

UNITED WISDOM

Helping One Person or Giving a Little to Many

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-18-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Helping One Person or Giving a Little to Many

Epigraph

> *that there may be equality*

2 Corinthians 8:14, short concluding excerpt, King James Version. Its context is mutual provision for need in a religious collection, rather than a ready-made universal allocation formula.

What this article is about

Imagine a small neighbourhood assistance circle receiving several ordinary requests. One family needs a particular item to make everyday living more manageable; the available resources could meet this need completely. Several other families request smaller amounts for their own tasks. Everyone could receive a little, but no request would then be fully met. Maya, who coordinates the circle, is uncertain which choice is fairer. The first family's story moves her more, while helping many seems more impartial.

The number of recipients and the depth of assistance answer different questions. Fully resolving one task may be useful, but familiarity can obscure other needs. Small, equal contributions may matter or be insufficient for their stated purpose. Without clarification, neither deserves automatic preference.

We will examine the resource's purpose, real obligations, sufficient contributions and limits of knowledge. Historical texts offer ethical orientation rather than measured predictions. This is not financial advice or an emergency allocation procedure; it concerns ordinary voluntary assistance where requests can be clarified and a limited choice honestly identified.

I. What is being allocated?

Before choosing, establish what the circle actually controls. Are these unrestricted funds, money already promised, participants' time or items intended for a particular purpose? Apparently identical amounts may have different conditions. If donors contributed to a specific request, Maya cannot turn that contribution into a general fund without discussion. Unrestricted funds permit wider choices. Sometimes argument about one person or many precedes checking authority, and a good purpose conceals the absence of permission to change another's contribution.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Account separately for the costs of assistance itself. Obtaining an item, delivery, coordination and subsequent work require time. One large contribution may use almost all organisational capacity, while several small contributions require separate journeys. This does not automatically favour either option. Clarify what the group can perform rather than merely announce. Promised assistance that cannot be delivered or used differs from assistance actually received and suitable for the task.

Distinguish a one-time resource from a recurring possibility too. If further funds are merely anticipated, do not treat the next contribution as confirmed. Today's decision should use known capacity while identifying hopes for future collection separately. Giving everyone a little may otherwise create expectations that every request will later be completed, although the group has decided nothing of the kind. An honest limit does not diminish goodwill; it protects people from planning around resources that do not exist.

Cicero considers generosity alongside means and justice to others. We do not transfer his historical preferences between recipients into the modern group. The limited comparison concerns the gift's own grounds: it cannot be enlarged using resources one has no authority to control. Maya's first step is simple. Identify what is available, separate accepted commitments and clarify conditions of use. Only then discuss allocating the remainder among requests that are genuinely open.

II. Equal amounts do not always mean equal assistance

Giving everyone the same amount produces an understandable procedure. Participants can check the arithmetic and see that nobody received more. Equal contributions do not, however, tell us which difficulty is removed. A small sum may complete resources already gathered by one person while allowing another to do nothing they intended. Identical transfers then have different practical sufficiency. This does not prove equal distribution wrong; it identifies a question that division of the total cannot answer.

Maya should ask what partial assistance would accomplish. Can a smaller suitable item be bought, the contribution combined with existing means or a separate part of the task completed? Recipients need not promise miraculous results to be considered. An accurate account matters: what is sufficient, what is not and what remains unknown. If the outcome depends on further unconfirmed resources, that dependency should not become a dependable plan. Partial assistance can be reasonable precisely when its limit is recognised.

Nor should a small contribution be equated with complete uselessness. Sometimes ordinary supplies can be used independently of resolving a larger task. Sometimes particular assistance reduces a current burden without changing the whole situation. Describe scale carefully. A contribution can cover a specific part without being said to solve a family's life. Comparison

then becomes more accurate: particular actions and expected immediate results are examined, rather than the rhetorical force of saying helped.

In Corinthians, abundance is related to need and mutual provision, rather than merely equal gift size. The religious context supplies no calculation formula for a neighbourhood circle. It draws attention to the difference between visible equality and consideration of circumstances. Maya can maintain an equal procedure for examining requests without assuming identical amounts. Differences nevertheless need stated grounds; otherwise discussion of actual benefit becomes a convenient justification for personal preference never examined.

III. Fully resolving one task needs checking too

Helping one family is attractive because it appears clear. Buy the item, hand it over and see the task completed. That outcome matters, but the helper's feeling of completion is not the recipient's entire benefit. Is the item suitable, can it be used and does the family want that assistance? A group may choose something easy to show in a report while the recipient needs another kind of help. Completing our plan does not guarantee agreement with theirs.

