

UNITED WISDOM

Merit, Luck, and the Support We Receive

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-28-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Merit, Luck, and the Support We Receive

Epigraph

the value of leisure

Philip Gilbert Hamerton, Human Intercourse, essay on Bohemianism, p. 311. A short fragment from the author's Corot narrative, rather than an independent saying attributed to the painter.

What this article is about

After a successful presentation, someone thanks a teacher, family members, and colleagues. One listener hears a polite ritual; another hears an admission that success came too easily. The speaker may move between two accounts: I did everything myself, or nothing would have happened without help. Both can overlook something important. The preparation was real, and so was the support. A favourable moment does not cancel long practice, and practice does not retrospectively create a favourable moment.

This article treats merit, luck, and support as different questions about the same history. Merit concerns a particular action and responsibility for it. Luck points to circumstances a person did not fully control. Support brings other people's contributions back into view, including those so familiar that they seem part of the scenery. Distinguishing them is useful for acknowledging our work and others' work more accurately, rather than calculating a moral ranking.

We will discuss modest achievements, learning, and shared work. The article does not establish a scientific percentage for each factor, judge human dignity by results, or ask people to feel guilty about every advantage. Its question is simpler and harder: how can we tell the truth about something that went well, without turning gratitude into self-erasure or pride into ownership of the entire journey?

I. One result answers several questions

Imagine a workshop where a participant has made a sturdy wooden chair. They measured carefully, remade several joints, and finished the job. A teacher demonstrated a technique, a neighbour lent a tool, and an organiser provided the room. The chair emerged from the participant's actions under particular conditions. Saying they made it themselves can accurately describe whose hands did the work while concealing how the workshop was made possible.

It helps to distinguish a result from an explanation of the result. Naming the maker is one question. Describing the conditions that enabled the work is another. Establishing who is responsible for an inaccurate joint is a third. When these become confused, thanking a teacher can sound like surrendering authorship, while recognising skill can sound like claiming the room and tools appeared by themselves. The distinction makes room for each answer.

Merit here is not a magical substance inside a person. It recognises a particular effort: they practised, checked dimensions, and corrected a mistake. Luck need not involve a miraculous event. A suitable class schedule or freedom from illness that day may be relevant circumstances. Support concerns another person's action: someone explained, provided, reminded, or helped sustain a difficult stage. Each word directs attention towards a different part of the situation.

This does not mean every explanation is equally useful. The chair's strength matters when assessing its quality; tool access matters when organising the next course; specific contributions matter when expressing thanks. A list of favourable circumstances cannot answer whether a chair is safe. Praise for diligence cannot by itself make a course accessible. Accuracy involves choosing the question, rather than discovering the one correct legend about how everything happened.

Holding several questions together prevents success from becoming a verdict on personality. We can recognise good work without declaring its maker superior in every respect. We can identify substantial support without declaring the recipient useless. Human dignity does not have to wait for the calculation to finish. It should not depend on how successfully we can separate someone's contribution from everyone else's in one particular history.

II. Effort can be named without exaggeration

After acknowledging advantages, people sometimes become afraid to describe their own work. Mentioning convenient hours or an experienced mentor seems to remove their right to be pleased. Yet gratitude does not prohibit precise verbs. I read the material, persisted through several failures, learned to ask for comments, and corrected a weakness. Each verb identifies an examinable part of the story without demanding that it be the sole cause of the result.

It is useful to distinguish effort from suffering. A difficult journey deserves attention, but difficulty alone does not make a decision good. Someone may spend a long time repeating an ineffective method before changing it with another person's help. Their achievement may lie precisely in that change. An account of how painful everything was can then give way to a more informative one: what they noticed, learned, and accepted responsibility for.

The opposite trap is to consider an action worthless because it came relatively easily. Ease may reflect earlier preparation, a helpful explanation, a suitable tool, or the nature of the task. It

does not automatically reveal the value of someone's abilities. An experienced musician need not suffer before every performance for it to remain their work. Earlier preparation also had conditions, which can be acknowledged separately rather than erased by present fluency.

Accurate recognition limits its own scope. A well-organised celebration does not prove that its organiser is always right in relationships. Completing a project does not confer the right to decide for those who helped. Recognition belongs to an action; it need not become a lifelong certificate of moral exceptionalism. This boundary also protects the person being praised. They do not have to maintain the image of someone who invariably outperforms everyone else.

