

UNITED WISDOM

Work as a Means, a Craft and a Form of Participation

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A31 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Work as a Means, a Craft and a Form of Participation

Epigraph

> *enjoy the good of all his labour, it is the gift of God.*

Ecclesiastes 3:13, King James Version, a short literal fragment. A religious reflection on the good of labour, rather than a promise that every job necessarily brings pleasure.

What this article is about

Olga coordinates orders for a small workshop. She came for steady earnings, gradually learned to notice errors in task descriptions and now particularly values days when people receive a usable object without unnecessary confusion. At a gathering, acquaintances ask whether this work is her calling. Olga does not know how to answer. It is useful, she enjoys certain tasks and her family needs the income. Yet she does not feel that a job title explains her entire life, and she does not want to pretend for the sake of an attractive story.

The important question in this hypothetical scene is not finding one ideal profession. It is what functions work already performs and what demands we place upon it. Work can sustain life, provide an area for craft and allow participation in a shared undertaking. These aspects can connect, but need not have equal strength. None describes a person's whole dignity.

Examining these distinctions before major changes can reveal actual contributions, necessary conditions and unmet expectations while leaving room outside a role. Conversation then becomes more accurate than choosing between work solely for money and work as the final answer to every question about ourselves.

I. Work Can Sustain Life Without Explaining All of It

Earnings allow Olga to contribute to family expenses and make everyday plans. This is a serious function, rather than a less worthy reason than inspiration. Someone working for income need not add an invented story of destiny to deserve respect. The question of means concerns real dependencies: housing, food, learning, care and opportunities to use time. They do not become morally trivial because they are hard to present in a story about a great calling.

Yet a means needs a question about its purpose. What kind of life are we accepting this work to support, and what price are we ready to pay? Income does not exist apart from time, commitments and conditions. Olga can value earnings while noticing that endless expansion of

tasks obstructs the very life they should support. This is not necessarily ingratitude. It returns the means to its function: work helps us live, rather than automatically acquiring authority over everything else.

Distinguish present necessity from an ultimate conviction. Someone may accept available work in difficult conditions without regarding it as the best lifelong option. They can temporarily limit other plans and honestly identify why. Treating necessity as a freely chosen eternal destiny makes change harder to discuss. Calling it evidence of personal failure removes respect for a real choice. Accuracy permits both facts: this work is needed now, and its future place remains open.

In the selected section of Book I of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle distinguishes activities' ends from things chosen for something else. His argument concerns the highest human good and activity within a complete life. It does not determine Olga's contemporary career. A limited distinction helps our question: a particular occupation's function need not coincide with life's whole purpose. A role performed well can sustain a broader way of living without becoming the sole basis of human worth.

II. Craft Begins With Attention to the Quality of Action

Olga does not make objects with her hands, but learns to describe orders more precisely. She notices where an unclear phrase produces repeat work, which information needs checking and which question cannot be silently skipped. Here lies a craft aspect: acting better through knowledge of the subject and attention to the result. Craft in this article is not limited to manual labour. It includes practices where quality depends on acquired distinctions and responsible execution of a specific task.

Quality is not identical to outward complexity. A simple entry can be made attentively, while a complex project can be careless. Olga's skill appears when the next person receives an intelligible task and can work without unnecessary guessing. This is not research-based assurance of a particular writing method's efficacy. It describes her action's purpose within the hypothetical scene. Claims about achieved quality require checking the relevant result, rather than merely intentions to become more professional or the quantity of effort.

The enjoyment of craft can develop within work initially accepted for earnings. Someone notices an ability to see more accurately, act more reliably and correct errors without concealment. Yet this enjoyment cannot be demanded as a permanent emotional state. Repetition, difficulty and tiredness belong to practice. Lack of inspiration on one day does not prove lost ability or a wrong path. Distinguish quality of action from an obligation always to experience it as vivid confirmation of one's identity.

