-making power. Convenience and autonomy are not interchangeable: the same platform can save time and make exit difficult.

Part IV · Places, Relationships, and Responsibility

Chapter 13. The Home as a Practice of Freedom

A home is not simply the sum of its objects. It is an environment in which we seek rest, security, privacy, accessibility, and opportunities to meet others. Its quality depends on how it lets us live, not on how closely it resembles an image of austerity or luxury.

Tidying can facilitate activities, but a rigid ideal of order can turn domestic space into a place of surveillance. Families and people sharing a home need not have identical routines; they need proportionate agreements about cleaning, common use, care, and privacy.

Design also affects autonomy. Lighting, ventilation, accessible furniture, repairability, and energy costs can matter more than the number of objects. Housing decisions are constrained by prices, planning rules, and employment conditions; they are not always freely chosen.

Practicing simplicity at home may mean retaining what is useful, removing obligations that add no value, and reserving room for meaningful activities. Yet a small dwelling that obstructs care, work, or rest does not become sufficient merely by being labeled minimalist.

A smaller home might free resources yet intensify conflict when occupants need privacy, mobility support, or a quiet place to work. Square meters alone cannot measure domestic sufficiency.

Chapter 14. Relationships Beyond Possession

The logic of possession can enter our relationships when we confuse affection with constant availability or commitment with control. No person is an object in our life story; each retains desires, boundaries, and projects that may differ from our own.

Reducing expectations of control does not require indifference. Loving often involves keeping promises, negotiating sacrifices, and responding to legitimate needs. The challenge is to distinguish an accepted obligation from a unilateral demand that silences another person.

A simple relationship is not necessarily one with few meetings or few words. It may be intense, complex, and long-lasting. Its simplicity may lie in clear agreements, the ability to disagree, and the refusal to use guilt or dependence as instruments of domination.

Where violence or coercion exists, recommending calm communication or detachment is not enough. Protection, specialist support, and the material means to leave a dangerous situation take priority. Interpersonal freedom needs boundaries that are real, not merely ideal.

Relationships are not objects, but the language of decluttering can misleadingly turn human obligations into disposable burdens. Boundaries are necessary when a relation is harmful; they cannot replace duties to children or people who genuinely depend on us.

Chapter 15. Ecological Limits and Unequal Responsibility

Materials, energy, and the capacity of ecosystems to absorb impacts impose physical limits. Recognizing them allows us to discuss needs, durability, repair, and less resource-intensive forms of well-being. It does not, by itself, establish that everyone should reduce consumption in the same proportion.

Responsibilities vary with consumption levels, decision-making power, associated emissions, and available alternatives. A person without public transport does not have the same options as someone served by accessible services. Individual action matters, but infrastructures and policies determine many possibilities.

Buying a repairable product, sharing tools, or reducing waste may be beneficial. Yet full life cycles should be considered rather than replacing evaluation with symbolic gestures. A repair that is extremely resource-intensive, for example, is not automatically preferable to every replacement.

The ecological case for re-examining demand has a firmer empirical basis than a universal instruction to own fewer things. UNEP's Global Resources Outlook 2024 documents growing resource use and the environmental pressures associated with it. IPCC Working Group III examines mitigation through changes in service provision, infrastructure, and demand, emphasizing that individual choices interact with broader systems. These findings support examining the material consequences of arrangements, not blaming individuals equally or claiming that every instance of reduction produces an environmental gain. [7, 8]

Ecological simplicity has a political dimension: product standards, environmental protection, housing, energy, and the distribution of costs. Avoiding indiscriminate guilt supports a more demanding ethics by directing responsibility toward decisions and structures that can actually be changed.

A voluntary reduction in demand can help, but its effect depends on supply chains, rebound effects, and infrastructure. Money saved on one purchase can finance a more resource-intensive activity; an efficient product can encourage greater use.

Chapter 16. Care and Material Interdependence

Everyday life depends on visible and invisible work: food provision, cleaning, care, maintenance, and emotional support. Speaking of self-sufficiency without recognizing this labor can obscure how our freedom rests on other people's efforts.