Acknowledging effort can therefore be calm. I worked on this and am pleased with the result; these people and circumstances helped me; some difficulties remain unresolved. The statement contains pride and an open edge. It requires neither theatrical humility nor triumphant solitude. It also makes the next step easier to discuss, because success has not forbidden noticing weaknesses or requesting further assistance.

III. Luck does not explain everything away

Luck can become a quick way to end a conversation. One person was fortunate and another was not, so there is supposedly nothing left to examine. But circumstances can be specified. Someone met a relevant specialist, had usable free time, or received information before applications closed. These descriptions do not measure fate. They identify conditions that shaped an available path and were not wholly created by that person's decision.

This matters particularly when an unexpected event meets preparation. A surprise invitation to speak still has to be accepted, material prepared, and questions answered. Without the invitation, that result might not have occurred; without preparation, the invitation might have gone unused. These statements are compatible. They describe different links in a chain rather than demanding a choice between complete randomness and complete personal control over the outcome.

A past result does not let us run another version of a life in a laboratory. We cannot know exactly what would have happened without an introduction or in another city. Calling something a significant condition is therefore more careful than calling it the sole cause. Otherwise, acknowledging luck becomes as overconfident as denying it. An honest account leaves room for what its narrator cannot actually establish.

External conditions are not all accidental in the same sense. Family resources, the language of education, and long-term housing access may be enduring starting advantages; an unexpected encounter has a different character. Reducing them all to a winning ticket makes understanding harder. A stable condition may be maintained and extended, while a chance

opportunity is difficult to repeat on schedule. That distinction helps us consider the future without promising yesterday's good fortune again.

Acknowledging luck also changes the account of failure. If an outcome depended on circumstances beyond control, its absence does not prove an absence of effort. This still leaves mistakes open to examination: a poor decision remains a decision. But it interrupts the hurried conclusion that someone did not want success enough. Between excusing every error and condemning an entire person lies a concrete examination of actions, conditions, chance, and known or unknown consequences.

IV. Constant support can become invisible

A dramatic rescue is easy to notice. Someone arrived on a difficult day, helped finish the work, or paid for an essential journey. Continuous support can disappear into the background: a quiet place to study, regular childcare, patient explanations of unfamiliar rules. A person may sincerely remember their own late nights yet forget who made those nights available. Such invisibility need not begin with malicious intent; sometimes it begins with familiarity.

Philip Gilbert Hamerton's account of the painter Corot in Human Intercourse offers an example. The narrator associates his opportunity to pursue art with modest support offered by his father, and his later generosity partly with inheritance. This is Hamerton's literary and historical account, rather than an independent verification of Corot's whole biography. It highlights conditions without cancelling the artist's work. Hamerton, essay on Bohemianism, pp. 310–311.

Applying this distinction does not require finding a patron behind every movement. We can begin with one episode: preparing for an examination, moving a workshop, or finishing a report. Who freed up time? Who explained unwritten expectations? Who remained available after the first failure? These questions do not take the result away. They restore people whose actions belonged to the history but received no sentence of their own in its telling.

Support may be voluntary, paid, reciprocal, or part of someone's job. These differences affect appropriate recognition. A worker may need fair payment and acknowledgement of their contribution more than an employer's emotional thanks. A close companion may need reassurance that their time is not considered unlimited. Treating every form of assistance as one moral gift can conceal labour and replace an agreement with an attractive feeling.

Recognising support may feel awkward, but awkwardness need not be the final outcome. A more productive question asks what needs clarification now: a participant's name, payment, workload, or others' access to a similar condition. This connects memory of what was received to present action. It does not require proving that every minute of assistance was deserved before taking the next available opportunity.

V. A received resource and its use

In section VI of the Enchiridion, Epictetus distinguishes one's own action from a possession's excellence: a beautiful horse does not make its owner admirable. The Stoic framework directs attention to the use of impressions. This is normative philosophy, not a measurement of causes of success. Here it offers a limited basis for asking what someone did with a received resource. Epictetus, § VI, translated by T. W. Higginson.

