

UNITED WISDOM

Stoic Care for Others and the Mistaken Cult of Self-Sufficiency

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-02-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Stoic Care for Others and the Mistaken Cult of Self-Sufficiency

Epigraph

> *Mutual help*

Seneca, *Of Clemency*, II.V, a short fragment of his own argument about the Stoic school, in Aubrey Stewart's translation. His social argument is not a contemporary test of helping effectiveness. The context read.

What this article is about

The ability to refrain from demanding complete obedience from the external world can easily turn into a different demand: a worthy person must manage without others. Asking for help then begins to look like moral defeat, while care becomes a stronger person's right to control someone weaker. In the selected passages of Seneca, Stoic steadiness is joined to active participation in other people's lives. Yet this connection has difficult historical boundaries: the ideal sage, the treatment of pity and discussion of power cannot be carried into the present without qualifications. We will examine offering help, accepting it and refusing through the hypothetical preparation of a small shared meeting. The question is how someone handles their own action, another person's consent and a common task, rather than how much they can bear alone. Care does not promise a favourable outcome, and independence does not require denying a real need for support.

I. Independence does not mean doing everything alone

Imagine a voluntary group preparing an open meeting. One participant has taken responsibility for registering people, checking the time and preparing a short announcement. Others are willing to participate within particular limits, but the common work has not yet been fully distributed. The organiser says they will manage everything alone. At first, this means only a promise to complete the three named tasks. Answers to questions, preparing the venue and correcting mistakes are then added. They continue saying that help is unnecessary, although the original scope has long since changed.

Independence can mean different things in this situation. The person makes their own decision to participate and is responsible for what they communicate to others. This does not require carrying out the entire shared task alone. Naming a difficulty, clarifying the scope and asking for help are also their own actions. If independence means only the absence of any request, a

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

strange result emerges: the person maintains an outward image of autonomy through increasingly inaccurate communication about what is actually ready and what remains undone.

Suppose the deadline is approaching while some questions remain unresolved. The organiser can tell the group which tasks are complete and which they lack time for. This communication does not guarantee assistance. It gives others information they did not previously have and enables examination of the shared plan. Concealing difficulty to preserve an attractive self-image is a separate choice. Its consequences affect participants relying on the declared readiness. The question of asking cannot therefore be reduced to a private test of personal endurance without considering other people's plans.

We do not know why a particular person avoids assistance. They may fear refusal, remember previous pressure, distrust an available participant or genuinely prefer to complete a small task alone. The article does not select an explanation on their behalf or diagnose a motive. It examines a narrower substitution: the absence of a request does not itself prove a decision's worth. Understanding it requires information about scope, promises, available means and how truthfully the person describes the present situation.

II. The historical ideal joins steadiness and assistance

In *Of Clemency*, II.V–VI, Seneca responds to the view that Stoic teaching is excessively severe and excludes participation in another person's misfortune. He distinguishes assistance from the kind of pity he describes as disturbing the sage's inner condition. In his argument, however, the sage actively helps others rather than simply maintaining untouchable calm. This is a normative image within a particular philosophical school. It does not establish that people with strong feelings help less effectively, nor is it a contemporary study of emotional regulation.

The text addresses Nero and discusses power, punishment and clemency. Its historical system includes positions we do not adopt as guidance here: political hierarchy, disparaging assessments of certain people and the unwavering ideal of the sage. Readers are not asked to consider their grief a disease on the authority of an ancient formula. Our limited point of reference is the connection between inner steadiness and actual participation in another's need. It allows us to challenge the cult of complete isolation without automatically joining the entire original order.

In *On Benefits*, I.5–7, the argument read separately distinguishes an object transferred from the giver's intention. For our subject, this opens a question about the manner of help: an outward transfer does not yet describe the relationship. This treatise approaches benefaction differently from a discussion of clemency and power. Similar attention to participation in another's life therefore does not make them one work with one initial question. Both grounds

matter to us: assistance as actual participation, and its manner of provision as a separate subject of moral consideration.

