

UNITED WISDOM

Vocation and the Need to Earn a Living

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-03-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Vocation and the Need to Earn a Living

Epigraph

> *“He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver” — Ecclesiastes5:10, exact opening fragment, King James Version.*

What this article is about

Meaningful activity does not always produce income, while paid work is not always experienced as a vocation. A real question arises between these circumstances: what form of participation can someone sustain, considering necessary resources, agreements, and other people's lives? This article treats vocation as an enduringly significant direction of action, not a demonstrated inner gift or one profession assigned forever. It distinguishes an activity's meaning, demand for its results, and the conditions of earning a living. Aristotle's account of external means, Adam Smith's account of exchange, and biblical reflections on wealth retain different foundations. They help frame questions without promising income or deciding financial choices. The proposed practice clarifies what is known, which commitments exist, and which answers remain unavailable. It requires neither resignation, tolerating every job, monetizing every interest, nor proving an authentic vocation through willingness to live without necessary resources.

I. Avoid making vocation a single job title

Imagine someone who cares about explaining difficult things in accessible language. She helps acquaintances understand technology, prepares materials for a local club, and notices errors in instructions. Her main income comes from different work. This does not yet establish whether she should become a teacher, editor, engineer, or keep explanation as unpaid participation. In this hypothetical example, a significant direction does not prescribe a single form. A profession's title brings together tasks, conditions, and relationships that may suit someone differently. Even a chosen position offers no promise that every working day will involve the favorite activity. Someone can love explaining things while declining to teach at a particular organization whose work includes other commitments.

It therefore helps to name the interest's subject before making a solemn decision about an entire life. What matters: clarity, accessibility of knowledge, technical accuracy, or participation in learning? This is no test of a true destiny. An answer can remain provisional and change after actual acquaintance with the work. Naming a direction reveals several possible forms of participation without making them equally accessible. One requires preparation and

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

permissions, another time and participants' consent, while a third exists only in imagination. Vocation in the sense used here keeps a question about significance present; a particular form requires separate consideration of facts, limits, and consequences for the people affected by action.

II. Means are conditions of action

In Book I of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle connects a good life with activity and acknowledges external goods: many actions require means. This is part of his normative account of happiness, not a modern income formula. Nearby historical judgments about birth, appearance, and childlessness are not adopted here as norms. For our subject, the narrower question concerns conditions of actual participation. In our hypothetical club, wanting to explain things creates neither a room, access to materials, nor a free evening. If these conditions are absent, missing results cannot be attributed solely to insufficient self-belief. A specific constraint should be recognized before it is treated as a final verdict on a person or activity.

A means nevertheless does not become the meaning merely because it is necessary. Payment can enable someone to sustain life and participate in meaningful activity; its size alone cannot explain the significance of explanation. Conversely, personal significance cannot replace resources. This distinction requires no belief that every limitation can be overcome. Sometimes no available form exists yet, and an honest account preserves that uncertainty. Asking what a particular action requires is more precise than promising that sufficient desire will achieve it. The answer includes what is present and missing, conditions someone may change independently, and conditions whose alteration requires the participation or consent of other people.

III. Others need a result rather than our destiny

In Smith's account of exchange, someone appeals to another's advantage rather than relying solely on benevolence. This describes a particular relationship in economic life; it does not claim that friendship, care, and every human connection are trade. Here it helps distinguish wanting to pursue an activity from another person's reason for paying for a specific result. An instruction's recipient may need to understand equipment rather than confirm the author's vocation. If the explanation is inaccurate or unrelated to the task, sincere enthusiasm cannot remove that problem. Yet unwillingness to pay also cannot establish that the explanation has no value in every possible relationship and circumstance.

Offering a service therefore requires a separate question about its recipient. Who needs the result, what is promised, and how can completion be recognized? These questions do not

replace personal meaning with market approval. They clarify relationships in which meaning needs a form accessible to someone else. Neither another's interest nor silence should be assigned a definite meaning before specific information is obtained. This article supplies no validated sales procedure and promises no demand from a clear proposal. An answer may be that none of the accessible recipients currently seeks this service. That concerns this offer under known conditions, not a final verdict on someone's worth, an entire profession, or all future participation in the chosen direction.

