

UNITED WISDOM

How to discuss the distribution of contributions and results

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-26-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

How to discuss the distribution of contributions and results

Epigraph

> *This, then, is one species of the just.*

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, V.3, complete closing sentence translated by W. D. Ross, Internet Classics Archive. The context considers distributive proportion; the following section distinguishes another kind of justice.

What this article is about

Discussion of contributions often begins when a shared result already exists. In a hypothetical story, three people prepare a small exhibition of translated poems and a printed booklet. One translates, another designs, and a third finds premises and pays for printing. After part of the print run sells, money remains, and the earlier phrase doing it together no longer answers concrete questions. What is returned as an expense, what concerns accepted work, whose name belongs beside the text, and who decides further use? The article distinguishes these objects while preserving actual history and agreements. Aristotle's kinds of justice are compared with the vineyard workers' parable; their difference is not removed through a shared remuneration formula. The practical aim is to discuss a defined result and distribution's grounds, without turning every contribution into a contest over personal moral worth or treating one participant's generosity as permission to alter another's promised conditions.

I. First establish what is being distributed

After the exhibition, Alexei says he worked most, Vera recalls the design, and Denis presents printing expenses. These statements concern different objects. Paying for paper, preparing a translation, and an author's credit are not one share immediately divisible into three. Beginning with who deserves more overall mixes grounds for reimbursing expenses, recognising labour, and deciding the booklet's future. Each object should be named separately. This does not devalue contributions. The distinction instead helps consider what a person actually gave the undertaking without demanding victory over others in a complete comparison of merits first.

In the hypothetical story, one can ask which money actually remains after expenses, which expenses the group accepted, what was promised for work, and which decisions about using the text remain open. This list does not predetermine an answer. It holds discussion to its subject. Sometimes an expected result never appeared: sales covered only part of printing, or

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

payments have not arrived. An assumed surplus then cannot be distributed as money already available. Actual state and expectation need distinguishing. A future possibility becomes a separate question rather than grounds for declaring a transfer completed when participants cannot yet rely on it.

Results that are not divisible like objects also need seeing. A translator's credit does not become smaller because more money was received, and visitors' access to the exhibition is not distributed among participants by working hours. Different relationships can be discussed without making them interchangeable. If the group previously agreed on an arrangement, it remains a basis for today's discussion until reconsidered intelligibly. Where agreement is absent, its absence must be named rather than a favourite formula presented as what everybody supposedly always meant. A shared intention does not establish shared understanding of every future result.

II. Contribution history needs facts rather than one impression

Alexei remembers long translation evenings, Vera several layout revisions, and Denis negotiations for the room. Participants saw different parts of the work. An available history can be assembled: which actions were accepted, what was actually done, which materials were delivered, and which changes required additional effort. This does not require measuring every movement or revealing private life. Significant facts relevant to the object discussed are enough. Printing requires information about an agreed expense; attribution requires the actual work on the text. A general story about who grew more tired does not replace these different grounds, although tiredness may matter for future participation's scope.

Invisible work also needs specificity. Denis did more than find a room: he repeatedly clarified timing, provided access, and communicated information to visitors. Naming these actions makes their contribution available for consideration. He need not prove he worked exactly as much as the translator. Work has different forms and dependencies. Yet saying that one carried everything is too broad to determine every share by itself. Turning to which transitions were actually maintained is useful. This precision guarantees no common assessment; it helps discuss an action rather than a fixed image of the principal, invisible, or underappreciated participant.

History should preserve factual limits too. Vera may have spent longer revising the layout than expected, but the group did not request every alteration. This does not make her labour unreal. However, independently expanding work and agreed new participation provide different grounds for discussing a promised result. Both can be recognised while what can be accommodated now is separately decided. If revision causes are unestablished, nobody should immediately be designated the culprit. An error in the initial text, a new task, and a

personal choice to add detail are different situations. Recognising time spent does not automatically establish others' agreement with any amount or a new allocation of authority.