We actually read the selected second book of *Of Clemency*, I–VII, and the limited I.1,5–7 of *On Benefits*, without claiming to have read the entire collection or Latin critical tradition. The English versions are identified as Aubrey Stewart's translations. The contemporary scenes below are our reasoning, rather than an established effect of ancient counsel. They preserve the question of consent and limits to participation, which needs separate consideration in present relationships. Neither philosophical authority nor good intentions perform that work on behalf of the person acting.

III. A request communicates need without controlling another

The meeting organiser can ask an acquaintance to check a short announcement. This request has a defined subject, an expected deadline and a limit: look at one text and report unclear points noticed. It does not make the acquaintance responsible for the entire meeting. If the demand is instead always to come to the rescue, the subject gradually disappears. The other person faces an indefinite duty to demonstrate their relationship with the requester. The need for support remains real, but the form of the request stops communicating what work is proposed and what they can agree to.

An accurate request need not be made without anxiety. We can fear refusal and still state a limited scope. We can be unsure how long reading will take and honestly identify this. What matters is not converting uncertainty into another person's hidden promise. Agreement to read only the heading is not agreement to check the whole material. An offer to help later does not confirm the original deadline. Information about the limits of assistance needs to be incorporated into the plan rather than mentally expanded for convenience.

A refusal also provides information about available participation. It may require another method, a changed deadline or a smaller task. But it does not automatically communicate rejection of us as a whole. Such a conclusion would require separate grounds. In our scene, it is more useful to retain the actual answer and decide what is available without this assistance. This does not demand that we never feel hurt. It limits an inference: an expressed inability to check an announcement is not equivalent to a complete assessment of the organiser's personality or the meaning of their entire relationship.

Requests are not appropriate in every relationship. If earlier help involved threats, humiliation or unacceptable control, the person may take that experience into account. The article does not require turning specifically to someone who formally possesses the needed resource. Independent decision-making includes choosing a safe and suitable form of support, where available. It also permits acknowledging that the current task does not yet have the means it

requires. A resource shortage should be concealed neither from ourselves nor from those affected by the action promised.

IV. Help can be accepted while retaining responsibility

Suppose the acquaintance agrees to read the announcement and discovers ambiguity about the meeting time. The organiser accepts the observation and corrects the text. Responsibility for the new announcement does not thereby pass to the helper. The organiser decides which version to send and can check it against the actual agreement. Assistance adds information and available work, but does not turn someone else into the author of every subsequent decision. Otherwise gratitude quietly becomes a way of transferring responsibility that the other person never accepted.

The opposite mistake occurs when someone accepts the result of help but conceals the other's participation to remain entirely independent in appearance. Ordinary private support does not always need a public announcement. Yet another person's contribution must not be appropriated where its origin matters to an agreement or assessment of work. In our hypothetical case, it is enough to identify accurately who performed the check if the group is discussing task distribution. This imposes no duty to disclose the helper's personal circumstances and offers no reason to turn gratitude into a performance for an audience.

Acceptance also allows disagreement with a proposed correction. The helper may understand the wording differently or suggest an inconvenient method. The organiser can examine the grounds and retain their own decision while explaining the limits of agreement. Gratitude does not require taking every piece of advice. Yet someone cannot first ask for attentive work and then consider every unwelcome observation a violation of the relationship. If an observation is unsuitable, its content needs examination; if assistance has changed its subject, the agreement should be clarified rather than quietly expanded.

Accepting support and abandoning our own judgment are therefore different actions. The former may expand available information and means. The latter transfers choice without sufficient grounds. Stoic concern for our own action can coexist with acknowledging another person's contribution precisely because that contribution does not remove the question of what we now do ourselves. Our application remains limited: it does not establish what every piece of advice should be, or turn independence into a refusal to consider something the person had not previously seen.

V. Assistance creates no right to govern its recipient

The helper can also confuse roles. Having read the announcement, they may now believe they can determine the meeting's entire programme. Their contribution was real, but the original agreement concerned the text. Expanding participation requires fresh discussion. Otherwise assistance becomes an undeclared entry into power: because I spent time, you must arrange the task as I think right. This transition calls for separate consideration of what was agreed, even if the helper's suggestion seems reasonable and well-intentioned.