Separate particular necessity from a compelling story. Maya may know the first family personally, making details available and emotions strong. Other requests arrive as short messages and seem weaker. This is a difference in information, not necessarily need. There is no reason to condemn being moved by familiarity. Check which information about the others is missing and whether it can be obtained proportionately. Someone less able to describe their life is not automatically less worthy of attention.

Trying to know everything has costs too. Recipients should not disclose their entire private lives for a moral competition. An ordinary decision needs information about the request, sufficiency and relevant limits. Detail should serve the choice rather than the group's curiosity. Where one story is better known, record a knowledge limit. Honest uncertainty is more accurate than confidently concluding the first family needs help most because an emotional story about them is easier to imagine.

Mill's discussion of others' interests reminds us that actions have consequences beyond personal preference. The selected pages do not provide a complete allocation theory. Maya's practical conclusion is that the decision affects people she knows differently, so its grounds should be named before choosing. Helping one is permissible because a particular contribution meets a significant request within resources and obligations, rather than because their story won. Unselected requests remain real needs, rather than evidence of lesser personal value.

IV. Accepted obligations are not merely additional requests

Suppose the circle previously confirmed assistance to one family, then received new requests. That promise changes the task. Requests cannot all be compared as equally open choices while forgetting someone planned around confirmation. A more moving new account does not erase those grounds. First establish what was accepted, who was told and which important conditions accompanied the answer. A commitment can be limited, but convenience in making a new choice should not make it invisible.

Sometimes expectations arise without confirmation. Maya may have offered to consider a request while the family heard a promise. Check the conversation honestly. Not every expectation automatically becomes a duty, but the group should not exploit ambiguity it encouraged. An unclear answer requires accurate correction. This may be unpleasant, yet prevents another set of hopes that will later be explained away through insufficient resources.

Cicero examines promises alongside circumstances and harm. His historical examples do not establish contemporary legal liability. Distinguish two kinds of work: fulfilling accepted obligations and choosing new gifts. If actual changes make a promise impossible, discuss consequences and available repair rather than simply making the recipient compete again. Their situation includes an additional fact, reliance on a commitment, and that fact matters ethically.

This does not make every earlier decision permanently correct. The group may discover a mistake or a significant task change. Identify specific grounds for revision, inform affected people and examine what remains possible. Revision must not secretly convert an inconvenient obligation into optional charity. Before asking whom to give the remainder, establish what really remains unrestricted. This protects previous and new recipients from promises that appear complete only because their history has been forgotten.

V. Closeness matters without deciding everything

Maya knows one family better and feels particular responsibility. Closeness is not necessarily unfair. People have different ties and obligations; each private gift need not follow a universal worldwide list of needs. A shared circle may nevertheless have a purpose different from helping its coordinator's friends. If resources were given to consider several neighbourhood requests, Maya's personal closeness should not silently replace the accepted allocation framework.

Identify the preference's grounds: an earlier promise, knowledge of a specific need, an obligation to someone close or simply stronger emotion? Different answers deserve different consideration. Feeling is not inherently false, but does not prove other people's circumstances.

Acknowledge being moved more by the first story, then examine requests through equally understandable questions. Impartiality begins with transparent procedure and attention to information, rather than a demand to stop feeling attachment.

Kant's discussion of wide duty permits differences in performance without abandoning the ethical end. This does not instruct us to rank every recipient. It helps hold two points together: identical help for everyone is impossible, and complete indifference cannot become a principle. The group can choose a limited contribution on stated grounds without pretending to resolve all neighbourhood need. Refusing some people should not imply their requests have no ethical importance at all.

Confucian reciprocity adds a question: how would one want to receive an answer among those not selected? This requires neither identical gifts nor replacement of the recipient's voice. Avoid speaking of winners and losers in a competition of personal worth. Explain the resource limit, chosen grounds and what actually remains possible. Do not promise another collection unless confirmed. Respectful communication recognises need without turning it into a debt the organisation cannot honour.

VI. Precise scores should not conceal uncertainty

Allocation easily produces tables assigning scores for benefit, urgency and recipient numbers. Tables can help retain questions, but the numbers require grounds. Where outcomes are unknown, invented estimates do not improve knowledge. Helping four families cannot be called several times more effective merely because there are more families. Nor is one complete solution infinitely more valuable than all partial contributions. Both forms of arithmetic substitute convenient numbers for unknown results.

