

UNITED WISDOM

The Duty of Care When We Cannot Help Everyone

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-16-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Duty of Care When We Cannot Help Everyone

Epigraph

> *not that other men be eased, and ye burdened*

2 Corinthians 8:13, excerpt, King James Version. The passage concerns a collection for believers and the mutual meeting of need; it does not supply a complete rule for distributing every kind of help.

What this article is about

Lena has four free hours on Saturday. She has already agreed to drive a neighbour to the library, promised to help her brother sort some documents, and received a message from an acquaintance who needs a conversation. Meanwhile, a local group wants volunteers to move an older person's belongings. Every request has human meaning. None becomes trivial because another has arrived. Yet four hours do not become sixteen through a more attentive reading of the messages. This hypothetical scene raises a question easily concealed by two opposite answers: a good person helps everyone, or, since helping everyone is impossible, nothing is owed to anyone.

Between those answers there is still work to do. What has already been accepted? Where would delay matter? What can actually be done rather than merely promised? Which request needs this particular person? Care under limited resources involves choosing, but choosing does not itself prove indifference. It needs reasons, communication, and attention to consequences. We will consider how to preserve a definite obligation, acknowledge unmet need, and avoid using personal finitude as a universal excuse for inaction. This concerns ordinary helping relationships, rather than emergency response, professional triage, or medical decisions.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. The Impossibility of Everything Does Not Make Everything Impossible

The first difficulty arises before choosing a recipient. Several requests become one enormous task in the imagination, and the person then judges herself solely by whether she can complete it all. Lena stops thinking about the journey, documents, and conversation and starts thinking about being insufficiently caring again. That general verdict says nothing about which action is available now. It can accompany sincere concern, but it cannot replace a decision. In this scene, it helps to give the requests their separate names, deadlines, and purposes before asking whether Lena deserves to be called a good person.

Naming them separately changes the appearance of the limit. The journey takes ninety minutes including travel. The documents could wait until Sunday if her brother agrees. The conversation need not occupy an entire evening, although the acquaintance may want presence rather than advice. Moving belongings requires a vehicle and several people; Lena cannot provide that alone. This does not prove that all four requests fit together without remainder. It lets her see where incompatibility really exists and where her first picture was too general. Checking does not create resources, but it prevents available resources from disappearing from view.

The reverse matters too: reducing a task must not rename refusal as help. Sending a friendly acknowledgment in response to a request for transport may participate in a conversation, but it does not perform the transport. If Lena offers another contribution, she should name it precisely. The other person can then decide whether it matters to them. Care does not require a constant account of one's whole life, but it does require preserving the difference between what has been done, what has been offered, and what is impossible beneath agreeable language.

Asking what is available remains an ethical question when it is joined to what has been accepted and whom it matters to. A list of capacities alone can make care arbitrary: help whoever is most convenient. A list of needs alone can make it impossible: accept everything that seems significant. Bringing the two together supplies no mechanical formula. It returns choice to particular actions that can honestly be promised and actually performed, while preserving attention to people whose requests will still remain unanswered.

II. An Accepted Task Has a Weight of Its Own

The library journey was agreed in advance. The neighbour set aside another option and expects Lena at a particular time. This differs from a new request, even if the new request evokes stronger sympathy. The distinction does not establish the first agreement's permanent priority. It shows that cancellation brings an additional loss: someone has already organised part of her day around Lena's word. Care includes that reliance, rather than only the appeal of each separate opportunity to help.

In Chapter V of Utilitarianism, Mill distinguishes duties carrying a corresponding claim of a definite person from beneficence whose particular recipient and occasion are not prescribed in advance. This philosophical distinction helps us ask about the grounds of a demand. It does not mean that every helping situation lacks a definite duty, or that a written promise always outweighs someone else's need. In our scene, the agreement itself creates an additional ground. The article uses the distinction within limits, rather than turning it into a contemporary legal classification.

A more serious new circumstance might make postponing the journey necessary. Lena would not thereby become free of all responsibility for the postponement. She would need to communicate it, explore a possible replacement, and avoid depicting the neighbour as an obstacle to a more worthy deed. Recognising the reason for cancellation and recognising its cost can coexist. If helping someone else really is necessary, it does not require declaring the earlier expectation insignificant or blaming someone for relying on an agreement.

