

The Myth of Arrival

The Myth of Arrival: Luck, Happiness, and the Case for Necessary Struggle

1. Introduction

We speak of luck and happiness as though they were fixed points on a shared map, as if “good luck” meant the same thing to every person who used the phrase, and “happiness” named one destination toward which all human effort was, at bottom, aimed. Neither claim survives scrutiny. Ask ten people to define luck and you will get ten different admixtures of chance, timing, effort, and grace. Ask ten people what happiness feels like and you will get ten different emotional signatures, several of which contradict each other outright: the parent who finds happiness in exhaustion and duty, the ascetic who finds it in deprivation, the competitor who finds it only in the afterburn of victory. These are not variations on a theme. They are evidence that the words themselves are doing far less work than we assume.

This paper’s aim is narrow at first and expansive by the end. First, to strip “luck” and “happiness” down to whatever objective core survives the stripping, separating what is actually observable in the world from what is merely projected onto it by the person doing the labeling. Second, to use that stripped down picture to argue for something larger and less comfortable: that constant peace and happiness are not the natural telos of a human life, and that necessary hardship, not gratuitous suffering, but real friction and resistance, is the actual engine of human growth. The paper is not an argument for pain. It is an argument against the idea that the absence of pain is what we are for.

2. Deconstructing Luck

Colloquially, luck is the residue left over after we’ve accounted for skill and effort: the unearned remainder. A person wins the lottery: luck. A person closes a deal because they happened to be introduced to the right buyer at the right dinner: luck. The common thread is externality and randomness. Luck is what happens to you, not what you make happen.

But look closer at almost any story of “good luck” and a second causal layer appears. The person at the dinner didn’t win the deal because the universe favored them; they won it because years of preparation meant that when the opportunity appeared, they were positioned to recognize and use it. Someone else at the same dinner, equally exposed to the same “lucky” opportunity, would have let it pass unnoticed, unprepared to act on it. This is the old formulation, luck as preparation

meeting opportunity, but it is worth taking seriously rather than repeating as a platitude. What it implies is that a disproportionate share of what we call luck is actually a measurement problem: we see the moment of collision between readiness and chance, and we credit the chance, because the readiness was invisible, cumulative, and unglamorous. Opportunity is common. Distributed readiness to exploit it is not. That asymmetry is what luck usually names.

This doesn't collapse chance entirely into disguised competence. There remains an objective layer that is genuinely external and independent of the person: the dinner happened, the buyer was in town, the plane didn't crash. These are facts about the world, indifferent to anyone's preparation. But there is a second, subjective layer laid on top of that objective layer: the labeling of an event as good or bad luck, which depends entirely on the values, timing, and readiness of the person experiencing it. The same job loss is "bad luck" to one person and, in retrospect, "the best thing that happened to me" to another, without the objective event changing at all. What changes is what the person does with it.

Luck, properly deconstructed, is not a force. It is an event plus a valuation, and the valuation is where all the interesting variance lives.

3. Deconstructing Happiness

Happiness fares worse under the same treatment, because it doesn't even have a stable objective referent to argue about. "Luck" at least points to discrete external events. "Happiness" points to an internal state that people report using the same word to describe genuinely incompatible experiences: the calm of a settled life, the high of a risk paying off, the satisfaction of discipline, the relief of release from pain. Psychology and neuroscience can identify correlates, dopaminergic reward signaling, serotonergic mood regulation, the absorption state researchers call flow, and these give us something like an objective layer: measurable, physiological, cross culturally consistent to a degree. But the subjective layer, what each person actually qualifies as happiness and how much of it they believe they need, varies so widely that the objective correlates end up explaining the mechanism of happiness far better than they explain its content or its value to any given life.

This is worth sitting with rather than rushing past, because it exposes a sharper problem than mere definitional fuzziness: is happiness, as popularly conceived, a state to be reached and then maintained, even a coherent target? The evidence from hedonic adaptation research suggests it is not. People who win the lottery and people who become paraplegic tend, after an adjustment period, to return to something close to their prior baseline of reported life satisfaction. This is not because circumstances don't matter; it's because the "happiness" being measured is less a location than a rate of change, a derivative rather than a position. We feel good in the movement toward something, and that feeling fades as the something becomes the new normal. If that's accurate, then treating happiness as a destination is a category error, closer to treating velocity as a place you can stand still in. We describe it as a state we arrive at, while functionally it behaves like

something we are always in transit through.

4. The Turn: Human Nature as Striving, Not Arriving

If happiness behaves like motion rather than a location, the natural next question is what humans are actually built to do, and the honest answer, supported by both individual psychology and species level history, is that we are built to strive, adapt, and metabolize new experience, not to rest in satisfaction. Organisms that stop adapting stop surviving; this is true at the level of evolutionary biology and it appears to be true, in a looser but still meaningful sense, at the level of individual psychological function. Contentment without challenge does not sharpen cognition, build skill, or generate insight, it maintains. Growth, by contrast, appears reliably downstream of friction: the muscle that tears and rebuilds, the argument that forces a belief to be reexamined, the deadline that forces latent capacity into use.