The recipient may agree to additional participation, but that agreement needs content. Who makes the final decision? Which tasks have been transferred? What remains the original organiser's responsibility? Not every conversation needs a detailed formal document. Yet lacking a document does not make boundaries insignificant. A simple clarification is sometimes available and sufficient: help with an announcement does not mean deciding the schedule. If a boundary cannot be agreed, someone may end this particular form of cooperation while preserving the fact of support already received and not converting it into indefinite debt.

Attention to a boundary is not ingratitude in itself. We can acknowledge assistance while rejecting a demand that did not previously exist. This matters particularly when the person providing a resource presents their participation as proof of a right to know personal information, assess every decision or determine relationships with others. The article does not establish the legal classification of such actions. It preserves a moral question: how did a limited contribution become a claim to control a person, and was actual consent obtained for that?

Need does not make refusal easy. Replacing a resource is sometimes difficult, and pressure becomes significant precisely because of that difficulty. An abstract proposal simply to be independent is therefore insufficient. Available forms of support, the possible cost of ending participation and suitable assistance in a threat deserve consideration. We do not promise that one conversation will resolve everything. A more precise distinction is needed so that no power becomes justified merely because its holder once performed a useful action or currently possesses something needed.

VI. Care checks a need without inventing it

Help can be offered without clarifying whether it is needed in the proposed form. The organiser says they lack time to check the announcement, while the helper begins changing the programme. Another participant asks for a brief explanation of the time and receives lengthy counsel on discipline. Each action may require effort, yet its destination does not match the task expressed. The strength of intention does not automatically repair this mismatch. Where a question is appropriate, clarifying what the person asks for and can actually use is more useful first.

Clarification must not become a demand for an entire biography. Checking one text usually requires only the text, the agreed time and the desired scope of observations. Details of the organiser's personal life may be irrelevant. The helper gains no right to learn them to make their participation more convincing. They can honestly identify information missing for a specific task. The recipient can refuse to disclose it, and both can decide whether assistance is available within that limitation. Unknowns should be retained rather than filled with a story about another's weakness.

Sometimes the task really differs from what was initially named. Someone asked for the announcement to be checked, but the meeting time turns out to be unconfirmed. It is then useful to pause textual correction and clarify the basis. Yet discovering this does not permit attribution of a bad motive. Perhaps the person thought the time was confirmed, overlooked a gap or needs different work. Explanations require information. For now, we can name only the factual ambiguity without presenting our interpretation of their personality as a necessary part of assistance.

Care therefore includes the possibility of hearing that an offer is unsuitable. If someone does not want a particular option, their refusal and our dissatisfaction need to be distinguished. Refusal does not prove that no assistance is needed at all; our disappointment does not prove that this option must be accepted. Where conversation is available, a different subject can be clarified or the offer ended. The latter is sometimes more honest than maintaining pressure to confirm our role as a good person. Participation retains moral meaning while attention is directed towards the other, rather than only the helper's self-image.

VII. Calm is not a condition of the right to help

In *Of Clemency*, extraordinary steadiness is attributed to the sage. We retain this as a historical characteristic of an ideal, rather than a demand on a contemporary participant in the meeting. A person can help while feeling anxious; they can be affected by another's difficulty and still perform limited useful work. The article does not infer an action's quality directly from the presence or absence of tears. Understanding what happened requires information about the action itself, its appropriateness, agreement and consequences, rather than only the visible expression of an inner condition.

Suppose the helper worries that the organiser will not finish preparation in time. They can report a specific unresolved question and offer defined work. Their anxiety does not automatically make the proposal bad. But if they demand that the whole group immediately make them calm, the subject of help changes. Others must now remove a feeling for which they cannot promise a complete result. The distinction does not prohibit feeling; it asks what action is proposed and who has actually been assigned the obligation to perform it.

The opposite scene is also possible: someone looks completely calm while refusing to notice an evidently unfinished part of the shared task. Their outward steadiness does not confirm care. We can maintain an unruffled voice while concealing important information, or care while speaking awkwardly. A borrowed image of the sage is therefore unsuitable as a simple observational scale. Our limited question concerns a known need and our own promise. It allows assessment of a specific communication without claiming to measure a person's Stoic maturity through their face or manner of speech.