Skill needs conditions: an intelligible task, resources, time, access to information and opportunities to clarify limits. Without them, an appeal simply to do better may conceal impossibility. Olga need not compensate for every organisational ambiguity through unagreed extra hours. Responsibility within a craft includes reporting obstacles affecting quality. A person answers for their available part without becoming the workshop's sole source of reliability. Good work connects personal skill with arrangements that allow it to be used.

III. Participation Connects Results With Other People's Lives

When Olga helps pass on an order clearly, her action enters the craftsperson's work and the customer's opportunity to receive a needed object. She participates in a shared process without controlling every link. Distinguish participation from total control and moral heroism. It can consist of a small but definite part. Understanding a contribution requires asking who needs the result, how it is used and what lies outside our role. Without this, usefulness remains too general a word.

A person may not see the final recipient daily. Their work passes through colleagues, documents, services or preparation. This does not automatically make it meaningless. Yet presumed usefulness needs connection with reality. If nobody understands why a result is needed, the question should be asked rather than closed by saying everything matters. Participation becomes clearer when the next recipient and the subject of transfer are known. It is then possible to discuss whether an action serves the common task or merely sustains an unexamined routine.

In the selected passage from Unto This Last, John Ruskin evaluates production through how its results serve life. This is a historical moral criticism of political economy with its own religious grounds. We do not adopt it as a contemporary economic model or derive the workshop's pay arrangements from it. It helps pose a limited question: does work create only a visible volume, or leave people a genuinely usable result? Answering requires considering the particular undertaking, rather than approving every form of employment automatically.

Participation can satisfy without making workers responsible for saving every recipient. Olga can help a customer understand an order's conditions, but should not promise what she does not control. Contribution includes an accurate boundary: here is what I can do, and here is what requires someone else's decision. If a shared process creates harm or deception, the language of participation must not obscure that question. Belonging to a useful undertaking is assessed through actions and conditions, rather than solely an attractive description of its collective purpose.

IV. The Three Functions Can Carry Different Weight

For one person, work primarily sustains income; for another, it offers craft; for a third, it joins them to a needed undertaking. These proportions can change within one life. Initially Olga particularly needed stability, later valued coordination's quality and now cares about connecting results to people. Such change does not require rewriting the past as an error. Different stages may have different reasonable grounds, without those grounds forming a single ceremonial story.

If one function is weak, that is not yet a final verdict on the work. An occupation need not be a beloved craft if it leaves time for significant practice elsewhere. It may offer skill but need clearer pay. It may contribute to something useful while being poorly arranged for a particular person. Assessment becomes more accurate by asking about the missing aspect instead of immediately labelling the whole job good or bad. Distinctions do not cancel decisions; they identify their subject.

Nor can the functions always compensate for one another. Love of craft does not itself pay necessary expenses. Public benefit does not authorise concealing unsuitable conditions. High income does not make every result acceptable. Identify minimum conditions for each significant aspect. For Olga, these might be intelligible earnings, time for careful handover and the ability not to promise a customer something unknown. A minimum need not mean an ideal. It identifies conditions without which participation no longer fits her actual life and responsibility.

Compare available opportunities rather than an imagined world where every option is secured. Someone can accept an imperfect balance now while preparing change later. Another person may be able to decline sooner. Identical job titles do not prove identical choices. Discussion of work's functions supports attentive decisions, rather than ranking people according to how their biography fits our picture of proper labour. Respect remains possible where circumstances require temporary compromise.

V. Money and Meaning Need Not Be Opponents

Work only for money sometimes sounds accusatory. It may presume that attention to means obstructs deeper participation. Yet supporting oneself and helping loved ones already carry human meaning. Money does not explain every action's quality, but belongs to actual living conditions. Olga can ask for clear payment while attending carefully to orders. Neither demand loses seriousness because they are voiced together. Work's practical dignity does not require shame about its material aspect.