Interdependence does not mean that every obligation is without limits. Caregivers need rest, resources, and agency; those receiving care retain, as far as possible, their own voice. Fair distribution should consider the intensity, duration, and voluntariness of responsibilities.

Consider a family seeking to reduce expenses by doing more household tasks. If the savings depend on silently shifting hours of work to one person, the household may not have gained autonomy. An account of sufficiency must include time, effort, and lost opportunities, not money alone.

A simpler life can free time for care, but it also requires services and institutional arrangements that prevent private overload. Goodwill cannot substitute for fair material conditions.

Care exposes the limits of an ideal of complete independence. Every person moves through periods of receiving and providing assistance, although burdens are distributed unequally by gender, income, and policy.

Part V · Limits and Synthesis

Chapter 17. Voluntary Simplicity and Social Injustice

The same lack of possessions may express freedom or deprivation depending on whether it is chosen or imposed. Reducing possessions from a position of security is not equivalent to lacking reliable access to housing, food, or health care. An ethics of simplicity loses credibility when it erases this distinction.

Personal responsibility does not disappear in the face of structural injustice, but neither can it replace structural action. Choosing purchases carefully may be reasonable; securing dignified working conditions and essential services requires collective decisions and accountability mechanisms.

The difference between voluntary simplicity and enforced deprivation also matters analytically. The OECD's well-being framework explicitly considers inequalities and deprivation alongside national averages, and distinguishes present well-being from the resources needed to sustain it. A person lacking safe housing or adequate care cannot be assessed through the same moral lens as someone choosing to forgo discretionary purchases. The argument of this chapter therefore concerns fair access to basic capabilities before aesthetic preferences for austerity. [3]

Proposals to reduce consumption should assess whom they affect. A uniform increase in the price of essential resources can harm those least able to adapt. A fair policy distinguishes essential from luxury uses, ability to pay, and genuine alternatives.

Voluntary simplicity is valuable when it expands options, not when it legitimizes the idea that some people must settle for fewer rights. Our freedom to choose a modest life must be accompanied by recognition of others' right to escape deprivation.

Kate Raworth's distinction between a social foundation and an ecological ceiling offers a framework for seeing why minimum material security and ecological restraint must be discussed together. The capability approaches associated with Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum further clarify why nominally equal opportunities may not permit equal real choices. The book engages those ideas as points of comparison; its judgments about responsibility remain the author's own. [9, 10, 11]

The same instruction to consume less has opposite meanings when addressed to an affluent household and to one already unable to meet basic needs. Symmetric rhetoric can hide asymmetric capacity and responsibility.

Chapter 18. When Less Is Not Better

The rule of reduction fails when scarcity damages important capabilities. Less food, rest, care, accessibility, or information can mean less freedom, not more. Even apparently superfluous objects may sustain an identity, relationship, or activity essential to someone.

Sometimes redundancy protects us: spare medicines, document backups, or accessibility devices. At other times, an extra system creates dependence and upkeep. There is no contradiction in deciding that more resources are needed in one domain while fewer are preferable in another.

Reduction can also become a moral competition. Counting possessions, displaying austerity, or judging others' habits reproduces the search for approval that simplicity was meant to question. When a means hardens into a rigid identity, it ceases to serve life.

The productive question is what combination of resources, relationships, and commitments makes a responsible life possible. Sometimes the answer will be to reduce; at other times, to invest, seek help, or maintain something complex because it serves a valuable purpose.

There are situations in which more is unambiguously better: insulation in an unsafe dwelling, access to medication, mobility equipment, or protection against violence. An abstract preference for less must yield to these concrete goods.

Chapter 19. Building a Sustainable Personal Practice

A philosophy of sufficiency needs to move from general declarations to revisable decisions. We might begin by identifying three sources of friction: an expense that adds little well-being, an obligation accepted by inertia, and a practical skill we would like to develop. No single list fits everyone.

Before changing anything, it helps to establish which functions must be preserved: health, care, economic security, participation, and rest. Improvement should be assessed through consequences, not the number of objects removed. A small, reversible, time-limited trial offers more reliable information than a vow of permanent austerity.

A review may ask whether the change freed time, lowered costs without shifting them to someone else, improved attention, or reduced an actual risk. If it did not, revising the decision is not failure: it expresses independence from a rule that no longer served its purpose.

