

UNITED WISDOM

Service: taking part in something larger without disappearing

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P44 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Service: taking part in something larger without disappearing

Epigraph

> *Men exist for the sake of one another. Teach them then or bear with them.*

Marcus Aurelius, Meditations, VIII.59, translated by George Long. The appeal to patience does not establish an obligation to endure abuse.

What this article is about

Service can mean a voluntary contribution, a religious vocation, professional responsibility, or a demand to keep giving way to others. These meanings are easily confused. A person may then want to participate in something larger while fearing that participation will cost them their own voice. This article distinguishes contribution from disappearance: who needs help, who decides its form, which promises can actually be kept, and where one person's responsibility ends. We compare Stoic social nature, the Christian connection between greatness and service, Buddhist mutual care, action in the Bhagavad Gita, and Plato's obligation to return to common affairs. Their foundations differ; together they do not issue a command that everyone live alike. The practical aim is more modest: identify one possible contribution and arrange it so that the recipient retains dignity and the contributor can consent, decline, and hand the task on.

I. Who is my contribution for?

Imagine an ordinary situation: neighbours are organising help for someone who temporarily cannot go out to buy groceries. One brings cooked meals, another arranges delivery, and a third offers money. From outside, all these actions look like service. Their meaning, however, depends on what the neighbour actually needs. If a particular purchase is needed but volunteers insist on bringing unsuitable food, generosity no longer matches usefulness. The recipient becomes a screen for someone else's idea of goodness. The first question therefore concerns the task, rather than the helper's moral standing: what has this person asked for, what can they accept, and what are we merely assuming? Sometimes the answer is a small service, sometimes access to information, and sometimes the respectful withdrawal of unwanted help. This is a hypothetical scene, designed to examine a relationship rather than prove the effectiveness of a programme.

Service differs from a display of kindness because attention returns to the recipient. It allows that a person knows more about their own life than an outside observer. This does not mean every request must be fulfilled: the helper may lack resources, skill, or the right to act. A refusal or limit can nevertheless be explained without taking over the other person's voice. Saying 'I can bring groceries on Tuesday, but cannot promise daily help' leaves room for a shared decision. Saying 'I know what you need better than you do, so you must agree' closes that room. A contribution becomes more concrete when its object, duration, and possibility of revision are named. A limited offer can be easier to accept than an invisible debt to a rescuer. Such agreements need not make relationships cold; they free warmth from the burden of continually guessing its hidden conditions.

Some public tasks have no single person to consult: an accessible library, a clean river, or understandable information about local services. Here it helps to distinguish an intention from an observable result. I may want to support reading, yet discover that people need convenient opening hours rather than another ceremonial event. Participation in something larger begins with a willingness to revise the project. Feedback need not become an endless vote on someone's worth. We ask whether the chosen form works and whom it inconveniences. If the contribution misses its purpose, the action can change while the intention is treated respectfully. This is an important freedom: I do not have to prove that every effort of mine was beneficial. I can learn more about the task and make the next step more precise. Service then concerns action in the world, rather than defending the title of a good person.

II. The larger whole need not be grand

The larger whole is often imagined as an undertaking that will outlast generations or change the fate of society. That scale certainly exists, but it is not an admission ticket to meaningful participation. For someone struggling to understand a letter, ten minutes of careful explanation may matter more than a celebrated project. This does not automatically make every small action great. It simply locates the measure where a need meets a possibility. A shared world depends on inconspicuous acts: someone leaves clear instructions for the next shift, someone keeps an agreed deadline, and someone refrains from publishing a humiliating photograph of a recipient. Here the larger whole is not the size of the helper's biography. It is a connection with life beyond immediate self-interest. That connection can be sustained without a constant feeling of elevation or turning every minute into a public mission.

In Book VIII of the Meditations, Marcus Aurelius repeatedly connects action with human social nature. The epigraph from VIII.59 states that connection very briefly. This is the voice of a Roman Stoic who understands human beings as parts of a rational common order; his metaphysics should not quietly be presented as a modern scientific fact. For our question, the text directs attention towards another person as more than an obstruction to a private plan.