In everyday life, a resource might be a good library, a useful introduction, or a paid course. Having it is not the same as working with it. We may leave access unused, use it attentively, or close the same route to others. A discussion of merit therefore does not end with a list of advantages. Questions remain about the actions someone took within an opportunity that had become available.

This does not justify dismissing external conditions in the name of inner freedom. If the library is closed, moral discipline does not automatically unlock it. If education is inaccessible, a proper attitude does not replace fees or translation. An ancient philosophical framework should not erase material circumstances. Its use here is restricted: distinguish what was received from what was done, retaining both in the account rather than devaluing one to elevate the other.

Nor is the use of a resource always visible in the final result. Someone may reach a goal while withholding essential information from colleagues. Another may miss a goal but honestly share findings and help the work continue. These choices deserve separate consideration. Otherwise success becomes a universal excuse and failure a universal accusation. Recognition of an outcome and evaluation of conduct can differ without any logical contradiction.

This perspective can make gratitude active. An opportunity does not become a demand to repay the world with precisely the same quantity of goodness. We can nevertheless ask what we currently control: information, time, a recommendation, or the ability to identify an author. The answer need not be grand. Sometimes it means ceasing to portray shared work as solitary achievement and giving the next participant a comprehensible way into it.

VI. Gratitude without lifelong debt

Support is not always surrounded by peaceful relationships. Someone who helped may later demand agreement, affection, or a particular choice on the strength of the past. Recognition then becomes mixed with surrendering authority over one's life. But gratitude and obligation have different grounds. We can remember that assistance mattered while separately examining the agreement, the promises made, and whether a present demand belongs to that agreement.

The subject here is limited to the form of acknowledgement. It does not resolve every issue of dependency between people. Contracts, money, or threats require information about the specific situation. Even in an ordinary conversation, however, distinguishing two statements helps: you helped me then; I agree to this now. The first does not make the second compulsory. Otherwise gratitude becomes a mechanism for cancelling later choice.

A recipient may also invent an endless debt that nobody has demanded. They feel that, after receiving help, they have no right to rest, refuse, or enjoy their own success. Such an account rarely clarifies the contribution. Instead it makes every future boundary look like betrayal. Naming assistance at its actual scale can help: what was provided, when, and on which terms? Specificity recognises something substantial without declaring it limitless.

Reciprocity need not be symmetrical. Someone who was taught a difficult subject may later help another person in an entirely different way. A recipient of care may not yet have anything to give back. Neither circumstance makes the help pointless or places their dignity in escrow. Where repayment is expected, it is better to state that beforehand. Where a gift is freely given, it should not quietly become a contract after delivery.

Gratitude retains its human meaning when it allows truthful proportion. It may take the form of a letter, an acknowledgement, payment for work, or attention to another person's needs. It can coexist with disagreement and distance. Respecting support does not require rewriting a difficult relationship as wholly benevolent. Honest memory can hold specific assistance and specific harm together, without forcing either fact to erase the other.

VII. Recognition is not a bookkeeping exercise

Distinguishing factors can tempt us to assign percentages: this much belongs to effort, this much to family, and this much to luck. Particular research can develop models with defined indicators, but an everyday account does not thereby become a reliable calculator. Here we have neither an alternative life for comparison nor a common unit of measurement. Preparation hours, meeting a mentor, and a favourable day cannot be added like identical coins.

Even accurate time records answer a limited question. Two hours of skilled explanation may change months of work; those months may make the explanation understandable. Conditions matter through their relationships. Remove one link and both its contribution and the functioning of other links can change. A careful history therefore more often identifies significant conditions and decisions than assigns each an ultimate share of the outcome.

This does not forbid agreements about money, authorship, or responsibilities. Those need specific rules and sometimes measurable indicators. But an agreed share of compensation is not a complete map of success's causes. A participant with a small paid role may matter decisively at a difficult moment. Someone else may complete most of the work under a previously agreed contract. Different kinds of recognition should be discussed separately and transparently.

Bookkeeping of merit can also slide into ranking people. More support supposedly warrants less respect; more obstacles supposedly warrant unconditional trust. Neither conclusion follows automatically. Circumstances matter for understanding a journey, but they do not supply a ready answer about every decision's quality. Nor do they make dignity a prize awarded for the most difficult biography.

