

UNITED WISDOM

Joy You Do Not Have to Earn

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-10-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Joy You Do Not Have to Earn

Epigraph

> *“...it is the gift of God.”*

Ecclesiastes 3:13, King James Version, 1611; a short original fragment. The verse concerns eating, drinking, and the good in labour; the religious language of gift does not guarantee everyone's prosperity.

What this article is about

Imagine a free hour among unfinished tasks. Lovely light outside, a friend suggesting a walk, a good dessert at home. None involves large expenses. Yet a familiar postponement appears: first sort out work, become more disciplined, help everyone, earn a clear conscience. Wanting something good itself seems premature. The issue is not missing opportunity but a condition permitting joy only after final proof of personal sufficiency.

This article considers that condition of admission. We do not cancel obligations, buy a mood, or command joy. The question differs: why must completed work, another's approval, or suffering grant someone the right to every pleasant part of life? The possibility of joy and responsibility for action can be considered separately. Spinoza and Ecclesiastes provide distinct foundations for discussing the good; philosophical criticism of gloomy severity differs from a religious understanding of gift. Our application remains editorial: notice the rule, clarify actual limits, and leave room for the good without another examination of worthiness.

I. “First” needs a limit

“First” itself can help. First finish the promised urgent task, then walk: an understandable arrangement when timing and scope are known. Difficulty starts in a hypothetical situation where the subject becomes endless: first be useful enough, establish complete order, stop making mistakes. Postponement then has no completion. Any achieved result can be replaced by the next condition, leaving the right to the good permanently provisional.

Imagine someone finishes a work email and prepares to listen to favourite music. Another task appears, then a long list of personal improvements. Every task may have real value, but their existence does not forbid music. To understand the rule, ask which specific unfinished action requires continuing now and why. “I'm still not good enough” assesses a person rather than defining the conditions of a particular hour.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

There is no need to declare every delay harmful beforehand. Sometimes it fits one's own wish: resting after a specific task is easier. This sequence can be convenient. What matters is whether an end can be named and the decision changed under new circumstances. “I'll finish this page first” differs from “Until everything is done, nothing pleasant is permitted.” Identical external actions can follow different rules.

The discovered rule also needs no single explanation. It may have been learned in different relationships, concern current demands, or have arisen as one's own arrangement. The article establishes no reader's history. Today's wording can be considered without a compulsory search in childhood. An unknown origin does not prevent examining present meaning: what is forbidden, until which event, by whom, and with what consequences?

The first distinction makes postponement specific again. Unfinished work remains work; assessing personal value stops pretending to be an exact schedule. Perhaps the walk should indeed be delayed today. Perhaps the prohibition rests only on an undefined “not enough.” Either way, the decision concerns a particular action rather than an eternal examination of deserving an existence that is sometimes pleasant.

II. A reward for work and access to the good differ

A reward can have agreed conditions. Completed work receives payment, competitions award prizes, an exam is followed by a celebration. These events do not establish that every pleasant thing must follow the same scheme. Music at home, a friend's conversation, or beautiful light need not be a bonus granted by an assessor. Their possible value is not determined only by the amount of preceding labour.

Imagine two people with the same free evening. One completed an important task; the other could not finish for a valid reason. The first can be congratulated without forbidding the second a tasty dinner. Different achievements remain. Different rights to every good thing do not follow automatically. We claim no identical circumstances or cancellation of consequences for noncompletion; we only limit the conclusion's scope from a particular result.

If joy always counts as payment, someone may begin invisible accounting: how much effort earns an hour's rest, which suffering compensates pleasure, how many useful acts justify meeting a friend. In this hypothetical scene, pleasantness becomes part of a calculation. Every reward need not be declared bad. The question is whether room remains outside it for participation that does not require payment in proof of merit.

Sometimes joy concerns precisely an achievement. Its content is independent: you did something difficult, see the result, and share it. The article does not dissolve this joy into an indefinite right to everything. It preserves another possibility of joy: presence, beauty, a

chance encounter. One foundation should not consume the others. Work can bring the good without becoming the only institution granting permission for it.