IV. Unpaid activity retains its own conditions

Someone can lead a club meeting voluntarily without turning it into a commercial service. Music can be pursued without concerts, family records preserved without selling access. Such a form is not necessarily an immature stage of a future business. It can have its own purposes and recipients. Yet “unpaid” does not remove participation's conditions. Materials, time, permissions, and the quality of a promised result remain relevant. If a meeting has been announced, others can expect honest information about changes. An absence of payment grants no right to use another's work without consent or promise an inaccessible result while concealing uncertainty behind good intentions and love for the activity.

Voluntary participation must also be distinguished from unpaid work governed by a different agreement. Significance cannot retrospectively change another person's terms. In a shared project, each contribution needs discussion in its actual form: who does what, under which limits, and expecting which response. This is no legal contract template. The distinction matters before legal assessment so that talk of vocation does not hide the circumstances. Someone can retain a modest unpaid contribution without presenting it as rejection of earning a living or requiring loved ones to regard it as the only worthy form. Participation can also be declined when its specific conditions can no longer be sustained, while respect for the direction remains.

V. Meaning supplies no income forecast

In our example, several participants thank the author for accessible materials. Gratitude establishes a response from these people, not a future income. Even one person's willingness to pay says nothing definitive about accessible orders, necessary conditions, or what will happen later. Those belong to a separate inquiry requiring suitable data and expertise. They cannot be derived from an interest's intensity or a historical quotation. This article supplies no financial calculation, investment decision, or recommendation to change an income source. Meaning can explain a wish to explore a possibility; it does not turn that possibility into a verified fact or make its consequences accepted by everyone affected.

The opposite confusion matters too: uncertain income can be treated as proof that an interest is unserious. Someone can acknowledge financial uncertainty without abandoning the activity's significance. A more precise description becomes possible: this direction matters to me; an accessible paid form has not been established; existing commitments remain real. It supplies no automatic next decision, but removes the need to defend an interest with an invented forecast. Where consequences are substantial, the next step involves obtaining necessary information and examining conditions with appropriate competence. An unanswered question may remain unanswered. A confident story about future demand is no evidence simply because it sustains hope and sounds persuasive to its author.

Suppose a club participant asks for a separate explanation of a particular task. This is a specific request, but its conditions still need clarification. The author can establish the subject, accessible materials, and expected result before promising work. Such conversation differs from asking acquaintances whether the activity seems promising in general. An opinion about prospects cannot replace information about specific participation. If competence or conditions make a request unsuitable, declining preserves an honest offer; it proves no inability to explain anything. If it is suitable, agreeing to one piece of work remains agreement to one piece of work. Neither acceptance nor refusal needs to make a particular episode evidence of a final destiny. Being able to consider a request and being able to fulfill it should be named separately.

VI. Others' participation does not follow from our conviction

Suppose work on the club requires a shared room and changes how family time is arranged. The direction matters to one person, but others' agreement has not thereby been obtained. A specific form of participation needs discussion rather than a demand to approve the right to have an interest. Others can respect the interest while declining the proposed conditions. Refusal need not mean insufficient love or inability to understand a vocation. It may concern space, time, workload, or existing commitments. Its motive cannot be known without grounds; uncertainty also cannot become permission to act on another's behalf. In a shared undertaking, significance for one participant cannot automatically decide acceptable consequences for everyone else.

No universal approval is needed for every independent activity. The question concerns actual effects, not others' right to control an entire life. Specificity distinguishes these: which resource is shared, whose promise changes, whose participation is needed, and what can be done independently? Where a decision alters another's conditions, conviction about a special mission cannot replace discussion. Where participation is unnecessary, disagreement about personal meaning need not prevent action. This boundary cannot settle difficult relationships through one rule; it identifies the conversation's subject. In disagreement, room should remain

for clarifying facts and available forms rather than casting oneself as meaning's sole defender and the other person as its inevitable obstacle.