Record confirmed information, reasonable expectations and unknowns separately. It is confirmed that the funds cover a particular item. It is expected to remove a specific everyday difficulty. Whether a partial contribution can be combined with another source is unknown. This does not eliminate uncertainty; it identifies which question deserves asking before the choice. Obtain information capable of changing the decision. Endless investigation of every biography also consumes resources and delays available help.

Check whether there is a sufficiency threshold and how it was established. It may follow from an appropriate item's price, confirmed existing funds or the amount of particular work. Sometimes the group invents a threshold because it wants a finished report. Ask the recipient about a smaller independent outcome then. A threshold concerns a task rather than human dignity. It can change after clarification without making the earlier description dishonest or the recipient blameworthy.

This article's sources are normative and religious, rather than comparative outcome measurements. They do not support predictions we cannot establish. Maya may remain uncertain after a good discussion. Describe the choice as a limited decision based on available information. Record what new evidence would justify review, then check the immediate result. This is more honest than an unprovable guarantee of maximum benefit. Ethical seriousness appears in the limits of a claim rather than the confidence of its final number.

VII. A shared decision should remain understandable

With shared resources, Maya needs to know who decides and under which arrangement. She might gather information while participants confirm the choice, or have advance authorisation within a defined scope. Unclear authority turns the one-or-many question into a dispute about speaking for the group. Small ordinary assistance does not need elaborate structure. An understandable process can avoid presenting the coordinator's preference as an automatically accepted collective decision.

Name the grounds before selecting a recipient. The group might first honour confirmed commitments, then consider sufficient contributions and actual capacity. This is an author-designed suggestion for our scene, not a universal moral formula. Another circle can have a different established purpose. The rule should not appear afterwards solely to justify the favourite story. Participants need to understand how the same question was applied to different requests and what remained unknown.

Where clarification leaves several comparable permissible options, a simple agreed selection method may be considered. Procedure should not bypass existing obligations or ignore known significant differences of need. Equal consideration does not make all outcomes identical. Do not prolong debate about perfect justice indefinitely where a sufficiently grounded limited step is available. Equally, a quick vote's convenience does not remove affected people's need for accurate information about assistance.

Communicate what has actually been confirmed. If one request is chosen, others should not receive vague assurance of help for everyone soon. If partial contributions are chosen, state their limits without promising full completion. Public accounts should match scale too. Helping several people with a particular part of expenses is more accurate than solving their difficulties. Honest reporting protects recipients from becoming evidence of the group's success and lets the next allocation draw on real experience.

VIII. Assistance is not a gratitude contest

A group may unconsciously prefer people who express appreciation well. Choice then depends on expected pleasant responses as well as requests. Gratitude is natural, but does not precisely measure need or benefit. Someone may be reserved, busy or unwilling to appear publicly. This does not automatically make assistance less important to them. A recipient need not provide donors with an emotionally complete story for their request to deserve consideration.

Separate assistance from permission to publish a story. Agreement to an item or sum is not agreement to photographs, interviews and family details. Discuss publicity separately where planned. Do not choose whoever most readily accepts it and then describe the choice solely as a response to greater need. Our scene has no obligatory public campaign. There is even less reason to add that price silently after a person begins relying on the gift.

In the Christian letter, the giver's willingness and religious understanding matter. We derive no guarantee of recipient gratitude from this. Kant's end of others' happiness likewise gives no authority to prescribe pleasing behaviour. The sources have different grounds; comparison is limited to the direction of assistance. Maya can ask whether the choice survives without a beautiful response. A decision changing only because one family will praise the circle better deserves honest examination of motives.

The recipient still participates in a particular agreement. Confirming receipt or reporting changes may reasonably belong to assistance. That information differs from compulsory admiration or disclosure of a life. Clear conditions allow necessary responses to be requested without buying recognition. For the one-or-many question, this matters especially: the number of grateful messages should not become a hidden objective determining assistance instead of its actual purpose.

IX. A choice that can be explained and checked

After clarification, Maya might find that resources completely meet one significant task, while partial contributions elsewhere provide no independent result yet. Helping one then has understandable grounds. Elsewhere, small contributions may complete existing funds for several recipients, making distribution reasonable. These are different hypothetical circumstances rather than universal conclusions. Information needed to decide cannot be bypassed through a favourite principle of numbers or completion.