Clarify the connection being made. “This is how I mark a result” is a choice. “Without a result I have no right” is a broader rule. It can be examined without abandoning celebration after success. The difference concerns scope: a reward relates to a specific achievement; pleasant participation's possibility need not depend on a final assessment of the whole person and every unfinished task.

III. An error does not impose a complete ban on life

An error may require correction, conversation, compensation, or a new way of acting. Consider consequences specifically. But an error does not say someone is now forbidden laughter, enjoyable food, or noticing beauty. Self-punishment through withheld pleasantness does not automatically repair harm. This is a logical distinction between actions and a general deprivation, not a claim about every punishment's psychological effectiveness.

Imagine someone forgets an important agreement. They acknowledge what happened and arrange the next step. Later, a cheerful conversation with someone close occurs at home. Participation can coexist with responsibility for the error. Laughter does not cancel promised correction. If the conversation instead avoids returning to the issue altogether, the situation differs. Pleasantness does not establish avoidance; actual nonfulfilment and a sequence of actions do.

Guilt is not a schedule of correction either. It can be strong while the needed actions are already known or persist after completion. The article determines no correct amount of feeling. We ask whether an endless prohibition has been added to specific responsibility. If no further requirement or reason why absent joy helps can be named, indefinite punishment remains without new information about the action itself.

“Joy need not be earned,” however, provides no protection from criticism or consequences. Others may be unready for fun together, decline a meeting, or request returning to an unfulfilled agreement. Your right to notice the good creates no right to another's participation in every form. Joint action's conditions need agreement, especially when the error affected these people and their actual capacities.

The distinction separates two questions: what needs doing, and what person must I become before living again? Circumstances can answer the first. The second easily receives an unattainable standard. You can be imperfect, continue correction, and impose no total ban on the good. This is no reward for reaching the correct conclusion but a limit on consequences that can be drawn from a particular event.

IV. Relinquishing severity need not relinquish responsibility

In Spinoza's *Ethics*, part IV, proposition XLV, note, discussion of laughter and moderate enjoyment accompanies criticism of gloomy severity. Tears and fear themselves do not count for the philosopher as signs of virtue. This is a position inside his system, not research into a contemporary reader's habits. It questions a rule: why should absent good establish seriousness better than actual actions?

Spinoza lists food, music, growing plants' beauty, and other accessible enjoyments. Moderation and avoiding injury to a neighbour remain in the text. Permission therefore justifies neither every impulse nor every expense. It concerns participation in the good within real boundaries. The author's criticism of suffering as a certificate of virtue cancels no necessary labour and promises neither constant availability nor equal tolerability of pleasure.

Imagine two employees after a hard task. One says they cannot attend a gathering: serious people must show how tired they are. The other acknowledges tiredness and chooses a short, quiet evening. These actions cannot establish their virtue. Perhaps the first truly needs silence; perhaps the second finds a meeting suitable. The problem is an extra criterion making a display of difficulty obligatory proof of responsible participation.

A task's difficulty can be respected without suffering beyond its actual cost. Required time and effort remain. Nothing requires adding refusal of everything pleasant merely for credibility. Our conclusion does not call suffering meaningless altogether. It clarifies one connection: difficult feeling does not automatically establish an action right, and pleasantness does not automatically expose unserious intentions.

A philosophical text must not become a new accuser either. Someone feeling bad and unwilling to enjoy anything need not prove liberation from severity. Experience can remain as it is. Removing a prohibition on the good and obtaining a good feeling are separate events. The article considers access to possibility rather than manufacturing an obligatory emotional result from an idea read.

V. A gift is not a receipt for deserving

In Ecclesiastes 3:9–13, a question about labour stands beside human understanding's limit and the language of gift. Eating, drinking, and the good in labour are called God's gift. We read a limited religious passage, not the whole treatise or every interpretation. What matters here is that the good is not described exclusively as one's own receipt for personal faultlessness.

