


UNITED WISDOM

# Generosity That Creates Dependence

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-18-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Generosity That Creates Dependence

## Epigraph

> *nothing is generous, if it is not at the same time just.*

Cicero, On Duties I.14, §43, Walter Miller translation, 1913 edition, Project Gutenberg 47001. The historical text examines the justice of giving; it does not diagnose the relationship between recipient and helper.

## What this article is about

Imagine Oleg helping Nina pay for housing while she looks for work after moving. At first, support eases a difficult period. Then he starts expecting her to choose only jobs he approves, report every meeting and attend family dinners whenever invited. He does not call these conditions, but mentions his expenses whenever she decides differently. Nina is grateful while becoming less certain which decisions remain her own.

Dependence here describes an ordinary arrangement: access to an important resource becomes connected with someone else's approval. It is not a clinical term or a verdict on personality. Long-term support alone does not prove a problem, and a helper's wish to see results does not necessarily show an intention to control.

We will consider when giving expands possibilities, when unstated conditions restrict choice and how limits can be discussed without suddenly punishing a recipient. Philosophical and religious texts raise questions about justice, goals and willingness. They neither establish the exercise's efficacy nor replace professional assessment where ending support threatens safety or essential living conditions.

## I. Needing help does not remove dignity

Nina accepts assistance because paying for housing during her job search is difficult. Need itself tells us nothing about her moral worth, ability to choose or future conduct. Someone may need another's assistance briefly, for a long time or permanently. A continuing need does not require proving independence by immediately refusing help. Such a demand can place an ideal of self-sufficiency above actual living conditions and blame the recipient for circumstances that have not yet changed.

Our question is not whether Nina is strong enough. Examine the arrangement: what was promised, for how long, which decisions may Oleg help determine and which remain Nina's? Can she discuss conditions without unexpectedly losing support? Answers distinguish a real



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

need for resources from additional dependence on the helper's mood. The first may be impossible to remove quickly. The second can be made visible and discussed when circumstances permit a safe conversation.

Nor can freedom be judged simply by the amount of assistance. A small gift may demand continual obedience, while substantial regular support may have clear, limited conditions and respect for choice. Examine how the resource is connected to personal decisions. A helper can specify how much they can provide and for what purpose. Authority to define the contribution does not automatically give authority over the recipient's entire life. Separate these forms of control through particular actions.

Ask what possibilities assistance opens and which demands it adds, rather than declaring acceptance itself a weakness. Nina can receive support while remaining responsible for looking for work, expenses and communication. Oleg can assist while preserving his capacity limits. Respect for both begins by avoiding an overall label. The conversation concerns agreed conditions, actual needs and observable conduct, rather than a final determination of who is sufficiently independent or sufficiently generous.

## II. When a condition appears after the gift

Oleg initially said he would help with housing during the job search. Later, each family invitation was accompanied by reminders of his expenses. Those reminders could mean different things: he wants recognition, has budget difficulties or believes assistance entitles him to obedience. Do not guess a hidden motive and immediately accuse him. Identify the new connection itself: declining dinner is now discussed as inadequate gratitude for rent payments.

A condition important to accepting support should be stated before someone begins relying on it. They might choose another arrangement, a smaller sum or a different form of assistance. A requirement introduced later and extended to more decisions changes the original gift's subject. Nina becomes party to an agreement never openly proposed. Not every change is unjust: Oleg's circumstances can change too. New limits should nevertheless be discussed as changes, rather than presented as old, self-evident conditions.

Reasonable conditions can relate to the assistance itself. Oleg may specify the amount and duration, request timely information about a change of housing or agree that extra expenses are excluded. This differs from controlling friendships, clothing or every interview. No single rule always fixes the boundary, but the connection to the support can be examined. How does the requirement help carry out the arrangement? What information does the helper really need? Can clarity be achieved without access to the recipient's whole private life?

Cicero connects generosity with avoiding harm and preserving justice. We do not adopt his historical ranking of recipients as a contemporary measure of dignity. The limited comparison

concerns a gift that does not become just simply by appearing large and kind. In our scene, assistance must be considered alongside the additional price of choice. If hidden conditions require continual approval, naming them is a first step towards clarity. This is not a diagnosis; it asks whether the current arrangement matches what the parties originally accepted.

## III. Gratitude and obedience are different responses

Nina can sincerely thank Oleg while disagreeing about a vacancy. Gratitude recognises help received; it does not announce agreement with every future proposal. Otherwise the supposed debt keeps expanding: attend today, change work tomorrow, then seek approval for relationships. The recipient never knows when acknowledgment is enough. In this structure, the helper's judgment rather than a definite agreement decides whether access to support continues.