The opposite extreme makes income the only measure of a result. Skill, usefulness and conditions then matter only insofar as they immediately increase earnings. Such a view may miss why work belongs in a life at all. Olga can ask what arrangement of time accompanies payment and which result she is willing to support. This does not reject money. It prevents one indicator from acquiring final authority over the whole action. Means matter, but their adequacy is considered in relation to purposes and conditions.

People are often offered a choice between meaningful work and decent pay as though this were a natural contradiction. Opportunities may indeed be limited in a specific case. Yet limitations should be described rather than turned into a moral law. Saying a true calling needs no money transfers expenses to the worker and may conceal another person's advantage. Interest does not establish consent to every condition. This distinction particularly matters where shared meaning expands duties without intelligible discussion.

An honest formulation allows several purposes: I want to sustain life, perform my work well and contribute to an acceptable result. Combining them needs negotiation and choice, rather than promises of harmony in every circumstance. Sometimes a priority must be set for a defined period. Sometimes a limit cannot be compensated by other benefits. Even that difficult conclusion becomes clearer when pay is not declared inferior and quality or participation is not dismissed as a useless luxury.

VI. Usefulness Must Not Justify Unlimited Self-Giving

The workshop may make needed objects without requiring Olga to remain available every night. A result's benefit and the scope of a personal duty are different questions. If every time limit is declared a refusal to help people, shared meaning becomes pressure. Define the accepted role, available resources and handover arrangements. Care for results includes sustainable conditions, rather than hoping an active person will continually expand themselves to preserve the process. Temporary help must not silently become a permanent obligation.

Olga can offer to finish one urgent order while identifying a limit for the following week. This is not a double standard if conditions are clear. Unreliability arises where help is promised in one scope while others expect another. Additional participation therefore needs separate agreement: what exactly, by when and which tasks will be delayed? Not every conversation needs a formal document. Yet a significant burden must not disappear into we are doing a good thing. Purpose does not distribute work by itself.

When quality depends solely on willingness to work extra hours, craft loses its basis. A person may conceal an organisational error through personal effort, withholding information needed for correction. This article establishes no psychological or medical outcome of such arrangements. It notices an organisational limit: an unnamed necessary resource is difficult to

discuss when absent. Olga can report that careful order handover requires time and propose setting priorities. That supports quality more honestly than promising to accomplish everything simultaneously.

Retain the right not to turn every ability into a service. People can do more than a particular role obliges them to do. They may help voluntarily, but voluntariness includes limits and revision. Participation becomes mature when this distinction is recognised. It connects people through clear contributions, rather than demands for continual proof of devotion. Work can belong to a good life precisely because it leaves space for rest, loved ones and other relationships, rather than requiring their sacrifice to demonstrate its value.

VII. Craft Does Not Turn the Whole Person Into a Job Title

Olga can be proud of learning to understand orders more accurately. Yet a descriptive error does not make her whole life a failure. Professional quality deserves evaluation within its subject: what was done, what fails the task and what can be corrected? If every response becomes a verdict on personality, discussing quality becomes harder. People defend dignity instead of considering work. Distinguishing role from person permits responsibility for actions without granting a job final authority to define the self.

This distinction cannot serve to evade criticism. Saying work is not my entire life does not erase accepted commitments or handover quality. It sets proportionality in assessment. Olga can acknowledge an error, explain known causes and complete an agreed correction. This is professional action, rather than a need to prove total moral reform. A precise subject makes the next step intelligible. A result fitting the task is required, rather than a worker's conspicuous self-humiliation before the group.

Nor does a title describe every contribution. Olga may care for a relative, learn, support neighbours or make music outside work. These actions do not become secondary merely because they fall outside a paid role. A person may have a life needing no single professional name. This does not reject labour's seriousness. It recognises that one significant part need not contain every relationship, ability and value. Work can remain worthy when such impossible completeness is not required of it.