Applying it today, however, requires a separate ethical judgement. The injunction to teach or endure cannot simply be transferred into every situation involving power, dependence, or danger. I can acknowledge our shared humanity and still end contact. Indeed, maintaining a just boundary may sometimes serve the common undertaking better than sustaining a relationship built on unlimited demands upon one participant.

Common meaning does not erase a person's particular life. Someone helping with a neighbourhood library still has family, work, a body, desires, and a need for unallocated time. These parts of life need not compete, but they sometimes genuinely conflict. An honest conversation begins when the conflict can be named. If every personal interest is called selfish in advance, a participant cannot discuss the actual cost of a promise. If every shared obligation is treated as an attack on freedom, the ability to negotiate a common life disappears. Between these extremes lies the task of proportion. I can recognise that an undertaking matters without being available all the time. Another person can value my contribution without making my presence the necessary condition of their existence. This is not a mathematical balance discovered once and for all, but continuing work with circumstances that change.

III. Five different grounds for participation

In Mark 10:42–45, service is contrasted with rulers exercising dominion over those beneath them. The discussion concerns greatness among the disciples and culminates in the mission of the Son of Man. It cannot therefore be reduced to a neutral recommendation about teamwork. It can nevertheless prompt a precise question in an organisation: does a person's position make others more dependent on their authority, or expand their ability to act? We do not infer from the Gospel image that everyone is obliged to repeat Christ's sacrifice. The distinction between religious confession and a wider ethical application must remain visible. A leader may describe their work as service, but the description cannot replace examining how decisions, the right to object, and access to resources are distributed. A kindly tone does not remove domination when the recipient cannot say no.

The Buddhist Sedaka Sutta, SN 47.19, uses the image of two acrobats who need to perform a shared task safely. It connects cultivating one's own practice with caring for others, and care for others with patience, harmlessness, and goodwill. Its subject is the establishment of mindfulness, rather than a modern helping profession. Calling it evidence for the psychological effect of all boundaries would therefore be inaccurate. Its useful difference from the vanishing rescuer lies elsewhere: attending to one's own steadiness and attending to another are not presented as simple opposites. In Chapter III of the Bhagavad Gita, in Edwin Arnold's poetic translation, action is connected with duty, sacrifice, and sustaining the world. Detachment from personal reward does not mean indifference to consequences. The military setting, religious

cosmology, and language of duty remain parts of the text, rather than decorative packaging for a modern idea of volunteering.

In Book VII of the Republic, 519–520, Plato requires educated philosophers to return to the affairs of the city. They received their education through the whole and must share its responsibilities. The ground is political, and compulsion is openly present in the proposed arrangement. This is a significant difference from a modern voluntary contribution: responsibility for received opportunities can be discussed without presenting Plato's system as a model of consent. The Stoic common order, Christian mission, Buddhist practice, action in the Gita, and the organisation of Plato's city do not speak with one voice. They can be compared through the question of acting beyond personal advantage. They cannot be said to define personhood, freedom, duty, or the final aim identically. This distinction protects both texts and readers: someone may recognise a congenial idea without silently subscribing to every foundation of another tradition.

IV. What happens in the indispensable rescuer's role

The rescuer's role begins with a distribution of power, rather than simply the size of the help offered. One person continually knows, decides, supplies, and repairs; the other is left to give thanks and meet expectations. This arrangement can develop without malicious intent. A project participant might take over all correspondence because doing it quickly seems easier. Gradually, others stop knowing where documents are kept or how decisions are made. The participant then sincerely feels that everything will collapse without them. Their indispensability has partly resulted from the organisation they themselves maintained. This is neither a diagnosis nor an accusation; it describes a possible relationship between action and the arrangement of shared work. A way forward begins with ordinary information sharing. Who could continue tomorrow if I were absent, and what skill could I pass on today instead of making another unlimited promise of personal availability?