Oleg may want his contribution noticed and discuss a troubling absence of responses or information about expenses. Not every request for recognition demands obedience. Nina should not use autonomy to deny agreed responsibilities or conceal significant changes either. Where help concerns a defined purpose and particular accepted conditions, respect includes honest reporting of their fulfilment. Obligations should be identified by their content, rather than derived from an undefined entitlement to gratitude.

Kant treats others' happiness as an ethical end while leaving people to determine what belongs to their happiness within permissible limits. He also preserves the ability to refuse demands to which someone has no right. This is not a contemporary sponsorship rule. The comparison helps distinguish supporting another's welfare from assigning their goals. Oleg can question a vacancy and offer reasons without turning his vision of a good life into the only permitted path.

Consider the other side of gratitude too. A recipient may agree to everything to avoid appearing ungrateful, then resent requirements sustained by their silence. This does not make them responsible for the whole structure. In a safe discussion, however, they can begin naming a particular distinction: assistance is valuable, while the work decision needs separate consideration. They need not prove entitlement to their life by rejecting all support. Restore clarity about what they are thankful for and what they have never promised.

## IV. Assistance should consider the recipient's goals

Oleg is confident that the vacancy he found is better. He may be right about particular factors, such as location, schedule or known requirements. Accurate knowledge of several conditions does not give him complete knowledge of Nina's life. She may consider concerns he does not see and prefer another permissible option. Assistance becomes more useful when it discovers those goals instead of assuming the recipient should repeat the helper's own path. Understanding goals does not require agreeing with every desire, but does require learning their substance first.

Ask which difficulty housing payments currently remove. Do they allow a considered job search, completing education or remaining in a particular neighbourhood? Separate this purpose from a vision of the person who should emerge. If Oleg regards support as conditional on choosing his approved profession, state that openly. Nina can then examine whether the offer matches her goals. An unclear gift that promises freedom while expecting complete personal transformation leaves the parties with different versions of their relationship.

In Chapter I of On Liberty, an adult's own good is not sufficient reason to compel them towards someone else's decision. The text contains historical exclusions that we do not adopt. For our scene, the narrow distinction between advice and control matters. One can explain, persuade and identify limits to one's own involvement. But assistance already relied upon should not silently turn advice into a command. Notice especially when discussion of reasons is replaced by a reminder of dependence on the resource.

Oleg is not obliged to fund every goal Nina chooses. He may decline particular expenses or revise the available amount. The distinction concerns how the decision is framed: a clear limit to his contribution, or a requirement to transfer authority over her choice. Different arrangements are possible, including help directed towards a particular permissible purpose. Their honesty depends on understandable conditions and real room to accept, suggest an alternative or refuse. Without that room, a polite conversation alone may be insufficient.

## V. Long-term support is not a diagnosis

Dependence often prompts a quick solution: end assistance so the person becomes independent. Ending rent payments does not automatically create work, income or available transport. It may simply transfer the difficulty to the recipient. Consider duration alongside the real task. Some needs change gradually; others continue. We do not call permanent care a failure because it has not ended by an arbitrary deadline, or promise to turn every recipient into a financially independent person.

There is a difference between support replacing an unavailable resource and an arrangement requiring permission for every small action. Regular assistance can provide a clear amount, a stable period and independence within it. Alternatively, every transfer may depend on whether the helper liked yesterday's conversation. Uncertainty then becomes an additional burden. In our scene, discussing predictability is more useful than simply trying to end material involvement as quickly as possible.

Nina may also want gradually to change the arrangement. After starting work, she might pay some expenses while retaining temporary assistance for others. This is a hypothetical option, not a compulsory recipe. Check actual capacity instead of treating a hope as confirmed income. If a plan relies entirely on an imagined future, abruptly rejecting current help may create another difficulty. More responsible discussion distinguishes known resources, possible changes and what remains unknown.

In Corinthians, Paul considers one community's abundance alongside others' need and possible future reciprocity. This is a religious context, rather than research on material dependence. It helps us see assistance between people whose circumstances can change, instead of an eternal division into strong giver and weak recipient. Nina need not demonstrate future usefulness for her need to matter. Oleg need not promise unlimited resources. Both need an honest arrangement addressing the present without pretending it has already become different.

## VI. The helper's limits deserve clarity too

Oleg may face expenses that make the earlier level of assistance unavailable. This is a separate circumstance that should not be hidden behind accusations about Nina's life. If the problem is the budget, discuss the budget and possible support changes. If it concerns the purpose of spending, name that. Mixing grounds prevents the recipient from understanding what is happening and suggests that any personal choice could suddenly remove an essential resource.