Accepted tasks also require checking how they arose. Lena may have said she would try and later learned that this was understood as definite agreement. She may have accepted one hour and then silently allowed the task to expand. Clarifying such differences must not conveniently erase a clear promise after the fact. It is better to recover the words and circumstances, name the discrepancy, and discuss it. The ability to limit future help remains, but it does not permit arbitrarily making earlier agreements optional once a competing request arrives.

III. Serious Need and a Strong Impression Are Different

An urgent message often gets more attention than a calm request. Yet confident speech does not prove lesser need, and an anxious tone does not automatically establish priority. Lena needs to learn at least what is necessary: what is required, by when, and what would happen without her participation. She need not demand the whole story, ask for painful details, or become an expert in someone else's life. She needs to avoid treating her impression of a message as an already verified description of the situation.

Ordinary circumstances contain different kinds of consequence. The neighbour could miss an uncommon event; her brother could miss a deadline known to him; the acquaintance could find it difficult to remain alone after an unpleasant conversation. These consequences cannot honestly be represented on a single scale without further grounds. Still less can the people themselves be ranked as more or less valuable. What is compared is particular actions, their timing, and available alternatives. A recipient's dignity does not diminish because their request is not first today.

When something is unknown, naming that uncertainty is more honest than deploying a confident formula. If Lena does not know whether the documents can wait, she can ask her brother. If she does not know whether the acquaintance needs to speak now, she can offer two definite times and hear the answer. Sometimes another solution becomes visible; sometimes the limit becomes sharper. Clarification has a limit too: it must not turn into endless postponement or make a person compete with others in demonstrating the persuasiveness of their suffering.

Safety, health, and professional assistance lie beyond this scene. The article does not propose replacing specialised services with private comparison of requests. Even in ordinary life, however, it helps to distinguish finding refusal difficult from having participation that cannot be delayed without a substantial consequence. The first describes the helper's experience; the second needs grounds in the situation. They can coincide, but coincidence cannot be assumed. This preserves sympathy without a promise accepted mainly to end one's own discomfort at another person's expectation.

IV. The Helper's Capacity Belongs in a Truthful Description

Lena has four hours because work, rest, and household matters occupy the others. She need not prove that every minute already serves a morally higher purpose. If a resource is genuinely limited, acknowledging it is necessary for a credible promise. At the same time, cannot sometimes means not wanting to change an established plan. The grounds differ, although both can lead to refusal. Calling a preference an impossibility is convenient, but it makes an honest discussion of choice harder.

In the introduction to his doctrine of virtue, Kant allows latitude in the method and extent of performing an ethical duty. That latitude does not permit discarding the maxim itself and also helps accommodate different ethical ends. In section V, others' happiness does not mean submission to everything they consider desirable. These points supply a philosophical context for finite participation. They establish no modern working-hours rule, do not choose Lena's Saturday task for her, and do not make every inconvenience a sufficient exception.

The practical meaning of a limit appears in the consequences of an inaccurate promise. If Lena accepts everything, the first journey is delayed, her brother receives no warning, and the conversation begins in haste. An expanded list of agreements is not yet expanded help. Sometimes a narrower promise preserves more actual participation because it lets someone seek additional help in advance. This is an editorial inference from a hypothetical scene, rather than a claimed research finding. It must be checked against performance, not the number of agreements spoken.

Rest cannot be treated solely as a suspicious remainder after care. A helper remains a person with a life of her own. Recognising this nevertheless leaves open the question of an accepted duty or an exceptional need. If Lena cancels a definite commitment, a general appeal to finitude does not explain this particular cancellation. Circumstances and communication are needed. If she limits a new request, naming her available contribution can suffice without elaborate self-defence. Responsibility becomes more precise when a personal limit is used neither for indefinite submission nor for disappearing without trace from an accepted agreement.

V. Passing On a Task Does Not Mean Passing On a Person

The moving group may find other participants. Lena offers to contact someone with a car. Until that person agrees, the offer remains a possibility rather than a secured replacement. The difference matters: she cannot tell the organiser that the problem is solved when she has merely supplied a name. Nor can she promise another person's time on their behalf. Coordination sometimes increases available help, but it requires separate consent from the person who will do it and an honest description of the arrangement's stage.

Passing on a contact also affects the recipient's consent. Someone may have asked Lena precisely because they trust her and do not want acquaintances to hear their situation. A useful resource does not automatically authorise sharing private information. She can ask whether an introduction is welcome, pass on only the necessary request, or suggest that the person write directly. Clarification takes time, but preserves the recipient's participation in a decision about their own life. Help need not be fast at the expense of excluding their voice.