VII. Ordinary earning does not diminish a person

Work providing necessary resources can matter through that function even when it expresses only part of someone's interests. This requires neither accepting every condition nor renaming an unpleasant situation a vocation. Different subjects need honest distinction: tasks, treatment of the person, agreements, available resources, and one's own response. One useful property cannot automatically justify all remaining conditions. Yet an absence of destiny does not render every completed day meaningless. Someone can perform a necessary procedure, support a shared undertaking's reliability, and earn payment without a story of an exceptional personal mission. Participation in this form requires no contempt for oneself, colleagues, or those who actually need its results.

Treating all current work as a temporary obstruction before real life begins is problematic. While participation continues, recipients, promises, and consequences are real. A future change removes no responsibility for today's action. Responsibility nevertheless requires no permanent stay. Another form can be considered, conditions clarified, or competent help sought for a substantial question. This article cannot decide what step is accessible to a particular reader. It proposes retaining two points together: present participation involves actual relationships; a significant direction need not fit completely inside a current position. This distinction permits considering change without devaluing an already lived life or inventing a promise that the next job must combine every human interest.

VIII. Change the form without replacing a promise

The materials' author may decide that regular meetings are currently impossible while short written explanations remain accessible. This changes a form without necessarily changing the interest's subject. Yet a new form does not count as fulfillment of an earlier promise without clarification. Participants expecting a meeting need the actual situation explained rather than the meeting's absence renamed creative freedom. Vocation can explain continuation of a direction while retaining specific responsibility for altered agreements. In our hypothetical case, existing promises can be separated from unannounced plans. Plans may be provisional; a promise involves the conditions under which it was given and people who have already arranged actions and expectations around it.

Not every change abandons the self. New information may show that a form needs unavailable resources, conflicts with actual constraints, or fails a recipient. Relief after a change nevertheless proves no correctness of all its consequences. The decision's subject and

conditions require attention. If clear explanation mattered before, does that activity continue, or only the project's name? If a commitment changes, can it be discussed honestly? These questions require no permanent fidelity to one form. They distinguish revising actual participation from renaming an unfulfilled promise. Someone can preserve part of a direction in an accessible form and acknowledge that another part remains impossible, without demanding that this mismatch count as either complete success or total defeat.

For example, written material may be accessible to one participant but useless to another who needed a shared demonstration. Changing the form requires clarifying this difference rather than treating it as already resolved for everyone. Honest conversation might reduce a promise, postpone discussion, or acknowledge that an expected result will not yet be supplied. No permissible procedure for changing a particular agreement is prescribed here; it depends on actual conditions. The distinction prevents someone from assuming a right to rename another's expectation. Even when a new form better suits a significant direction, the recipient retains a question about the result. Respect for vocation and recipient can coexist when neither question is presented as an answer to the other.

IX. Distinguish need from insatiability

Ecclesiastes 5 connects love of silver with a lack of satisfaction, then speaks of wealth, loss, and human finitude. At the end of the passage considered here, enjoying the good of labor remains God's gift and a person's portion. This is no rule against all earning or proof that a particular income necessarily causes dissatisfaction. For our subject, care for necessary resources can be distinguished from expecting accumulation finally to grant permission for a meaningful life. The biblical grounding remains religious. A reader with another position can examine a question about expectation's limits without pretending agreement with theology or turning a historical passage into a modern financial norm.

This distinction cannot establish whether a particular person has sufficient resources. Actual need does not become greed because it is voiced insistently. Access to food, housing, and necessary commitments concerns real conditions that a beautiful phrase cannot determine. Someone may nevertheless ask what another achievement is expected to supply: a specific means for action or confirmation of personal worth. The answer can be unclear and requires no immediate abandonment of the goal. It clarifies the expectation's subject. If meaningful activity is continually postponed until a final feeling of sufficiency, the postponement's condition deserves attention. That does not establish that every action is accessible today or that material constraints may simply be ignored.