What do you do for work is therefore best heard as a question about one area, rather than a demand to explain an entire destiny. Olga can answer calmly without an invented calling. She coordinates orders, values a certain part and needs particular conditions. This leaves room for what she does not yet know about herself. Uncertainty does not equal absence of meaning. Sometimes an accurate account of the present helps more than a completed story in which every future turn must violate an announced destiny.

VIII. The Good of Labour Need Not Require Constant Joy

In the selected passage of Ecclesiastes 3, labour appears alongside human limits and good received as God's gift. The religious context does not promise pleasant employment in every case or assign a profession. Our comparison is limited to noticing good within finite participation without turning labour into complete control over life. Someone can value an available result while recognising what they cannot know or secure. These aspects need not be artificially reconciled through one formula.

Olga notices a day when an order is clear and an object returns without unnecessary confusion. This episode can matter even in a difficult week. It cannot establish a duty to accept every condition. Gratitude for good differs from prohibition on discussing deficiencies. Today's usefulness can be acknowledged while tomorrow's arrangements are questioned. If enjoyment proves that complaints are no longer permitted, attention to good becomes concealment of a real issue. Serious gratitude can withstand clarification of conditions.

Absence of enjoyment also requires caution. A dull day does not always prove lost interest; pleasure does not always prove the whole job right. This article diagnoses no condition and offers no psychological test. It suggests describing a particular aspect: task, pace, relationships, result or expectation. This helps avoid demanding that one feeling make a final career decision. Experience matters, but its meaning emerges through actual conditions rather than a single word, enjoy.

Noticing good also matters outside a career story. Sometimes necessary work is done well without impressive recognition. Contribution may be quiet, repetitive and unlike a personal breakthrough. This does not remove its dignity. A usable result for another person, an acquired distinction or sustained everyday life can be serious enough. Yet nobody must find consolation in every difficult undertaking. Meaning is not assigned from outside as another worker's duty towards an attractive image of labour.

IX. Questions About Functions Differ From Decisions to Change Work

Olga may find that her work sustains income well and provides some craft while certain tasks' shared result remains unclear. This is not yet an instruction to leave. It identifies the next question: clarify results, discuss conditions or investigate another possibility. Elsewhere, distinctions may reveal a significant limit of participation. Decisions need further information about available options and consequences. This article names functions, rather than declaring every deficiency grounds for immediate change.

Recognising current benefits does not create a duty to remain forever either. Work can perform an important function during one stage and cease to fit later circumstances. Participation can be reconsidered without denying the whole past. Gratitude for acquired skill or earnings does not become permanent loyalty to a workplace. Distinguish recognising past good from agreeing to future conditions. Their history connects them, but they do not automatically replace each other.

If departure is already in question, consider it separately: which change is needed, what can change internally and which options are genuinely available? Commitments and authority require attention. Do not transfer every undecided transition question into an examination of work's functions. Nor should meaning close a concrete question about conditions. Separate questions allow a sequence: first understand what work does within life, then decide how to respond to the balance discovered.

This sequence particularly matters when people compare themselves with someone else's biography. An inspiring account shows part of a path without always revealing resources, limits and consequences. It can prompt a question, but does not prove the same transition available to Olga. Her own account should include what is known and unknown. Moral accuracy need not abandon hope. It prevents a picture of a possible future from being treated as an already secured option on which commitments can be built without clarification.

X. Precise Participation Gives Work a Place in Life

Olga may find no single answer about calling while recognising three real aspects. Work sustains everyday life, allows better coordination and connects her with a useful result. Some connections are strong; others need clarification. This account need not end in ceremonial certainty. It grounds a concrete action: retain something needed, discuss a condition, check a result or explore a possibility. Meaning connects with participation, rather than only a role's name.

Each aspect needs an appropriate question. For a means: what does it sustain, and at what cost? For a craft: which quality am I learning, and which conditions does it need? For participation: whom does the result serve, and what falls within my available responsibility? Answers may remain incomplete. Do not hide this behind general praise or disappointment. A concrete question need not solve the whole life. It can clarify one significant relationship while leaving others open.