A sound choice also acknowledges limits. Not every request will be met. Recognise this without condemning people or promising the next collection will certainly resolve matters. Remaining need does not make every decision hypocritical, but requires honest scale. A

refusal may include available information or another limited action where genuinely possible. Do not offer a false substitute merely to feel nobody was left without an answer.

After transfer, examine the actual result. Did assistance arrive? Was the item suitable? Was a partial contribution used for the agreed independent part? These questions do not require access to the recipient's whole life. They establish what matters for the group's promises and the next similar task. Describe outcomes differing from expectations instead of hiding them for reporting. A small honest procedural correction is more useful than repeating a confident formula that did not match the circumstances.

We obtain no infallible allocation system. We preserve distinctions supporting responsibility: unrestricted and promised resources, complete and partial results, known need and emotionally vivid stories, respect and pursuit of gratitude. Helping one or many concerns specific action within a real framework. It can be decided without ranking people's dignity or presenting uncertainty as precise calculation. Clarity makes generosity concrete even when less is available than we wish to give.

What this means in practice

Choose an ordinary voluntary allocation task with time to clarify requests. Do not use the exercise for emergency rescue, medical choices, legal rights or professional decisions governed by mandatory rules. It offers no universal priority procedure for those circumstances.

Record available resources and their purpose. Separate confirmed promises from new requests. Clarify who can decide and whether a contribution's purpose can change. Do not count expected future receipts as already available.

For each genuinely open option, identify the immediate result of full and partial assistance. What is known about sufficiency? What depends on other funds? Which information could change the choice? Obtain what is necessary without creating a competition of detailed biographies. Note familiarity as a possible influence on attention, rather than proof of greater need.

State grounds before choosing: for example, obligations first, then independent usefulness and actual capacity to perform. Do not assign invented efficiency scores to unknown outcomes. Where several choices remain permissible, use an understandable agreed procedure suited to the task.

Tell recipients the exact confirmed contribution and its limit. Promise no undecided continuation. After transfer, check one significant result while preserving privacy and separate consent to publicity. This author-designed exercise has no established research efficacy. Its

aim is an explainable limited decision and honest checking, rather than guaranteed maximum benefit or freedom from regret.

Key quotation

> *our beneficence should not exceed our means*

Cicero, On Duties I.14, §44, short excerpt, Walter Miller translation. Limits of means do not imply indifference to need; they distinguish real contributions from promises of unavailable resources.

Connections between traditions

Connection	What it clarifies and where the comparison ends
2 Corinthians 8:12–15 / equal amounts and sufficiency	Abundance is considered relative to need and mutual provision. The religious text gives no universal benefit calculation formula.
Cicero I.14 / shared resource limits	Generosity is related to means and justice. Historical worthiness criteria are not transferred into a contemporary competition.
Kant VII and VIII(2) / limited performance	Wide duty allows choice of means without abandoning its ethical end. This is not a ranking table for every need.
Mill, On Liberty IV / unselected people's interests	Actions affect others beyond personal preference. The selected passage supplies no comparative outcome measurements.
Analects XV.23 and XV.27 / a less vivid request	Reciprocity and examining popular judgments help distinguish circumstances from impressions. Historical role ethics is not modern allocation procedure.

Primary sources

• 2 Corinthians, King James Version, Wikisource. 8:1–24 and 9:1–15 were read. The epigraph is the identified short excerpt from 8:14. The religious collection's context is preserved, without financial promises or empirical allocation assessment.

• Cicero. De Officiis I.X31–33 and I.XIV42–45, Walter Miller translation, 1913, Project Gutenberg 47001. Continuous English passages on promises, harm and generosity were read. The key

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

quotation is the I.14 §44 excerpt. Historical preference criteria do not determine contemporary personal worth.

• Immanuel Kant. The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation, Project Gutenberg 5684. Introduction IV, V(B), VII and VIII(2) were read. Ethical ends are distinguished from latitude in performance; no allocation calculation method is inferred.

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

• Confucius. The Analects XV.5 and XV.11–29, James Legge translation, Project Gutenberg 3330. The selected context was read; numbering follows Legge. Reciprocity and examination of majority judgment are compared. Full texts are not ingested; worldwide rights in the named editions are not asserted.

Tags

assistance, allocation, generosity, resources, sufficiency, equality, proportionality, need, obligation, promise, choice, impartiality, closeness, information, uncertainty, priority, shared contribution, partial help, consequences, gratitude, privacy, consent, checking, justice, Kant, Mill, Cicero, Confucius, Pauline letters, responsibility

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.