Instead of percentages, try a short map: one's own actions, others' actions, starting conditions, unexpected events, and what remains unknown. It need not be exhaustive. Its purpose is to correct a particular blind spot. Sometimes clarification shows that adding a name, changing a sentence, or opening access is enough. We do not have to recalculate an entire life endlessly for acknowledgement to become more honest than it was yesterday.

VIII. How success stories shape advice

A successful person often wants to share experience. This can help as long as experience does not become a universal instruction. A story about studying for two hours every evening quietly assumes available evenings, a place to study, and freedom from other urgent responsibilities. The advice need not be false, but its conditions need naming. Otherwise the recipient is asked to repeat an action for which they lack the same space.

More accurate advice includes limits: this helped me; these were my conditions; this is what I have not tested elsewhere. Such an opening does not weaken the experience. It lets another person compare it with their circumstances and choose the useful part. Experience becomes a proposal that can be modified, declined, or supplemented without shame, rather than an examination of the recipient's willpower.

Stories of overcoming difficulty require particular care. They can encourage, but they can also conceal a journey's costs. Someone reached a goal despite an obstacle; that does not mean the obstacle was beneficial or should be retained for everyone else. Describing one's

persistence is compatible with making the next journey easier. Removing unnecessary difficulty does not take away work already done by those who encountered it before.

If someone says your advice does not fit, you need not defend your biography. Their refusal may concern schedules, health, information, or a different goal. It is not a declaration that your effort was unreal. You can ask which part of the path differs, and stop if discussion is unwelcome. Recognising differences preserves both histories' dignity: one does not become evidence of the other's inadequacy.

Learning becomes more useful when conditions travel with the method. Offer an accessible text alongside an exercise, an explanation of how to apply alongside a professional recommendation, or a clear way to ask questions alongside praise for independence. This connects success with the organisation of another attempt. Gratitude towards the past becomes a small useful action for someone whose situation does not have to resemble our own.

IX. Acknowledging advantage without performing self-condemnation

Noticing a starting advantage can make someone feel obliged to publicly devalue themselves. Acknowledgement then becomes a performance with the same person at centre stage. A long speech about being undeserving does not necessarily reveal others' work or change access. Sometimes it merely requires the audience to offer reassurance. Asking what the acknowledgement changes is more useful than insisting on the correct emotion.

We can name a condition plainly: I had free time, access to a mentor, or the ability to make several mistakes without immediately losing income. Then ask which of these is available to others, and who sustained it. There is no promise to repair all inequality in one conversation. There is a refusal to present our circumstances as normal for everyone. Such accuracy can shape the next decision even without guilt.

Gratitude should not become a competition either. A longer list of helpers does not guarantee a more honest person. Some contributions are public; others involve private matters that should not be disclosed without consent. Sometimes acknowledging the existence of support without naming people or circumstances is enough. Recognising a contribution does not authorise telling someone else's story to make one's own sound morally convincing.

The appropriate form depends on the situation. A collective report needs authorship; a family discussion needs attention to time; course admission needs understandable participation requirements. A general acknowledgement of privilege does not replace these decisions. The

more specific the subject, the easier it becomes to see a possible change. There is also less need to declare oneself either wholly deserving or completely unworthy of the result.

Calm acknowledgement allows pleasure as well. We may enjoy learning, good work, and meeting a helpful person. Pleasure does not prove indifference towards others' difficulties. It becomes problematic when used as evidence that nobody else should have difficulties. Keeping personal experience distinct from a general rule lets us appreciate what we received while also taking part in extending available opportunities.

X. A truer account leaves room for another step

Return to the finished chair. Its maker can describe what they did: careful measurements, corrected joints, completed work. They can identify support: tools, explanation, and premises. They can note a favourable circumstance: the session happened when they could attend. None of these sentences cancels another. The account has several components because the work itself had several components, rather than because its author is obliged to diminish themselves.

This account helps with another attempt too. Knowing that timely feedback mattered makes it possible to request it earlier. Knowing that access to a tool mattered makes it possible to check that access beforehand. If a chance meeting was decisive, avoid promising a repeat and look for several possible routes. Clarifying the past becomes preparation for the future, provided preparation is not presented as a guarantee of the outcome.