In a serious condition, a threat or a need for specialist competence, the philosophical discussion can be stopped and suitable support sought. It does not replace professional assistance. Even in an ordinary task, someone may reduce their involvement if previously agreed work becomes unavailable. This change needs to be communicated when others rely on it. A resource limit does not prove an absence of humanity. Caring for others requires taking our actual ability seriously; otherwise a promise again becomes an attractive label for work that nobody will be able to perform.

VIII. Reciprocity is not an exact exchange of services

After receiving help, someone may want to respond in kind. This desire can sustain a relationship, but not every form of support is a contract for equivalent exchange. One participant checked the text while another later provided a venue; their efforts differ in timing, significance and circumstances. The article does not propose calculating a common price for every gesture. It asks which conditions were actually agreed. If exchange is expected, it is worth identifying it; if not, gratitude cannot retrospectively be presented as an obligation to fulfil a previously unknown demand.

The absence of exact exchange does not require endless giving from one side. A helper may notice that they accept more requests while lacking time for their own tasks. The current scope and the right to refuse then need consideration. They are not obliged to wait until the recipient guesses the boundary. Yet the explanation must not become a verdict on the whole person: this particular request is unavailable now, while the earlier contribution remains. Both truths can be preserved without depicting the relationship as entirely empty or entirely secured by everlasting reciprocity.

The recipient may also ask whether an offer has conditions. Clarification does not mean suspecting every contribution of self-interest. It helps prevent promises that cannot be fulfilled. If conditions change, a new decision is required. Assistance does not become less real because of an appropriate question that makes no demand to justify an entire life. Shared work can rest on clarity, rather than on the guess that everyone understands gratitude identically and considers the same future response obvious.

In our meeting, someone may accept a check of the announcement while being unable to help on another day. This circumstance needs to be communicated if specific participation is expected. It does not make the earlier support nonexistent or permit denial of its significance. But it also does not allow an available resource to be invented in place of an absent one. Respect for reciprocity begins with truthful description of present ability. Without it, care can become a system of promises protecting an attractive image of relationships while leaving actual tasks without someone to perform them.

IX. A mistake in helping calls for correction

Suppose the helper changes the time in the announcement, deciding it would be more convenient, although the organiser did not request this. The text is sent to participants, creating conflicting information. Good intentions do not remove ambiguity. The actual agreement, what was communicated and who needs clarification must be established. This examination concerns the result of a specific action. It does not require immediately declaring the help entirely harmful or the helper unworthy, but it does not allow correction to be abandoned merely because someone tried to serve the common task.

The organiser may also have erred by accepting the proposed version without checking it. Acknowledging their own difficulty does not require transferring all responsibility to the helper. Naming their part matters more: I sent the text without comparing the time with the agreement. The helper can separately acknowledge changing a condition without consent. These acknowledgments can coexist. Neither erases the other, and responsibility is not determined by who first found a convenient explanation or appears more confident when discussing what happened.

A limited step may then be possible: communicating the clarification to those who received the announcement, where available and actually necessary. If it is unknown whether everyone read it, complete removal of the mistake cannot be promised. The completed part and remaining uncertainty can be named. The article establishes no protocol for every organisation. It preserves a simple moral limit: correction must rest on real actions, rather than a statement that consequences automatically disappeared after an apology. Participants may have their own knowledge of inconvenience the helpers do not see.

After correction, the parties may reconsider cooperation. Perhaps it is enough to clarify which changes need consent in future. Perhaps the present distribution no longer suits them. These decisions need not confirm a previous image of perfect mutual support. Care allows discovery of error, a changed form and the ending of particular assistance. If preserving a pleasant version of a relationship matters more than truthful communication, the help itself loses its subject. Acknowledging limited failure is therefore sometimes more accurate than renewing a promise to care for everything without changing a single condition.