The process must leave room for pleasure, culture, and connection. A practice that removes what makes existence worth living eventually betrays its foundation. Sustainable sufficiency adapts to our situation and to care for others.

A sustainable practice needs feedback rather than an irreversible pledge. A household might review spending and obligations each quarter, record unintended consequences, and reverse a change when health or relationships suffer.

Chapter 20. Sufficiency, Autonomy, and a Life of One's Own

Less is more only when what we remove makes room for something valuable. The phrase does not state a universal law; it invites us to examine the cost of what we own, pursue, or maintain through habit. The final criterion is not austerity, but responsible freedom.

Throughout the volume we have distinguished need from expectation, preparation from accumulation, comfort from dependence, and cooperation from subordination. We have also recognized that individual choices take place within social and ecological structures that distribute resources and opportunities unequally.

A life of our own does not require resolving these tensions once and for all. It requires enough clarity to recognize them, act prudently, and change course when conditions change. Learning, seeking help, and accepting legitimate obligations are compatible with autonomy; isolation and absolute self-sufficiency are not necessary ideals.

The practical conclusion remains open: retain what sustains existence, release what constricts it, and care for the relationships and material conditions that make choice possible. Ultimately, simplicity means not spending our entire life managing what was supposed to help us live it.

Sufficiency is not an end-state where further deliberation ceases. It is a political and personal method for deciding what deserves protection when resources, desires, and obligations compete.

The conclusion is deliberately conditional: a freer life cannot be inferred from fewer possessions without examining capabilities, institutions, and relationships.

Epilogue · A Sufficiency That Can Be Revised

This book offers no single measure of enough. It invites us to recognize the instrumental value of resources: they should support experience, judgment, care, and genuine opportunities to act.

The decision to live with less must not be imposed on those who already lack necessities or become a test of moral superiority. Retaining the ability to change our minds is part of the freedom that simplicity seeks to protect.

Bibliographic context

Interpretations are the author's own unless expressly attributed; the works listed indicate thematic points of dialogue, and institutional reports provide empirical context. No precise page-level verification of the philosophical works is claimed.

References Numbered references follow the order of first appearance. References 12 to 14 provide additional bibliographic context.

[1] Frankfurt HG. Equality as a moral ideal. *Ethics*. 1987;98(1):21-43. doi:10.1086/292913.

[2] Epicurus. Letter to Menoeceus. In: Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of eminent philosophers*. Vol. 2. Hicks RD, translator. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1925. Book X, sections 122-135.

[3] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. *How's life? 2024: well-being and resilience in times of crisis*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2024. doi:10.1787/90ba854a-en.

[4] Gregg RB. *The value of voluntary simplicity*. Wallingford (PA): Pendle Hill; 1936. (Pendle Hill Pamphlet; no. 3).

[5] Elgin D. *Voluntary simplicity: toward a way of life that is outwardly simple, inwardly rich*. New York: William Morrow; 1981.

[6] Illich I. *Tools for conviviality*. 1st ed. New York: Harper & Row; 1973.

[7] United Nations Environment Programme. *Global resources outlook 2024: bend the trend: pathways to a liveable planet as resource use spikes: summary for policymakers*. Nairobi: UNEP; 2024.

[8] Creutzig F, Roy J, et al. Demand, services and social aspects of mitigation. In: *Climate change 2022: mitigation of climate change*. Working Group III contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2022. Chapter 5. doi:10.1017/9781009157926.007.

[9] Raworth K. *Doughnut economics: seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. White River Junction (VT): Chelsea Green Publishing; 2017.

[10] Sen A. Development as freedom. New York: Alfred A. Knopf; 1999.

[11] Nussbaum MC. Creating capabilities: the human development approach. Cambridge (MA): Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; 2011. doi:10.2307/j.ctt2jbt31.

Additional bibliography

[12] Veblen T. The theory of the leisure class: an economic study in the evolution of institutions. New York: Macmillan; 1899.

[13] Kittay EF. Love's labor: essays on women, equality, and dependency. New York: Routledge; 1999.

[14] Kasser T. The high price of materialism. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press; 2002. doi:10.7551/mitpress/3501.001.0001.