If the next experience ends badly, the map remains useful. We can examine a decision without declaring our whole personality a mistake. We can acknowledge an external obstacle without denying that some available part may change. We can request help without treating the request as evidence of dependence. Attention returns to actions and conditions instead of a general verdict about what a person is supposedly worth.

Merit, luck, and support are therefore not three rivals for one prize. They are three directions of attention. One preserves action and responsibility, another limits the illusion of complete control, and the third restores relationships and shared labour. Holding them together does not promise perfect feelings about ourselves. It makes more accurate speech, fairer acknowledgement, and more cautious advice possible when someone else's path is organised differently.

A more honest history need not be final. New information may reveal a forgotten contribution or unexpected consequence. Being able to revise an account does not make it worthless today. It keeps acknowledgement alive: we continue learning to see where we acted, where others helped, and where circumstances were favourable. Dignity does not depend on completing this map; responsibility concerns the next available step.

What this means in practice

Choose one small completed episode rather than your entire biography: a skill learned, a meeting prepared, or an object made. Record several of your own actions using concrete verbs. Separately identify others' actions, conditions that existed before the work, and unexpected events. If you do not know how much a condition mattered, leave that unknown. The exercise distinguishes factors rather than calculating percentages of dignity.

Check whether your usual account has claimed somebody else's work. You may need to name a co-author, pay for additional labour, or acknowledge time freed for you. Choose a form that fits the contribution. Ask permission before mentioning private assistance publicly. When professional work is involved, check whether thanks are replacing compensation or recognition of authorship that should have been discussed separately.

Find one sentence you can make more accurate. Replace a general assertion of complete independence with your work and its conditions. Replace a claim of pure luck with the opportunity you used and the preparation involved. Instead of devaluing a result because of support, explain the action that assistance made possible. Stay truthful; do not add helpers or advantages merely to sound persuasively modest.

Before advising another person, name the conditions of your experience and ask whether theirs are similar. Where they differ, offer an adaptation rather than a judgement of motivation. Then choose one available action: explain how to participate, share open material, make a colleague's contribution visible, or ease the next participant's entry. Do not promise to remove inequality or ensure success; check the actual usefulness of your offer with the person concerned.

Finally, preserve two separate possibilities: enjoying the work and continuing to clarify its history. Receiving help does not cancel your work. Your work does not cancel received help. If the exercise becomes endless self-accusation, return to the selected episode and one concrete action. Its purpose is clearer acknowledgement and a reasonable next step, rather than a final moral sentence on yourself or anyone else.

Key quotation

> *acts of fraternal generosity*

Philip Gilbert Hamerton, Human Intercourse, essay on Bohemianism, p. 311. A short fragment of the narrator's account of Corot's later assistance to others. The context distinguishes work and received means without assigning percentages to them.

Connections between traditions

Hamerton offers a historical and literary observation; the selected episode distinguishes work from enabling conditions. Epictetus's Stoic normative framework directs attention to action in the presence of an external resource. These texts ask different questions rather than forming one theory of success. The shared workshop in this article is our application of the distinction, not a universal law established by either author.

Their connection is limited to acknowledgement. It does not justify deriving moral worth from the number of obstacles overcome, dismissing external conditions, or treating gratitude as authority over a recipient. Differences of purpose and genre remain: historical narrative offers a particular image, philosophical instruction proposes a norm, and everyday analysis requires checking the facts of one's own situation.

Sources

• B17-R-28-N02-S1. Philip Gilbert Hamerton. Human Intercourse. Essay on Bohemianism, printed pp. 310–311. Selected surrounding context, pp. 309–313, read; the author's narrative and two short fragments are used, without independent biographical verification.

• B17-R-28-N02-S2. Epictetus. The Enchiridion. § VI. Translated by Thomas Wentworth Higginson. Selected section and neighbouring context read; used as a normative distinction, without direct quotation.

Tags

merit, luck, support, effort, gratitude, advantage, labour, recognition, authorship, conditions, opportunity, learning, mentoring, independence, responsibility, dignity, success, failure, reciprocity, resources, pride, accuracy, self-assessment, cooperation, access, success stories, experience, Epictetus, Hamerton, United Wisdom

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.