III. Proportion depends on the chosen basis

In Nicomachean Ethics, V.3, distribution is considered through relationships between people and distributed goods, while criteria of merit differ across political arrangements. Ancient statuses do not become a contemporary right to a share here. A limited connection helps reveal that proportional still leaves the question: proportional to what? Hours, accepted work, funds contributed, or another agreement? Even a careful calculation can conceal a disputed basis. The measure needs discussing before its result is presented as uniquely fair merely through mathematical precision. A number makes the selected relationship visible without selecting it on participants' behalf.

Suppose the group previously agreed to reimburse defined printing expenses from sales and use the remainder for another exhibition. Proposing now to divide it by working hours is a new option. It can be considered, but should not be declared the original promise. Conversely, where remuneration was agreed, a new shared intention does not automatically cancel it. The article appoints no financial rule and resolves no contractual dispute. It distinguishes an actual agreement from a proposed change. This makes proportion discussable concretely, without presenting one's own understanding of equality as a fact another person supposedly accepted when first helping the undertaking.

Grounds may differ for different results. An expense is reimbursed for an accepted object, attribution reflects the work's origin, and further use of remaining funds follows a separate decision. Separating them does not mean the relationships are unconnected. They affect the group's possibilities and can be discussed together. But a connection does not make them one account. Vera can receive accurate recognition of design without acquiring the right to alter the translation; Denis can recover an agreed expense without becoming author of every text. Discussion becomes clearer when a measure concerns a defined good and action rather than establishing a universal participant hierarchy from one contribution type.

IV. Correcting a violation differs from new distribution

In V.4 of the same book, Aristotle distinguishes a corrective relationship from distributive proportion. The historical judicial scheme is not transferred as a contemporary procedure for our group. The limited connection concerns different questions: what to distribute now and what to restore after a defined violation. If Denis's agreed expense was mistakenly omitted, correction need not await a general contest of merits. The expense and its accepted basis need establishing first. Otherwise discussion of a future surplus hides a specific past omission. A new decision may be reasonable without becoming correction of the earlier state merely because one participant is offered a different benefit now.

Nor can every disappointment be declared a violation in advance. Alexei expected half the surplus, but the group accepted no such condition. His expectation can be discussed, particularly if others' words gave grounds to understand the intention that way. Yet an actual promise, an ambiguous message, and an unexpressed hope are different situations. They require clarification rather than choosing a convenient history retrospectively. If the initial understanding cannot be established, this limitation remains part of discussion. An available solution can be agreed now without claiming it proved a single truth about every earlier intention or corrected a violation that remains unestablished.

Correction has its own scope. If Vera's credit is missing from the booklet, adding it in the next printing matters without changing copies already distributed. An available clarification for earlier recipients and a future edition can be considered separately. If money went to the wrong recipient, a corrected record does not establish actual repayment. Which action occurred and what remains must be named. The article promises no restoration of every relationship through one gesture. It preserves the distinction between acknowledging an error, available correction, and a new agreement. Thanks or general generosity are thereby kept from replacing a concrete result that was accepted and subsequently violated.

V. Promised conditions and subsequent generosity are different

In Matthew 20:1–16, the vineyard workers' parable begins with an image of the kingdom of heaven. Differing work durations and equal payment create tension with the first workers' expectations, while their original agreement is preserved. Later workers had not been hired earlier; their story is not simply unwillingness to work. The religious foundation and reversal of first and last cannot become a universal pay formula. A limited connection helps consider a distinct question: kindness to another does not always mean something promised to me was taken away. This does not permit a contemporary participant to alter somebody else's conditions in generosity's name.