X. Dignity leaves room for other people

The mistaken cult of self-sufficiency makes assistance an exception that must be concealed. Its mistaken opposite turns need into a right to control others. Between these positions remains the possibility of independent decision within real relationships: ask for something specific, hear a boundary, accept a contribution, retain our own responsibility and refrain from expanding assistance into undeclared power. The selected Stoic reasoning about active participation enables this question, although the contemporary form of consent and available duties is not exhausted by its historical ideal.

The hypothetical meeting may take place or may not. Not every participant will receive the response they want, and care will not secure everyone's agreement. Yet ways of dealing with one another remain open to assessment regardless of the overall ending. Receiving help does not destroy the organiser's dignity; refusing an unavailable request does not destroy the helper's humanity. The moral question concerns an actual action and its grounds, rather than merely who appeared stronger, calmer or less dependent on others during preparation.

Independence can consist in honestly acknowledging our part of a shared task. Sometimes this means fulfilling a promise without additional assistance. Sometimes it means an accurate request, reconsideration of scope or acknowledgment of error. Care can consist in agreed action rather than complete control over the recipient's life. These distinctions leave room for a person on both sides of support. They do not promise perfect relationships, but prevent isolation from being declared the sole form of dignity and another person's participation from becoming the sole evidence that we have none of our own.

What this means in practice

Where appropriate, choose one small voluntary request or offer of help. Do not use a dangerous relationship, a serious situation or a task requiring specialist competence for the exercise. The note can be skipped or stopped. It does not test your ability to manage alone and requires no disclosure of personal information to others.

Name the subject, available scope and required consent. Separately note what remains your action after help: check information, decide, communicate a change or fulfil your own part. If conditions of support are unknown, retain that gap rather than a convenient assumption. Where an appropriate conversation is available, clarify only what the present task requires.

Check the boundary of refusal on both sides. The recipient need not accept every option; the helper need not expand the agreed scope. If assistance has already changed the plan, name the actual change and those affected. The exercise's narrow possible result is a more precise agreement or an honest acknowledgment of its absence. Calm, reciprocity, success and

approval are not guaranteed; continuing cooperation is not required as proof that the note is correct.

Key quotation

> *Help them and be of service*

Seneca, *Of Clemency*, II.VI, a short fragment of his own description of the sage's action, in Aubrey Stewart's translation. The ideal is historical, rather than a demand to suppress grief or a diagnosis of a helper. The context read.

Connections between traditions

Question	Sources read	Comparison	Boundary
Assistance and its manner	Seneca, Of Clemency II.V–VI; On Benefits I.5–7	Actual participation differs from an object transferred and the giver's outward image alone.	Two independent works; historical power and the ideal sage do not become a contemporary norm for relationships.
Participation and independent action	Seneca, Of Clemency II.V–VI; our hypothetical meeting	Help can be accepted while retaining the question of our own responsibility.	Contemporary limits of consent and duties are an identified editorial application, rather than a universal ancient protocol.

No interreligious identity or historical borrowing is asserted. The comparison is limited to the selected sources actually read.

Primary sources

1. **Seneca. Of Clemency / De Clementia, II.I–VII.** Aubrey Stewart, *Minor Dialogues Together with the Dialogue on Clemency*, London: George Bell and Sons,1889; Project Gutenberg64576. The selected second book was read in full in the displayed text; a limited paragraph of I.III was also read. No reading of the entire collection is claimed. Text. The public-domain indication concerns the United States; universal rights are unconfirmed and no full import is made.

2. **Seneca. On Benefits / De Beneficiis, I.1,5–7.** Aubrey Stewart's English version,1887, presented on Wikisource. The selected sections were read; no reading of the whole treatise is claimed. Only a limited paraphrase is used here, with no new direct quotations from this work. Text. Rights to the particular version have territorial and platform boundaries.

Tags

Stoicism, Seneca, clemency, benefit, care, help, self-sufficiency, independence, request, consent, refusal, reciprocity, gratitude, responsibility, boundary, resource, dignity, participation, support, promise, intention, action, pity, sage, mistake, correction, shared task, truthfulness, relationships, moral philosophy

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He researches inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor 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.