In personal relationships, handing something back may mean returning a decision to its owner rather than providing an instruction sheet. A helper lists options without choosing for an adult recipient, accompanies someone to a meeting without answering every question for them, or discusses expenses without turning support into supervision of every purchase. Some situations substantially limit independent action and require lawful representation or professional help. An attractive general phrase cannot resolve them. Precisely there, however, it becomes especially important to identify the role, authority, and limits. 'I simply love them, so I decide everything' conceals more than it explains. Respectful care can sometimes involve a difficult action on another's behalf, but that action needs an intelligible ground. The stronger the dependence, the more significant the possibility of scrutiny and participation by people whose competence fits the task.

Indispensability can be real: a small group cannot afford another worker, a family has few available helpers, or an emergency leaves little time. Advising someone to 'just delegate' can then sound like a rebuke to a person without resources. The distinction still helps if it does not become a demand to repair the system immediately. The shortage can be named, promises can stop exceeding available capacity, and the tasks resting on one person can be recorded. Sometimes the first step is neither departure nor delegation, but a clear request for support. Having to continue today does not prove that the arrangement is fair forever. Someone can fulfil a difficult obligation while seeking a different structure. Service does not require presenting compelled labour as a freely chosen vocation, or expressing gratitude for conditions that systematically remove the possibility of living one's own life.

V. Limits that make a promise honest

It helps to consider limits before exhaustion, rather than only afterwards. Otherwise a boundary arrives as an abrupt explosion: yesterday someone promised everything; today they refuse all contact. Conditions can be named in advance: hours, acceptable expenses, kinds of task, a way to communicate, and a review date. This is not a universal contract form or legal advice. It concerns transparency in relationships. A book-drive volunteer might maintain the catalogue without storing everything at home; a neighbour might deliver groceries without administering a bank account. The limit corresponds to a role, rather than a general claim about someone's goodness or badness. I can fulfil what I promised carefully and still decline the next task. The other person may seek different help without having to prove to me that their need is morally convincing enough.

Conditions matter for the recipient too. They may consent to a service without consenting to a public story about it, accept money without accepting a religious conversation, or request a qualified professional instead of friendly advice. If help depends on concealed conversion to a preferred worldview or continuing access to private life, that is a separate condition which should have been discussed. Generosity does not create ownership of another person's gratitude. Gratitude may be present, but it should not replace the ability to object. The possibility of disagreement shows how far participation preserves the other as an agent. Outside emergencies and special circumstances, it helps to ask directly whether the proposed form is suitable. 'No' need not mean rejecting the person; it often means the action does not fit the need, or carries a cost the recipient is unwilling to accept.

Not every inconvenience requires ending participation. Shared work involves expectations, repetition, and sometimes an unpopular duty. A boundary should not become a promise of life without any demands. The useful distinction is between a difficulty knowingly accepted and a demand that cannot be discussed. If I agreed to a shift, I need to notify others that I cannot attend; an inward refusal is not sufficient notice. If circumstances have changed for a

sustained period, the role needs review. Responsibility includes the consequences of one's choices, but does not attach someone indefinitely to their first promise. Review is particularly important in long-term care and public projects: the capacity to participate changes, and change need not wait for complete exhaustion. We can care about continuity while also ensuring that continuity does not depend on one participant disappearing into the work.

VI. From a kind gesture to the arrangement of shared work

A one-off gesture and a lasting arrangement require different questions. A single gesture may be enough: provide an address, help lift an object, or share a surplus item. A recurring need reveals an arrangement that deserves wider discussion. If the same people repair an organisation's mistakes for free every week, the word service may conceal a transfer of costs. The question then concerns paid work, responsibility, and authority as well as personal generosity. This distinction does not diminish the volunteer. It makes the contribution visible and allows a decision about which parts of the task need another support. A person can help voluntarily while also believing that the work should be funded. Participation in something larger does not require ignoring its material conditions. Without those conditions, an elevated conversation can become a way of overlooking other people's labour.