Not every task can be transferred without loss. A close person's presence sometimes cannot be replaced by a list of services, even when the list is useful. This does not make the close person permanently available. It means that the offered action should be named accurately: I can help find another option; I cannot come today. If refusal disappoints someone, truthful wording need not immediately remove that disappointment. Nor must the recipient regard the suggested alternative as equivalent before the helper may preserve her own limit.

A sound handover has a small, verifiable result. The contact is agreed, the time confirmed, the task understood, and the initial participant knows who now holds responsibility. Without that result, it is reasonable to say that the search continues. Lena may help the organisers find a car without accepting the whole move. Her contribution is then limited but real. It does not make the unfinished part unimportant or turn organising help into a universal way of avoiding direct participation whenever it is inconvenient.

VI. Equal Dignity Does Not Require an Identical Contribution

The brother gets two hours on Sunday, the neighbour a Saturday journey, the acquaintance an evening call, and the move no personal participation from Lena. This distribution is unequal. That alone does not prove injustice. People have different requests, agreements, and other options. Yet differences need attention to their grounds, especially when repeated. If the same calm person continually gives way to more insistent people, the pattern may reflect convenience rather than the circumstances' significance.

In 2 Corinthians 8:11–15, participation is connected to available resources and mutual provision for need. Paul addresses a particular community about a collection, using religious grounds and the image of equality. The limited comparison recalls that help need not mean one participant's one-sided depletion. It supplies no modern distribution formula and promises no return on every act of assistance. Lena's scene remains the authors' construction; her Saturday is not presented as the application of an apostolic budget.

An identical small contribution to everyone is sometimes possible and sometimes deprives each task of its necessary minimum. Five minutes of conversation may matter to one recipient; five minutes of driving will not take another to the library. Equal time therefore does not always mean equal attention. Ask whether an offered contribution performs its intended purpose and whether symmetry serves mainly a convenient report that nobody was neglected. A person needs an intelligible action, rather than merely an identical line on the helper's list.

Examining repeated choices can reveal one's preferences without judging one's whole character. Lena may notice that visible group activities attract her more than quiet, recurring errands. Alternatively, new people may always receive only the remainder. Such observations prove no hidden motive and supply no diagnosis. They raise a question for the next decision: do acknowledged grounds survive a change in the deed's visibility? Care under limited resources needs both the particularity of today's choice and a memory of how similar choices accumulate over time.

VII. A Refusal Can Be Communicated Without Devaluing Need

That is not my problem may end a conversation, but it often ends the distinctions already made as well. Lena can say that she understands why a car is needed, cannot participate today, and can check one contact before evening. That names the other person's purpose, her limit, and an available contribution. A long confession or proof that others have it worse is unnecessary. If no further contribution is possible, she should not invent one to soften matters. A reliable refusal is more useful than indefinite agreement that leaves someone waiting.

A recipient's disappointment does not necessarily mean the boundary is wrong. It may express the real loss of an option. They can remain dissatisfied and seek another possibility. The helper need not obtain the right grateful reaction before considering the conversation concluded. Nevertheless, not every complaint is merely another person's unpleasant emotion. If Lena has broken an agreement, she needs to hear the particular consequence. Preserving a limit can coexist with acknowledging one's action; neither should automatically absorb the other.

Excessive explanation can also be dishonest. Listing other people's more important needs may disclose confidences and make recipients unwitting competitors. Usually, communicating a limit requires only one's own available time and the subject of the choice. If postponing an accepted task needs explanation, the significant circumstance can be named without unnecessary detail. This does not guarantee understanding, but avoids increasing the conversation's harm merely to secure justification from the person being refused.

A clear refusal concludes a particular promise to respond; it does not erase the person from a relationship. Later, one can ask whether the matter was resolved if that attention is appropriate and actually possible. Such a question cannot retrospectively count as performing the original help. One can acknowledge an important unmet request and preserve respect without promising to compensate everyone for everything. Care then stops depending on imagined limitless availability and takes a more modest, truthful form of participation in finite human lives.

VIII. What Remains Undone Needs Memory Rather Than Endless Self-Accusation

After Saturday, some things will remain undone. The remainder itself establishes no guilt, but neither proves the choice morally flawless. Look at the particulars: the journey happened, postponing the documents was agreed, the call was accepted, and the car contact was unavailable. This record is not intended to calculate one's goodness. It helps keep result, intention, and promise distinct. Checking what another person actually relied on matters especially, rather than only what the helper hoped to offer.