The historical pattern is not subtle. Disproportionately, the intellectual and cultural leaps we consider civilizational milestones cluster around periods of adversity rather than periods of comfort: wartime acceleration of technology, economic hardship forcing innovation, personal crisis preceding the artist's or thinker's major work. This is not an argument that war and suffering are good; it is an empirical observation that peace, taken as a sustained condition, correlates far more often with consolidation than with leap. Comfortable eras conserve what adversity produced. They rarely produce the next leap themselves.

From this follows a claim that will strike many readers as counterintuitive, even distasteful: happiness, when treated as a constant end state to be achieved and defended, functions less like a reward for a life well lived and more like a constraint on further development. A person or a civilization that has fully arrived, that has eliminated friction and secured comfort, has also eliminated the conditions under which further adaptation occurs. Static happiness is not obviously a summit. It may be closer to a plateau that stops being climbed.

5. Steelman the Opposition

Before pushing this claim further, it deserves its strongest counterargument, stated fully rather than gestured at and dismissed. The objection runs like this: growth does not require conflict, war, or suffering as its engine. Curiosity does. Love does. Play, collaboration, and creative flow do. A child does not need to be traumatized to learn language; she learns it through delighted, low stakes experimentation with willing adults. Scientific revolutions have come not only from wartime urgency but from the quiet, sustained curiosity of people with the security and leisure to wonder. Darwin had the resources and calm of independent wealth; many mathematical breakthroughs have come from people in stable academic peace, not crisis. Loving relationships, on this view, generate enormous personal growth, patience, empathy, self knowledge, through positive sum cooperation rather than adversarial struggle. If this is right, then the striving this paper has

been describing does not require hardship at all. It requires engagement, and engagement can be joyful.

This objection is strong, and much of it is true. It would be dishonest to answer it by insisting that Darwin's finches or a child's first words were secretly forms of suffering. They weren't. The steelman correctly identifies that positive sum, low conflict processes can and do produce real growth.

6. The Refinement

What the steelman shows is not that struggle is unnecessary for growth, but that "struggle" was too narrow a word for what this paper actually means, and that a distinction has to be made explicit: not all hardship is equal, and this argument does not endorse all of it. Gratuitous suffering, pain with no productive relationship to growth, trauma imposed without purpose, deprivation for its own sake, is rejected outright. Nothing in this argument recommends it, and nothing about human resilience depends on it. That much should be uncontroversial.

But look again at curiosity, the steelman's strongest example, and a different structure emerges than "peaceful growth versus adversarial struggle." Curiosity is not the absence of tension; it is a form of tension, just one that doesn't feel like suffering. The pull toward understanding something not yet understood is, structurally, a discomfort: an itch, a gap, a not yet resolved state that the mind works to close. Darwin's calm circumstances did not remove the friction of not knowing why species varied; they simply let him sustain that friction productively for decades instead of being crushed by more urgent, unproductive friction (hunger, war, instability). The child learning language is straining, moment to moment, against the limits of her current expressive capacity; that straining is what makes the acquisition happen, not the absence of any resistance at all. Love, similarly, grows people not because it removes friction but because it introduces the specific, survivable friction of another person's needs, expectations, and difference, which the self must stretch to accommodate.

So the refinement is this: necessary hardship is not synonymous with conflict, scarcity, or pain. It is any form of real resistance, cognitive, emotional, physical, relational, that a person must move through rather than around in order to change. Curiosity, love, and collaboration are not exceptions to the struggle thesis; they are its gentlest and most sustainable instances. What they share with war and crisis is not violence but friction that must be metabolized. What separates the two is intensity, choice, and consequence, not the presence or absence of resistance itself. Growth in the absence of any tension whatsoever does not appear to occur, in the curious child or the comfortable scientist any more than in the soldier. What differs is only how survivable, chosen, and humane the tension is.

7. Thesis Statement, Explicit

Constant peace should not be the goal of a human life, because peace, sustained indefinitely, describes stasis rather than the condition under which humans

actually change. The goal, if a single word must be chosen, is not arrival but passage: to move through hardship, in whatever gentle or severe form it takes, to metabolize it rather than avoid it, and to emerge altered by it. Happiness, understood as a permanent, frictionless plateau, is not the honest description of a life well lived; it is closer to a description of a life that has stopped changing. Resilience through repeated, survivable challenge, not the successful pursuit of static contentment, is the more accurate account of what human beings are actually built to do with their time.

8. Implications and Closing

If this is right, it changes what counts as good advice. “Just be happy” is not neutral guidance; it quietly recommends stasis. Setting life goals around the elimination of friction, the debt free, conflict free, risk free life, optimizes for a plateau, not a peak, and plateaus are not where the interesting growth in a human life tends to happen. A more honest framework for evaluating a life well lived would ask not “how much unbroken contentment did this person sustain,” but “what did this person move through, and what did they become on the other side of it.” That reframing doesn’t tell you which hardships to seek out, how much friction is enough, or where the line falls between necessary tension and gratuitous damage, and it shouldn’t pretend to. That line moves with circumstance, capacity, and consent, and no formula sets it in advance.

What it leaves the reader with is not a technique but a question, worth sitting with rather than resolving too quickly: if happiness is motion and not a place, what are you actually moving through right now, and is it something you are metabolizing, or something you are only enduring?

Written by Gana Eric