X. A provisional answer is not necessarily a weak answer

Someone can honestly say they do not yet know whether earning a living can be combined with a significant direction. This is not indecision about everything else. Some conditions are known: work continues, an agreement exists, a particular form is accessible or inaccessible. Others require clarification. Separating these states prevents uncertainty about one question from turning an entire life into waiting for a final sign. In our example, accessible explanation can continue without being declared a future profession; it can also be acknowledged that even this form currently lacks time. Each account concerns something specific, and neither establishes a vocation's final fate by itself.

Provisionality grants no right to preserve unsupported promises indefinitely. If uncertainty affects others, its actual state matters to them. A purely personal plan can retain an open question without a public commitment. Reasons for revision should connect to new information and actual changes, rather than a demand to feel the same confidence every day. This is no established decision technique or experimental schedule. The questions identify a missing answer and what would make it more substantial. Sometimes conversation with a participant is needed, sometimes competent assessment of conditions, sometimes acknowledgment that information remains unavailable. Uncertainty can be carried without invented proof or an obligation to close it immediately with an attractive conclusion.

XI. Significance requires no continual heroism

Love for an activity cannot establish how much workload someone can sustain under particular conditions. It does not imply that tiredness proves insufficient vocation or that rest betrays meaning. This article assesses no health condition and proposes no recovery regimen. It distinguishes participation's grounds from the accessibility of a specific action. In our hypothetical club, someone might retain a small piece of material, cancel an additional task, or state that participation is currently impossible. Actual conditions and honest treatment of existing promises matter. No choice is required between appearing inexhaustible and claiming that every limit makes the direction false. A constraint concerns action's form and circumstances unless further information establishes otherwise.

Others likewise cannot be required to give continuously because a shared undertaking seems important. A participant can support its direction while declining additional work. Their limit is no proof of indifference without examination of facts. If a project survives through concealed limitations, calling it a vocation cannot establish its sustainability or fairness. Who promised what, and what can actually be fulfilled? This question promises no solution for every project. It returns a human measure to discussion of significance. An activity may demand serious work,

but seriousness is not measured through compulsory exhaustion, abandonment of the rest of life, or readiness to hide impossibility from people relying on a result.

XII. Require no final harmony

Vocation and earning can coincide in one activity, overlap partly, or remain in separate forms. No arrangement has universal priority through its name alone. Paid meaningful work retains actual conditions and commitments; a separate source of income retains participation's dignity; an unpaid direction retains its own limits. A factual mismatch need not be declared proof of a spoiled life. This distinction nevertheless permits wanting a more suitable arrangement. Change can be considered without a promise that difficulties will finally disappear. In our example, explanation remains a question about action and recipient, while earning concerns resources and conditions. Their relationship is possible but needs inquiry rather than being named success in advance.

A mature account may be quiet: this activity matters; this is how I currently participate; necessary resources come from here; these consequences have been discussed, while this information is missing. It may not sound like a final discovery of destiny, but preserves subjects that can be checked and room for change. It guarantees neither satisfaction nor freedom from contradictions. It permits respect for meaning without financial invention and respect for earning's necessity without devaluing interest. Historical grounds illuminate different sides without forming one compulsory doctrine. Further decisions remain connected to a particular life, people, and accessible conditions in which someone seeks to act honestly rather than prove that one correct title for an entire life has been discovered.

What this means in practice

Choose one meaningful direction and one actual commitment connected with earning a living. Do not immediately choose between them. First describe each through action: what you do or wish to do, for whom, and under which known conditions. Keep the label “vocation” beside this description so that it does not replace the subject. If an action exists only as a wish, identify that state honestly. This is a voluntary reflective practice, not a test of personal authenticity or financial adequacy.

Distinguish three questions next. Why does the direction matter to you? What means and conditions does the proposed form require? Why might another person need its result and pay for it? Answers need not coincide. Unknown demand, insufficient resources, and absent meaning are different situations. Where information is unavailable, record precisely what is unknown without substituting a confident forecast. Meaningful participation may currently

have only an unpaid form; recognizing this requires no immediate transformation into a service.