A helper can limit their contribution without proving the recipient bad. This matters: people sometimes find moral condemnation easier than acknowledging finite capacity, adding unnecessary cruelty to the conversation. Oleg can state the amount and duration he can sustain, what changed and when they need to review it. This does not promise to resolve every difficulty. It makes the limit understandable and reduces the need for Nina to infer it from moods or family arguments.

A particular promise already made also matters. If Oleg confirmed payments for a definite period, he cannot act as though he were choosing the amount for the first time today. Reliance deserves attention. We do not determine legal enforceability here, but ethically a change

should be communicated promptly, consequences discussed and available transition considered. Genuine inability differs from threatening to end assistance to control an unrelated decision. Separate these grounds through facts rather than the force of the justification offered.

Cicero warns against generosity exceeding one's means or violating justice to others. His historical examples and priorities do not provide a family budget table. The limited comparison supports asking at whose expense the gift is made. If helping one person destroys existing obligations to another, a large gesture is not unconditionally good. Clear limits protect more than Oleg: they let Nina plan real life rather than rely on resources existing only as expressions of generous feeling.

## VII. Discussing change without punishment

Separate a discussion of support from disagreement on another subject. If Oleg announces an end to payments immediately after Nina declines dinner, the causes can appear connected even if the budget problem arose earlier. A calmer time does not guarantee trust, but helps identify the subject. Explain what changes, when and why. The recipient needs to understand whether the decision concerns available means or expectations of particular behaviour.

Nina can prepare questions about duration, amount and what conditions Oleg regards as current. There is no need immediately to argue about his character. First compare their versions of the agreement. Both may have thought the period obvious while imagining it differently. New requirements may have appeared without discussion. Repair depends on the actual history. A general label of toxic generosity does not distinguish misunderstanding from progressively expanding control and may close clarification that remains possible.

Avoid dramatic tests of freedom. Recipients need not publicly reject money if doing so places them in danger. Helpers should not remove support to test gratitude or teach independence. Such actions turn a resource into an examination while hiding consequences behind an educational purpose. In this ordinary, safe scene, a smaller amount, another period or clear conditions can be discussed. Where threats or control of essential access are present, the exercise neither determines a procedure nor promises protection.

Check what changes in practice afterwards. If Nina is supposedly free to choose vacancies but every different decision is treated as a breach of duty, words have not changed the arrangement. If Oleg names an expense limit but continually funds new sums, that limit remains formal too. A visible next step should match the agreement. It may be small: a clear amount for next month, a review date or separation of a family invitation from a financial condition. This is more modest than complete independence but more accurately reflects the real work.

## VIII. The position of the person offering a gift

If the reader is in Oleg's position, ask which answers are permitted. Can someone accept help while disagreeing with advice? Can they ask about conditions? Can they refuse part of the offer without punishment for insufficient gratitude? These questions concern the gift's structure, rather than a hidden judgment of the helper's identity. Kind feelings can coexist with controlling habits, and clear limits with sincere care. Examine what is actually offered.

Next ask what information the assistance requires. Housing payments may need an amount and duration rather than the content of every personal meeting. Additional information sometimes belongs to a particular agreement; identify its purpose. Wanting access to the recipient's whole life can feel natural, especially after a large contribution. The size of a gift does not explain why someone should surrender privacy. Conditions of information access are a separate part of the arrangement rather than an unnoticed addition to generosity.

Confucian reciprocity prompts asking whether one would accept assistance on those terms. It cannot replace asking the recipient, whose preferences may differ. Historical role systems do not establish universal contemporary equality between parties; the comparison is limited to attention to another's position. Oleg may hear something uncomfortable about how Nina experiences his reminders. Responsibility means considering it, rather than immediately declaring every criticism correct or abandoning all limits of his own.

Do not make the recipient's independence a newly compulsory outcome of the gift either. Helpers sometimes want a particular kind of success that vindicates their investment. Another person's life need not report on our virtue. Specific purposes and actions can be agreed, limits preserved and support reviewed. Do not offer assistance as freely given relief and then judge the person by how well their later story enhances the giver's reputation. Clear conditions protect generosity from becoming control here too.

## IX. A gift that leaves a life of one's own

A good outcome need not involve ending support altogether. Oleg and Nina might agree on an amount and duration while leaving the job search her decision. They might choose assistance for a specific purpose she actually accepts. Or discover that less is available and discuss transition. No option can be pronounced morally perfect without knowing the circumstances. Identify what both parties have accepted and which decisions fall outside that arrangement.

Nina can remain grateful without promising every future concession. Oleg can remain interested without turning every suggestion into a condition. Disagreement does not mean assistance must automatically make one side the winner. Distinguish grounds: the resource, an accepted obligation, a new request and a separate personal decision. This does not instantly

remove unequal capacity. It makes that inequality visible and prevents a good action becoming an unlimited source of authority.