If the promised contact search did not happen, Lena can communicate that instead of disappearing. If another participant was willing but she did not check their consent, that is a particular coordination error. Acknowledging it requires no verdict that she always abandons people. It lets her name an available next action and change future practice. If a task remained impossible after an honest capacity check, she need not invent wrongdoing to explain the difficult feeling associated with someone else's unmet need.

Remembering how shared help is organised matters too. Repeatedly unanswered requests may reflect something larger than one Saturday: no clear schedule, an assumed permanent volunteer, or uncertainty about who arranged transport. Lena need not repair the group's organisation alone. She can name what she has observed and propose a limited change if she wants to participate. That possibility distinguishes recognising finitude from permanently ending attention. I cannot today should not automatically become a rule that nobody ought to notice this need.

The duty of care when helping everyone is impossible has no universal number of hours or identical ordering of recipients. It requires holding together the accepted task, another person's need, actual resources, consent, and consequence. Human finitude is not a moral defect. It becomes problematic when concealed by an impossible promise or used to erase every definite commitment. An honest result in Lena's scene may be incomplete. Its value lies in naming performance as performance, a limit as a limit, and an unmet request as something that still has human significance.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary day with several requests. Record each separately: action, recipient, deadline, and what has already been agreed. Leave out painful details of other people's lives. Separate an accepted task from a new opportunity to participate. Then identify realistically available time and other resources. If impossibility mainly conceals a preference, acknowledge that preference honestly to yourself; it does not always prohibit refusal, but needs different grounds from having no capacity at all.

Clarify one uncertainty that could change the choice: whether postponement is possible, whether your particular vehicle is needed, or whether someone wants a conversation today or concrete help tomorrow. Demand no demonstration of sufficient suffering. Compare the consequences of declining actions without ranking people's dignity. Where threats, health, or professional responsibility are involved, this exercise does not replace the relevant assistance procedure or qualified decision.

State an available promise so that what you will do, and by when, is clear. For a handover, separately obtain the new participant's consent and the recipient's permission for necessary

disclosure. Until confirmation, call a replacement a proposal rather than a solved matter. Communicate what is impossible as early as you can. Acknowledge the consequence of cancelling an accepted task while retaining your own limit. Require neither gratitude nor immediate agreement in exchange for such clarity.

Afterwards, check only definite agreements: what was performed, what was postponed by consent, and where a promise remained unfulfilled. Correct one error of your own and retain an observation about repeated unmet need. This author-designed practice is not a goodness test, carries no research efficacy claim, and promises no freedom from difficult feelings. It offers a more precise description of participation, in which the helper's finitude and the human significance of another person's request remain visible together.

Key quotation

> *according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not.*

2 Corinthians 8:12, concluding clause, King James Version. The condition of willing readiness and the collection's context remain in the article; the excerpt does not declare every personal preference an insurmountable impossibility.

Connections between traditions

Source	Context	Limited comparison	Difference retained
Mill, Utilitarianism V	Perfect and imperfect duties	A definite accepted task has separate grounds	No legal classification of every modern request
Kant, Introduction V(B), VII	Others' happiness and latitude in duty	Limiting extent does not abolish the ethical end	No formula allocating hours
2 Corinthians 8:11–15	Collection, resources, and meeting need	Participation relates to actual capacity	The particular Christian context and grounds remain
United Wisdom	Lena's hypothetical Saturday	Agreement, need, capacity, and communication	The authors' sequence is not attributed to the traditions

Sources

• John Stuart Mill. Utilitarianism, Chapter V, Project Gutenberg 11224. Longmans, Green, and Co., seventh edition, 1879. A continuous selected passage on duty and justice was read, including perfect and imperfect duties, web lines 360–373. A limited philosophical distinction is used without a literal quotation.

• Immanuel Kant. The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation, Project Gutenberg 5684. Selected Introduction V(B), VI–VII was read, web lines 251–281; V(B) and VII are used. The page's misleading 1780 heading is not used to date the work. Historical philosophy establishes no modern assistance procedure.

• 2 Corinthians, King James Version, Wikisource. The continuous Chapter 8 context was read, including 8:1–24; 8:11–15 is used. The epigraph is 8:13; the key quotation is the ending of 8:12. Edition rights are not declared established worldwide; full source texts are not imported.

Tags

care, help, finitude, resources, time, duty, agreement, promise, need, priority, urgency, consent, handover, contact, willingness, responsibility, refusal, boundary, dignity, equality, justice, participation, consequence, coordination, memory, Kant, Mill, Corinthians

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 coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.