Gift's language does not cancel labour, explicitly present in the verse. The text cannot be opposed to every effort or declared a program of constant rest. Nor does it guarantee equal resources for all readers. Its religious perspective has a foundation in relation to God. Our

comparison is more modest: receiving the good and proving personal merit can be considered separately, while reasons and conditions for the good's appearance remain specific.

In a hypothetical scene, a friend brings you fruit for no occasion. You can thank them and accept without calculating whether you helped enough. A gift involving pressure or hidden obligation needs its conditions examined. Yet those cannot automatically be assigned to every gift. Distinguish an actual demand from your own sense that pleasantness is impermissible without equivalent payment.

Accepting does not mean acquiring a right to demand. The friend need not bring fruit tomorrow, repeat the meeting, or ensure your good mood. Gratitude is possible without making the giver indebted. This matters especially beside unearned good: the idea expands an ability to receive without granting control of another's time, attention, or resources. They retain separate authorship of decisions.

Ecclesiastes and Spinoza do not speak with one voice. God's gift and a philosophical argument about human existence's nature have different foundations. Their intersection proves no common hidden doctrine. Two questions suffice here: must the good be payment for merit, and why must suffering establish worth? Each source supports its limited angle; contemporary application remains our reasoning.

VI. Another's difficulty does not make your joy a crime

When someone close is struggling, a pleasant moment may raise doubt: do I have a right while my friend suffers? The question deserves attention to relationships. Perhaps specific help, presence, or a respectful conversation is needed now. Another's difficulty does not automatically forbid every joy, however. Distinguish helping from trying to equalise lives emotionally so nobody nearby is better off.

Imagine you helped an acquaintance with something important and then take a walk. Their problem does not disappear through your walk, but forgoing the walk alone does not solve it either. Is there an unfulfilled agreement, urgent need, or available help? These are factual questions. Without answers, a general demand to remain unhappy together replaces no action and reveals no particular need.

This conclusion cannot justify escaping shared responsibility. When your choice removes another's necessary help, the question exceeds freedom to enjoy. Consider consequences, dependencies, and agreements. The article does not excuse leaving someone in danger with an attractive sentence about personal rights. It distinguishes actual harm from different moods themselves; the second does not establish the first without further circumstances and actions.

Expression's form sometimes matters. You can refrain from describing entertainment when someone asks to discuss loss. You can choose another audience for good news while retaining its significance. Tact does not require cancelling the experience itself. Internal permission and public expression differ, preventing attention to another from becoming a general prohibition on your life, where different events and different times occur.

Another's difficulty should not become material for our obligatory good feeling either. Help need not bring joy to be real. You can help without emotional elevation and then have a separate pleasant part of the day. We assign no roles where one suffers and the other must rescue to earn permission to live. Actual capacities, respect, and clarity of participation matter more in relationships.

VII. Rest need not justify itself by future productivity

Sometimes prohibition changes wording: rest is permitted only if it makes someone more efficient afterward. This expectation can have practical meaning in planning work without justifying every pause. A pause can simply be a desired part of the day. If valuable only as a promise of future results, rest remains work with a delayed examination the pleasant moment must pass.

Imagine someone sits with tea and immediately calculates tasks to finish afterward. The calculation may help organise time. Yet notice whether it becomes a condition of permission: if energy does not increase, the tea was unlawful. We claim neither constant restoration through rest nor its complete separation from tasks. The question concerns a rule under which absent measurable effect automatically makes the pause unworthy.

A pause's availability depends on material conditions. Free time, quiet space, and care for dependent people are distributed unequally. The article promises no solution by changed thought. Sometimes an agreement, adjusted workload, support, or acknowledging temporary unavailability is needed. A right to the good does not mean it is already provided. Internal permission and actual conditions must remain different parts of one picture.

An available short pause needs no improvement project. Look outside without developing attention; listen to music without acquiring a skill; converse without strengthening a predetermined measurable social resource. Any such continuation is possible too if desired. Preserve choice. Removing a general prohibition should not quietly replace it with correctly resting, growing, and extracting maximum benefit from every pleasant hour.