If Denis voluntarily gives his own available share to help the next exhibition, that is one act. If he disposes of funds the group promised Vera, that is another. Both may outwardly sound like contributions to the common undertaking, but their grounds differ. Generosity presupposes a boundary around what a person is actually entitled to dispose of. The parable cannot be used to declare every demand for accepted remuneration a spiritual weakness. A person can wish another well and ask for a promise to be fulfilled. The article resolves neither a theological question of reward nor a legal dispute. It preserves a concrete agreement where moral language might close it without examination.

An agreement nevertheless does not prohibit offering more or helping differently. A gift, alteration of one's own share, or a new common arrangement with intelligible consent may be possible. These actions need not repeat one proportion. Fulfilling what was accepted and voluntarily expanding assistance can be distinguished. Another person's different good does not make my work less real. This question does not cancel discussion of actual unfairness: whether a condition was violated, and which one, still needs seeing. Comparing with the parable preserves tension between calculations of merit and generosity instead of dissolving it into a slogan of equal pay for everyone or an administrator's unrestricted right to choose any measure.

VI. Recognition of origin cannot be replaced by a general compliment

The booklet can identify who translated the poems, designed the pages, and organised the exhibition. This attribution concerns actual work. It need not give everyone an identical place in every line. If Alexei translated and Vera designed, different names and roles may be more accurate than created by the team. But attribution should not conceal a contribution that materially changed the text. Another participant may actually have proposed a correction and helped verify it. That can be identified within a suitable scope. The article establishes no legal authorship rights; it discusses honest provenance of a result the group uses and presents to others.

Recognition does not become precise through ceremony. Public thanks to Denis may fail to explain that he paid for printing and secured premises. Vera may be called an inspiration although she made a concrete layout. Such language is sometimes attractive but may reduce visibility of actual work. Warmth can be preserved while an action is named. Attribution need not become a complete list of every instance of assistance if irrelevant or difficult to read. Yet choosing brevity should preserve substantial truth rather than only a convenient image of an author around whom others supposedly supplied atmosphere without creating any part of the result.

Nor does money cancel provenance. Payment does not automatically make a translation anonymous if no such arrangement was accepted; a larger financial share does not prove authorship of all materials. Conversely, a cover credit does not mean someone agreed to waive a promised expense or payment. These relationships can be connected through a particular agreement that must actually be established. It cannot be inferred from an overall impression that someone already received sufficient recognition. Discussion remains precise when thanks, attribution, remuneration, and the ability to use material have intelligible grounds, even if the group chooses to express them in one short record.

VII. Additional contributions need a separate conversation

During preparation, Vera makes several extra pages because new translations appear. If this change is agreed, the earlier work scope no longer exists. Timing, available effort, and effects on the result need discussing. Old conditions cannot be retained merely because the task still bears the same booklet name. Meanwhile, a new action need not automatically alter every earlier share. The group might choose fewer texts, postpone publication, or offer limited help. The change needs naming before it becomes a history of silent debt. Participation accepted within one scope is not endless readiness to support any expansion of a shared intention.

Independently added work can also be considered without devaluation. Denis organised an additional evening the group had not planned. It may prove useful, but usefulness does not establish that everyone previously accepted its expenses. Who was authorised to decide and what information others received need clarifying. Discussion need not reduce to thanks or an accusation of acting unilaterally. There is an actual result and a question about its basis. Work can be recognised while a proposed distribution measure is declined; part of an expense can be accepted now, honestly identified as a new agreement rather than an invented consent before the action began.

Labour that rescued an urgent gap needs particularly careful consideration. On the final evening, Alexei rechecked labels so that the exhibition could open. Assistance matters without making him permanent holder of every subsequent decision or erasing the other work. If the group wants to entrust a new scope to him, that is separate participation. If he wants additional labour recognised, its object and earlier conditions should be named. Urgency creates no universal measure. Accurate history helps avoid exchanging rescue for indefinite power or turning gratitude into a demand that the helper never speak about the available limits of personal participation.