This attention is not reserved for people with extensive choice. Even within limited conditions, someone can identify what was accepted through necessity, what was learned and what remains a wish. The record promises no immediate removal of constraints. Yet it does not require treating them as a final personal definition. Circumstances, actions and personal worth

remain distinct. If change becomes possible, it will be clearer which aspect should be sustained and which altered. Meanwhile, real work retains dignity without an ideal balance.

Work can be a means, a craft and a form of participation in different combinations. It need not be reduced to indifferent earnings or enlarged into life's sole content. Respect for labour begins with accurate attention to results, conditions, people and a role's limits. Respect for a person leaves them more than a title. A mature connection becomes possible: seriously perform the accepted part, discuss its place and retain freedom to continue a life that need not be exhausted by one way of working.

What this means in practice

Take one ordinary working week. Record what work sustains in your life, which quality of action you develop and who needs its result. Name one concrete example for each aspect. Where an answer is unknown, retain that uncertainty instead of substituting compulsory inspiration or general condemnation. Separately identify relationships and activities important outside the paid role.

Choose one question to clarify: pay and time conditions, a resource for quality or a result's recipient. Determine what you can learn yourself and what needs conversation with an authorised person. Do not treat proposed changes as accepted before an answer. Distinguish voluntary extra help from permanent duty. Where a significant work transition is involved, consider it separately through real options and consequences.

Return to the record after the agreed step. What became clearer, what changed and what remains unavailable? This original practice is not a calling test, diagnosis or proven method for increasing satisfaction. It aims to reveal current labour's functions and participation more accurately. Specialist financial, legal or medical questions require appropriate information and competent consideration.

Key quotation

> *There is no Wealth but Life.*

John Ruskin, Unto This Last, Essay IV, Ad Valorem; a short literal sentence. Historical moral criticism of economic purposes, rather than a contemporary valuation formula.

Connections between traditions

Source or perspective	What it helps us notice	Limit of comparison
Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, I, 7	Particular occupations' ends differ from a complete life	An ancient human function is not identical to a contemporary job
Ruskin, Unto This Last, IV	Production's results are considered through serving life	Moral criticism does not replace economic calculation
Ecclesiastes 3:9–15	Labour's good appears beside human limits	A religious gift does not promise pleasure in every job
United Wisdom	Means, craft and participation have distinct functions and limits	Original consideration rather than a calling or efficacy test

Sources and notes

1. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Book I, W. D. Ross's translation, Internet Classics Archive, section 7 read continuously in full, displayed lines 81–100. Ends, self-sufficiency, human function and a complete life are not transferred as instructions to find one profession. The electronic version's historical printed basis was not independently established.

2. John Ruskin, Unto This Last and Other Essays on Political Economy, Ward, Lock & Co., London/Melbourne/Toronto, 1912, Project Gutenberg 36541; Unto This Last, Essay IV, Ad Valorem, continuous selected displayed lines 1396–1405 read in full, printed pages 193–195; key sentence at 1403. Its own moral and religious criticism of production remains explicit; other economic and social generalisations are not adopted as contemporary scientific laws.

3. Ecclesiastes, King James Version, 3:9–15 read continuously in full, displayed lines 231–241; epigraph from a short fragment of 3:13. The religious context of labour, human limits and gift is not declared a contemporary career method.

Reading checked on 10 October 2026. Worldwide rights for specific versions have not been established; brief quotations, links and limited paraphrase are used. Full sources are neither imported nor vectorised. The scene and practice are original; no psychological or organisational efficacy is promised. This article distinguishes work's functions without establishing the sole meaning of an entire life.

Tags

work, means of living, craft, participation, earnings, skill, quality, useful results, meaning of labour, role boundaries, working conditions, shared processes, human dignity, everyday life, responsibility, professional practice, money and meaning, personal time, voluntary help, feedback, complete life, calling, necessity, gratitude, rest, practical ethics, Aristotle, Ruskin, Ecclesiastes, 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.