The inquiry can be simple and proportionate. Is there an urgent task now, essential participation by another, or a condition making a pause impossible? Without one, no retrial of an entire biography is needed. A small rest is not a decision about all of life. Limiting scale

reveals the available hour without advance proof that it will produce better results and a worthier version of the person.

VIII. Internal permission is no command to feel

An idea can produce a new judgment: if joy need not be earned, why am I still not joyful? Permission becomes a demand. The person must immediately show they learned the text, removed guilt, and chose the good. We distinguish absent prohibition, available opportunity, and appearing feeling. These are three different questions; a positive answer to the first guarantees neither of the others.

Imagine the walk happened but experience remained difficult. This establishes no failure or secret inability to accept life. Perhaps much else is present; perhaps conditions did not fit; the exact answer can remain unknown. The practice does not establish a condition's causes. Action and the missing expected response can be noted separately without condemning their combination as incorrectly permitting oneself the good.

Sometimes pleasantness does occur alongside guilt. Coexistence requires no immediate choice of only one. Tea's taste and a familiar “You haven't earned it” can both be noticed. No correct sentence is promised to remove the voice. The question concerns its authority: must it determine action without specific grounds? A real agreement remains important; a general verdict gains no factual force through insistence alone.

Declining pleasantness today is permitted too. Not wanting a walk, dessert, or meeting does not necessarily mean the old prohibition. Another wish or needed silence may be present. Avoid a trap where every refusal proves insufficient freedom. Examine a rule while retaining the right to decline the offered good. Freedom of permission includes saying no without compulsory explanation by the author's theory.

The article is no treatment for a lasting difficult condition and demands no independent coping. If the subject becomes painful or life noticeably difficult, appropriate support is an option. One text may be insufficient without the reader failing. We assign no diagnosis or explanation from “guilt.” A particular condition of admission is considered, not the complete causal system of human emotional experience.

IX. An opportunity can be small and your own

Joy easily suggests celebrations, travel, or great achievements. Yet deservedness's rule can appear beside a very small opportunity. A few minutes in sunshine, music, a calm meal. Small scale does not cancel reality. Modest participation need not grow into an important life event before someone can recognise its pleasantness without making it a bonus for personal worthiness.

In a hypothetical scene, someone cannot afford expensive rest but can take a short walk. The article does not offer it as a substitute for necessary material support. Real absences remain. Yet the available walk need not wait for every difficulty's removal. Keep both facts: conditions are imperfect, and a separate opportunity exists. Neither should erase the other or close a needed conversation.

Small scale also distinguishes choice from declaration. There is no need to promise a new life, constant joy, or no self-assessment. Receive particular pleasantness within specific limits without contracting for future emotional freedom. A different decision tomorrow does not devalue yesterday's step. Authorship of a revisable action is considered rather than an obligation to become a certain personality type.

Your own opportunity need not look convincing to others. Someone finds a walk boring, the music strange, a quiet hour incomprehensible. Different taste does not make your choice bad. An action involving another needs agreed conditions; otherwise approval is optional. Avoid requesting a general tribunal's permission for something that causes no specific harm in available circumstances and fits your wish now.

Small good should not force gratitude either. Someone can notice an opportunity and remain sad about what is missing. Gratitude is no prescribed price for pleasure. Calling tea pleasant need not mean nothing else can be requested or changed. This description keeps the moment's scale without making acceptance of one part of life silent agreement with every other condition.

X. A right needs no daily confirmation

Return to the free hour. Several questions can now be examined separately. Is there an urgent obligation, what attracts you to the walk, what needs agreement, which rule adds a prohibition? Perhaps you work today; perhaps you go outside. Authorship is not automatically determined by the side chosen. Decision becomes more precise when actual conditions stop blending with an overall verdict on personal insufficiency.

If a pleasant moment happened, proof of correct use is optional. It can remain a walk, taste, or conversation. If joy failed to appear, no repeat examination is needed. The possibility of the good is no contract with an emotion obliged to arrive at a set hour. One extra condition is removed from decision while real limits and an unknown outcome remain.