VIII. Only what one may dispose of can be distributed

The exhibition uses provided premises and texts with defined conditions. Agreement among the three does not authorise changing promises to people outside the group. If the room is available only for free admission, a new decision to charge requires its actual grounds to be clarified. If the original poet permitted a defined use, the booklet's success does not automatically establish another. The article determines no legal conditions of use. It recalls an editorial boundary: internal distribution creates neither missing consent from third parties nor a resource available for every future intention out of material currently accessible.

Nor should a future possibility not yet provided be distributed in advance. Denis heard of a likely invitation to another venue. This grounds clarifying conditions rather than offering a confirmed result to Vera in place of today's promise. Perhaps the invitation will not happen or will require different actions. Future participation is discussed separately. Recognising this limit does not diminish initiative. It preserves accuracy about what the group currently possesses. Otherwise a promised share easily becomes a promise of some unknown future benefit that a person did not accept as replacement and whose receipt still depends on other people's decisions.

Where a surplus is available, its use for a shared task can be considered, but the decision needs an established scope. Every sum on one account should not be treated as one person's freely available resource. Nor must every participant accept expanding the project as the only noble option. Some are ending participation, while others are willing to continue. Respect for the common undertaking does not require concealing these differences. The article gives no financial instructions; it considers the transition from a result's existence to grounds for further use, so that ours does not replace the question of what was actually accepted and to whom it was promised.

IX. Disagreement should concern a defined object

Vera says distribution is unfair. Clarification helps: was an accepted expense omitted, work scope altered, a credit concealed, or the surplus measure disputed? These questions can be connected but need different information and actions. Discussing a concrete object does not prohibit expressing a feeling of being underappreciated. It helps identify an available examination that does not depend on others agreeing with her entire inner assessment. Attribution and layout history can be checked even while shares remain disputed. Resolving one part then does not become a demand first to convince the group that this person deserves trust in general.

Nor must another person's motive be established as a precondition of correction. Denis may have omitted Vera's expense mistakenly or considered it unaccepted. Facts and grounds need

clarifying. If causes are unestablished, a convenient psychological story should not fill them. Equally, absence of proven bad intent does not make an actual omission nonexistent. Examining the current state, permissible correction, and a future arrangement differ. A record might be clarified now while future acceptance of new expenses is separately agreed. The former does not prove the latter already operates; an elaborate future form does not replace available correction of today's object.

When agreement is unavailable, the open question and limits on further participation should be named honestly. A temporary option may allow the exhibition to finish while a new edition is postponed. Appropriate outside assistance on a particular subject may be needed. The article does not substitute legal or financial advice for it. A tired participant's silence should not be presented as acceptance of a new measure. Completed work can be preserved and a defined scope ended without announcing that every relationship has been fairly established. Ending discussion and resolving its subject differ; precision about that boundary avoids creating an extra promise merely for a feeling of common agreement.

X. A shared result does not require a shared ranking of people

The three can agree on particular relationships without finally deciding who contributed more to the exhibition's entire life. Denis recovers an agreed expense, Vera receives accurate design attribution, Alexei retains translation credit, and the surplus is considered on an accepted basis. This is only a hypothetical option rather than a universal formula. Relationships will differ in another story. Practical clarity means every action has an object and history, and participants know what remains open. A result need not be accompanied by an overall moral ranking that makes one role permanently principal and turns every subsequent decision into continuation of an earlier comparison.

One can also generously alter personal participation without requiring others to repeat the gesture. Alexei waives an available share for another edition while preserving others' agreed conditions. Vera may accept or decline further design work. Denis may end his organisational role after handing over the actual state. These differences do not prove less love for the common undertaking. They reveal different decisions under different circumstances. Comparing sources preserves the possibility of seeing both a defined measure and a good not reducible to competition over merits. Neither becomes permission to dispose of another's promised result under the name of shared spiritual maturity.