Name affected commitments and people separately. Does a promise already exist? Which resources are shared? Whose consent is actually needed? Someone can support your interest while declining the proposed burden. Their boundary alone cannot decide their relationship to you. If a form changes, name that change directly and identify who needs discussion of the actual circumstances. Legal, financial, and other substantial consequences cannot be decided by a philosophical phrase alone; appropriate information and competence are required.

Finally choose a question with an actual addressee or an accessible subject of verification. A participant's expectations, permissible use of materials, or the terms of an existing agreement may need clarification. Starting a new undertaking is not compulsory: acknowledging that a particular form is currently inaccessible can be an honest result. Keep what remains significant beside what has not been established. Return to the description when information or conditions change, rather than to prove desire's strength daily. The practice clarifies discussion; it guarantees neither income, satisfaction, nor a final reconciliation of every part of life.

Key quotation

> *“it is impossible, or not easy, to do noble acts without the proper equipment.” — Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics I.8, exact fragment of W.D.Ross's English translation.*

Connections between traditions

1. **Activity and its conditions: Aristotle and the contemporary vocation question.** I.8 acknowledges external means for good action; here means concern a specific form of participation. The similarity distinguishes action from its conditions. Boundary: Aristotelian happiness is no individual career program; historical judgments about birth, appearance, and childlessness are not adopted.

2. **Personal interest and recipient: Smith and a meaningful offer.** I.II describes appealing to another's advantage in exchange; this article distinguishes personal meaning from reasons to pay for a result. Both require attention to another participant. Boundary: exchange explains neither every relationship nor guaranteed demand for a clear offer.

3. **Means and expectation's limits: Aristotle and Ecclesiastes.** External goods matter for action; love of silver in5:10 receives no promise of satisfaction. The comparison distinguishes resources from final fulfillment. Boundary: normative ethics and biblical wisdom have different foundations, and neither determines a reader's sufficient income.

4. **Work for another and the good of labor: Smith and Ecclesiastes.** Exchange concerns a recipient;5:18–20 preserves enjoying labor within God's gift and a human portion. Their shared subject is activity in people's lives. Boundary: economic description is not theology; the religious text supplies no pricing or payment rule.

5. **Significance without guarantees: three grounds and a contemporary limit.** Activity's conditions, exchange relationships, and accumulation's limits pose different questions around work and earning. Reading them together helps retain meaning, means, and recipient as distinct subjects. Boundary: this is an original comparison, not one historical doctrine, evidence of practice efficacy, or a financial recommendation.

Primary sources

1. Aristotle, Nicomachean EthicsI, W.D.Ross English translation. Complete displayed I.8 lines102–117 actually read; previously read I.7 retained as context. Lines115–117 on external means adopted; key fragment115 checked exactly. Historical exclusionary judgments at116 not adopted. Greek and print edition not collated.

2. Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations, original English text, Gutenberg3300. I.II120–140 and opening I.III142–143 previously actually read; only exchange and the recipient's advantage used here. No demand or income forecast or contemporary financial recommendation inferred; precise print edition not established.

3. Ecclesiastes5, KJV. Displayed scripture5:1–20 checked in fresh reading;5:10–20 adopted with God, gift, and portion retained. Epigraph is the exact opening fragment of5:10; Russian rendering ours. Modern commentary excluded; Hebrew and a1611 facsimile not collated.

Smith is used in original English; Aristotle and the biblical text in the named English translations. Russian quotations rendered by United Wisdom. Short attributed quotation establishes no worldwide rights clearance or permission for source import or vectorization. Historical grounds establish neither practice efficacy nor a financial decision.

Tags

vocation, earning, meaningful work, resources, labor, activity, meaning, income, commitments, consent, recipient, exchange, conditions, boundaries, responsibility, profession, participation, volunteering, uncertainty, demand, expectations, wealth, sufficiency, change, Aristotle, Adam Smith, Ecclesiastes, philosophy, religious foundations, United Wisdom

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

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.