Merit, responsibility, and gratitude have places. Success can be celebrated, errors corrected, help valued. None need control the whole possibility of pleasantness. Life is not completed before the good appears; tasks can remain open. This conclusion does not establish every joy timely in every circumstance. It means timing is determined by circumstances rather than a person's final faultlessness.

Understanding does not guarantee a familiar condition disappears. Notice it again and clarify scale: a real agreement or a general judgment? One hour needs one decision, not an entire philosophy of freedom. Sometimes the decision is help, sometimes a pause, sometimes postponement. The ability to choose using available information matters, without making suffering permanent currency or awaiting an imaginary final judge's approval.

Joy you do not have to earn remains a possibility, not a required state. It cancels neither work, another's separateness, nor action's cost. It leaves someone a place in life before every task is finally finished. There, the good can be received while much remains unknown, errors corrected without total deprivation of pleasantness, and a moment allowed its own value without annual or daily confirmation of a right to it.

What this means in practice

If “Earn it first” feels familiar, choose a small, safe opportunity for the good. Write exactly what you want: music, a walk, a calm meal. The strongest wish or spending money is unnecessary. Separately name actual obligations of this time. The practice is voluntary; it does not cancel necessary help, work, agreed deadlines, or safety conditions.

State the prohibition literally. Until which event is it forbidden? How will its arrival be known? A specific answer allows deciding an order. If the answer is “Until I'm good enough,” note an assessment of character rather than a measurable agreement. Immediate argument or explaining its entire origin is unnecessary. Notice the distinction and retain the right to further clarification.

Then choose an available decision, including changing nothing for now. If pleasant participation fits actual conditions, give it limited room without promising productivity afterward. If it involves another, agree what is needed. Their agreement to joint action is not general permission for your dignity. These questions must remain distinct even when the outcome is postponement or refusal.

An observable result is a specific decision and clarity of its basis. Guilt disappearing, joy appearing, and proof of inner freedom are unnecessary. Pleasantness and doubt can both be noticed. Stop if reflection becomes difficult and choose suitable support. One text should not become the sole permissible way to examine difficult experience.

Finally, make no new list of merits from the practice. You need not permit yourself joy daily, report progress, or correctly select a small good. Opportunity remains open without the exercise. Its point is to clarify a rule in one episode rather than issue another task after which someone finally earns the right to drink tea peacefully.

Key quotation

> *“...refresh and recreate himself...”*

Spinoza, *Ethics*, part IV, proposition XLV, note, R. H. M. Elwes translation, Gutenberg no. 3800; a short original fragment. The context includes moderation and avoiding injury to a neighbour; this is a philosophical way of life, not medical advice.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Intersection and boundary
Spinoza IV ↔ severity as certificate	Suffering alone does not establish virtue; today's deservedness rule is an editorial question, not a diagnosis from the treatise.
Ecclesiastes 3 ↔ receiving the good	Eating, drinking, and the good in labour are called gift; God's gift is not a psychological permission technique.
Spinoza ↔ Ecclesiastes	Pleasantness is not reduced to a personal receipt for faultlessness; philosophical nature and religious giving have different foundations.
Spinoza's moderation ↔ actual obligation	Permission cancels neither injury nor cost; specific conditions do not become endless assessments of character.
Labour in Ecclesiastes ↔ reward and opportunity	Labour remains present; the editorial distinction does not claim every effort conflicts with freely receiving the good.

Sources

• Spinoza, *Ethics*, part IV, proposition XLV and note, R. H. M. Elwes, Gutenberg no. 3800. Complete XLIV–XLVII context and metadata were read; the scope is philosophy of moderate enjoyment, not empirical psychology or treatment.

• Ecclesiastes 3:9–13, King James Version, 1611. The whole specified passage was read; labour, understanding's limit, and the religious language of gift are retained.

Tags

joy, merit, permission, postponement, obligations, reward, gift, labour, responsibility, error, correction, guilt, severity, pleasure, rest, productivity, condition, limit, moderation, help, separateness, gratitude, choice, opportunity, unknown, voluntary participation, Spinoza, Ecclesiastes, dignity, good

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