Discussion ends with sufficient precision when people understand what was completed, what is transferred, on which grounds, and which questions need a new decision. Not every disappointment will disappear, and the article promises none of that. The philosophical distinction between kinds of justice and the Gospel parable remain different references with their own limits. Contemporary discussion belongs to participants themselves. Its quality

concerns the possibility of naming contributions without legend, distributing something defined without silently expanding rights, and acknowledging unfinished matters without denying completed work. A shared result then becomes an object of agreement rather than the final proof of who was worthier than everybody else.

What this means in practice

Choose one object of distribution: an accepted expense, promised remuneration, attribution, access to material, or further use of a result. Name its actual state and initial agreement, separating these from an expectation and a new proposal. Gather only necessary information about work and limits on disposal. Do not begin with a general ranking of merits. If proportion is proposed, clarify its basis and applicability to this object. Numerical precision does not itself establish the selected measure's correctness. In the hypothetical exhibition, printing expenses and translation provenance are discussed alongside each other without automatically being exchanged as parts of one abstract share.

Distinguish new distribution from correcting an established violation. Name exactly what needs restoring, which action was already performed, and what remains available only in the future. Consider additional work through its actual scope and agreement, without denying independent labour or retrospectively assigning others' consent to it. Preserve a person's right to offer generosity within their own disposal. Do not use a religious image to cancel another's promise or prohibit discussing a concrete condition. Clarify credits and material origins instead of replacing them with general thanks that do not show what someone actually did.

Finally, name accepted actions, open questions, and the boundary of subsequent participation. Without full agreement, an available part can be completed while the disputed object is preserved separately. Do not present a corrected record as an actual transfer or a new conversation as an arrangement already operating. This practice guarantees no fairness of every relationship. It helps discuss contribution and result at a defined scale: seeing different grounds, following accepted conditions, and allowing generosity without making it another's duty. Shared participation gains clarity without a demand finally to decide whose work determines every participant's entire worth.

Key quotation

> *So the last shall be first, and the first last:*

Matthew 20:16, first clause of the verse in KJV Standard, King James Bible Online. The parable concerns the kingdom of heaven and preserves the initial agreement with the first workers; the quotation is neither a wage rule nor permission to alter promises.

Connections between traditions

Question	Historical reference	Editorial connection	Boundary
On which basis to distribute	Aristotle, V.3	Proportion requires a named measure	Ancient statuses do not establish contemporary shares
What needs correction	Aristotle, V.4	Correction and new distribution differ	Not a contemporary court procedure
What another person's good means	Matthew 20:1–16	Generosity need not remove what I was promised	The kingdom of heaven is not a payment formula
Where generosity ends	Matthew 20:13–16	The initial condition remains in context	No right to alter another's promise
Preserving a shared result	Different questions of justice and gift	Do not reduce every relationship to a ranking of people	The sources' tension is not eliminated

The map preserves the difference between philosophical distribution and the Gospel image. Contemporary discussion is an editorial proposal, without a single remuneration algorithm or empirical guarantee of agreement.

Primary sources

1. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, V.3–4. Translated by W. D. Ross, Internet Classics Archive. Complete selected sections on distributive proportion and the corrective relationship were read; translator metadata were checked. Differing historical merit criteria and civic statuses are not adopted as a contemporary measure. The exact print edition and worldwide rights of the electronic version were not independently established.

2. Matthew 20:1–16, KJV Standard. The complete selected parable was read, including the kingdom of heaven, initial payment, later workers' absence of earlier hiring, and conclusion; the displayed edition was checked. Site commentary is not used as Gospel text. The exact modern print source and worldwide rights of the site were not established; KJV status depends on jurisdiction. Sources do not replace suitable legal or financial assistance and establish no effectiveness of the practice.

Tags

contribution, result, distribution, cooperation, justice, agreement, proportion, grounds, expenses, remuneration, attribution, recognition, provenance, promise, generosity, boundaries, participation, additional work, history, correction, error, expectation, disagreement, handover, shared intention, Aristotle, Matthew, parable, translation, joint exhibition

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.