Durability begins with ordinary things: a shared task list, intelligible document storage, permission to report overload, and a known way to replace a participant. Care takes a form that need not produce a powerful feeling. Consider a hypothetical volunteer translating an instruction and leaving an editable file, its source, and the date of checking. The next participant can continue, and the reader knows how current the information is. If everything remains in the volunteer's personal correspondence, every question returns to them. The first arrangement reduces dependence; the second increases it, even if the wording is equally kind. This is an editorial organisational inference, rather than a proposition in an ancient source. It can be examined in a particular project: who has access, what happens when the author is absent, and how an error is corrected without locating the sole indispensable person.

Handover does not mean abandoning quality. Necessary conditions can be explained, difficult points identified, and decisions requiring expertise marked. In some tasks, ordinary goodwill cannot repair an error, so professional and legal requirements apply. Quality, however, should not be confused with making everything exactly as the first participant did. A new person may choose a different reasonable method. If every different method is called ingratitude, the handover remains symbolic. Reviewing shared work needs to distinguish the required outcome, permissible variation, and personal taste. Accurate addresses may matter; the colour of a folder may be a preference. Separating these levels is itself a form of service because it releases people from unnecessary control. The contributor gains the possibility of taking time

away, and the undertaking gains the possibility of existing without continually reproducing that person's individual style.

VII. When values genuinely conflict

Sometimes a person faces two significant demands and cannot meet both fully. A shared project and a loved one both need them; continued help would cost essential income; or they want to support someone but disagree with the proposed action. Such situations are not resolved by proving that one side does not matter at all. It is more useful to name what we are protecting and the cost we can see. A decision may be temporary, incomplete, and painful without becoming morally worthless. Service does not give a person the ability to abolish limited time and resources. The demand to remain faultless for everyone often produces promises that cannot be kept. A more honest decision acknowledges losses and tries not to conceal them behind solemn language. I can explain why I choose this obligation today and what I need to do tomorrow for the side left waiting.

There is a difference between one's own responsibility and the habit of answering for every anxiety nearby. Responsibility usually has a ground: a specific promise, a professional role, family obligations, or consequences I created. Another person's anxiety alone does not yet establish precisely what I must do. It deserves attention, but attention may take the form of a question, information, or finding suitable support. If someone needs a physician, my willingness to talk indefinitely does not replace medical care. If a group needs a paid worker, my extra nights do not resolve the budget problem. This is not a reason to withdraw from every difficulty. It is a way to choose a form that fits the need. Where safety is threatened, actual protection and appropriate services take priority over a philosophical exercise. In an ordinary situation, we can compare the answer circumstances require with the answer demanded only by an image of ourselves as perpetual rescuers.

Personal history influences a choice too, but should not become a final sentence. Someone may previously have helped too little, too much, or in a way they now consider mistaken. A specific correction can be learned without inventing a lifelong debt of atonement. They might acknowledge an unkept promise and offer a realistic way to repair its consequences. The past cannot be repaired by disappearing into a new role and losing the ability to distinguish consent from compulsion. A contribution arising from gratitude or regret remains freer when it has an object and an end. Freedom here does not mean having no connection to the past. It means being able to answer the past through an action that does not declare all future life its repayment. Service can be serious and lasting while a person retains the right to review its form as knowledge, circumstances, and relationships change.

VIII. Noticing a contribution without making it a title

Assessing a contribution differs from counting one's moral elevation. It helps to ask about the traces of an action: is it clearer who does what, did the recipient receive what they requested, could they decline, and can the next participant continue? The answers may be mixed. Help took place, but the agreement was unclear. Information is useful, but has become outdated. Someone did considerable work without reporting expenses. Such assessment does not destroy goodness; it allows the work to continue more precisely. A person may enjoy what they accomplished, accept thanks, and speak about their labour. Modesty does not require pretending nothing happened. A report of usefulness should nevertheless be separated from a demand that its author be recognised as an exceptional being. The contribution can be named specifically: 'We made these materials more accessible,' rather than 'Without me, nobody would ever have managed.'

An absence of thanks proves neither that help was useless nor that the recipient is ungrateful. They may be occupied, embarrassed, unhappy with the form of help, or unable to respond. Gratitude matters in some relationships, and it can be discussed. Recognition, however, should not become a concealed price of the service. Otherwise help becomes an unannounced exchange: I acted, so now you must sustain my picture of myself. Ordering oneself to expect nothing is also difficult and not always honest. A better approach may be to acknowledge the wish to be seen and find an appropriate place for it: conversation with colleagues, rest, transparent payment, or feedback on the work. The recipient need not be the sole source confirming my existence. The human need for recognition then stops silently determining someone else's decisions.