Remember people beyond the pair too. If Oleg promises resources already needed by other family members, their interests do not disappear because the purpose is good. If Nina accepts help, clearly agreed expenses and significant changes still matter. Respect for autonomy does not mean indifference to consequences for others. It lets those consequences be discussed specifically, instead of demanding obedience as gratitude or total refusal as proof of personal strength.

After the next month, return to one observable question: did assistance expand the ability to act or introduce additional unstated conditions? The answer may be mixed. Clarify a particular part rather than declaring the relationship wholly saving or destructive. Generosity retains meaning when someone receives a resource and an understandable place for their own decision. This does not promise an end to need or judge every giver alike. It invites comparison of good intentions with the actual arrangement and the recipient's life.

## What this means in practice

Choose one safe, ordinary support agreement. Do not use the exercise to test relationships where refusal or changes involve threats, violence or loss of essential living resources. It determines no procedure for such circumstances. Assistance important to everyday safety should not be abruptly ended as an experimental proof of independence.

Record four elements: what is provided, for how long, which conditions were stated beforehand and which decisions remain the recipient's. Separately note later expectations. Do not treat every request as a condition; check whether refusal is actually linked to resource changes or accusations of ingratitude. Use observable events rather than assumptions about a hidden personality type.

Compare the helper's purpose with the recipient's. Where do they coincide? What limits may the helper place on their own contribution? Is control of an unrelated decision being required? Prepare one question about the distinction and one specific clarification. Do not promise long-term independence whose grounds remain unknown.

Discuss a review date if conversation is possible and safe. Changes to confirmed support should consider reliance and an available transition. Do not use sudden withdrawal as education or a gratitude test. Afterwards check one result: is the amount, date or boundary between support and personal choice clearer?

This United Wisdom exercise has no established research efficacy. It aims to make assistance more understandable. Receiving support does not cancel dignity, while limiting a contribution does not require declaring the recipient unworthy. Preserve both principles together.

## Key quotation

> *God loveth a cheerful giver.*

2 Corinthians 9:7, short concluding excerpt, King James Version. A religious statement about giving, rather than a guarantee of income, gratitude or the helper's success.

## Connections between traditions

| Connection | What it clarifies and where the comparison ends |
|---|---|
| Cicero I.14 / hidden conditions of generosity | Giving is considered alongside justice and harm. Historical ranking is not a contemporary measure of recipients' dignity. |
| Kant V(B) / Nina's purposes | Supporting welfare does not provide complete authority to assign someone's goals. This is not a ready-made financial support theory. |
| Mill, On Liberty I / advice becoming a condition | Reasons can be distinguished from compulsion for another's good. The text determines no legal status here; historical exclusions are not adopted. |
| 2 Corinthians 8:12–15 and 9:7 / continuing assistance | Capacity, willingness and changing need matter in the religious collection. This is neither dependence research nor a promise of material returns. |
| Analects XV.23 / the helper's perspective | Reciprocity draws attention to the recipient's position. Their answer cannot be replaced by the giver's imagination; historical hierarchy is not transferred. |

## Primary sources

• Cicero. De Officiis I.X31–33 and I.XIV42–45, Walter Miller translation, 1913, Project Gutenberg 47001. Continuous English discussions of harm, promises and generosity within one's means were read. The epigraph is the identified I.14 §43 excerpt; historical priorities are not measures of recipients' dignity.

• Immanuel Kant. The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation, Project Gutenberg 5684. Introduction IV, V(B), VII and VIII(2) were read on moral ends, others' happiness and latitude. A normative source rather than an empirical model of helping relationships.

• John Stuart Mill. On Liberty, Chapters I and IV, Project Gutenberg 34901. Selected continuous passages on pressure, independence and others' interests were read. Mill's text is separated from Courtney's introduction; colonial exclusions are not adopted.

• 2 Corinthians, King James Version, Wikisource. 8:1–24 and 9:1–15 were read. The religious collection's context is preserved; the key quotation is the identified excerpt without financial promises.

• Confucius. The Analects XV.5 and XV.11–29, James Legge translation, Project Gutenberg 3330. The selected context on sincerity, reciprocity and examining judgments was read. Numbering follows Legge; full text is not ingested. Worldwide rights in the named editions are not asserted.

## Tags

generosity, assistance, support, dependence, autonomy, dignity, resources, gratitude, obedience, conditions, agreement, need, choice, goals, responsibility, justice, limits, long-term care, predictability, privacy, transition, reciprocity, consent, gift, Cicero, Kant, Mill, Confucius, Pauline letters, relationships

## 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.