Participation in something larger need not use the word service. For some it retains religious depth; for others it recalls subordination; for others it simply sounds too solemn. The name matters less than the arrangement of relationships. Work, neighbourliness, care, participation, and fidelity to an undertaking can address a similar practical question from different worldviews. What matters is whether people remain visible on both sides of help. The recipient is not material for the helper's spiritual development. The helper is not an expendable resource for common meaning. Between them, an action may improve part of the world without promising to repair everything. Such a contribution need not come with constant inspiration. It may be quiet, limited, and entirely ordinary. Its worth lies in making life and action more accessible to someone while preserving the possibility of conversation, revision, and freely continuing the relationship.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary task in which you already participate or would like to participate. This is an optional writing experiment, rather than an established therapeutic technique. If you lack the energy or the task involves danger, skip the exercise and seek suitable practical support.

Record whom the contribution is for and how you know about the need. Distinguish the person's request, checked circumstances, and your assumptions. For a shared project, name the people who use its result and an available way to obtain feedback. Then formulate one offer: its object, amount, duration, and acceptable cost to you. Instead of promising always to be there, try a statement that can actually be fulfilled this week.

Examine the right to decline on both sides. Can the recipient refuse your form of help, retain privacy, and decline to endorse your worldview? Can you turn down a new task and give notice when your capacity changes? If an answer is unclear, record the conversation needed rather than inventing certainty. Establish what happens when your participation ends: the result is handed over, the promise is completed, or another support is needed.

After acting, compare expectation with observation. Do not assess your whole personality. Four notes are enough: what was actually done, what proved unnecessary, what cost became visible, and what needs review. If a correction concerns the relationship, discuss it with the participant rather than only with yourself. If expertise you do not possess is required, say so directly. The final step may be continuing, reducing the role, handing it on, or honestly declining. All these possibilities can respect a common undertaking when they account for actual obligations and consequences.

Key quotation

> *And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all.*

Mark 10:44, King James Version; read with 10:42–45, concerning greatness among the disciples and the mission of the Son of Man.

Connections between traditions

Tradition and source	Comparable question	Significant difference
Stoicism: Marcus Aurelius VIII.59	How can another be seen within a shared world?	A rational cosmic order; no modern proof of obligations
Christianity: Mark 10:42–45	How does service differ from domination?	The disciples and Christ's mission; no command that everyone repeat his sacrifice
Early Buddhism: SN 47.19	How are personal steadiness and care for others connected?	Mindfulness practice; no study of professional burnout
Bhagavad Gita, III	Can one act without being captured by personal reward?	Dharma, sacrifice, a military setting, and sustaining the world
Plato: Republic VII, 519–520	How does received education connect one to common work?	The city includes compulsion; voluntariness is not assumed

Primary sources

1. Marcus Aurelius. Meditations, VIII, George Long translation; particularly VIII.59, with the displayed book context read.

2. Mark 10:42–45, King James Version.

3. SN 47.19, Sedaka Sutta, Thanissaro Bhikkhu translation; the full sutta read, not the full Samyutta Nikaya.

4. Bhagavad Gita, III, The Song Celestial, Edwin Arnold translation, 1900 edition; the opening Chapter III passage through action sustaining the world read, not the whole work.

5. Plato. Republic, VII, Benjamin Jowett translation; 519–520, the paragraphs requiring philosophers to return to the cave. Translations and concepts differ; the contemporary practical model is an editorial inference.

Tags

service, contribution, common work, meaning, voluntariness, boundaries, care, dignity, reciprocity, responsibility, rescuer, help, consent, refusal, handover, society, Stoicism, Marcus Aurelius, Christianity, Gospel, Buddhism, Sedaka, Bhagavad Gita, Plato, duty, relationships, everyday life, participation

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.