

UNITED WISDOM

The end of the working day when you are always reachable

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-21-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The end of the working day when you are always reachable

Epigraph

> *Nothing, Lucilius, is ours, except time.*

Seneca, Letter 1, §3, short excerpt, Richard M. Gummere translation. This is an ethical appeal concerning time, not a determination of contemporary employment rights.

What this article is about

Imagine Ilya coordinating ordinary orders in a small team. The working day ends, but messages keep arriving: a colleague asks about tomorrow's task, a manager forwards an idea, and another contributor requests a look at a file. Each reply takes only a few minutes. Ilya answers, notices another question and returns to his phone. There is no substantial separate evening assignment, yet the evening no longer belongs to the activity he chose for himself.

The ability to contact someone does not establish a duty to engage immediately. Still, the boundary does not arise solely from deciding privately to stop answering: others may rely on availability previously provided or agreed. The issue concerns cooperation, clear obligations and authority to change expectations.

We will distinguish receiving a signal, replying and accepting work, then examine urgency, exceptions and fairness in a shared schedule. Historical texts illuminate time's cost without establishing modern legal rules. The article concerns ordinary adult activity with arrangements that can be clarified. On-call duties, safety threats, coercion and special professional responsibilities require specific information and suitable decisions that this article does not replace.

I. A message is not yet an assignment

A group chat contains different actions despite presenting them all as messages. Someone shares a thought, asks for information, proposes work or reports an existing dependency. Receiving the text does not make those actions equivalent. Ilya can first establish what is actually expected: reading, acknowledging receipt, answering a question or doing a task. Otherwise each notification may quietly become an assignment accepted merely because he saw it before other contributors.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Replying need not mean accepting. Ilya can acknowledge that he understands the question and state when he can examine it substantively. A casual agreement to look may be ambiguous: one person hears a promise of an imminent result, while the other means an unspecified future. A boundary should not rest on that mismatch. Naming the available action and next clarification is enough; no special negotiation technique is required. Willingness to read need not imply willingness to perform immediately.

The deadline for a reply also differs from the deadline for a result. A colleague may need to know tonight when a file will be ready, although the file itself is needed tomorrow. A brief clarification could preserve the sequence without a full return to work. Another answer requires checking information and is itself substantial work. Calling it a single message then hides the scope. Neither every answer nor every question should be presumed trivial. The actual dependency determines what both people need to understand.

This distinction does not require Ilya to analyse every line throughout the evening. An ordinary team can agree which messages require an immediate response and which simply record something for the next day. The clarification then belongs to organising cooperation, rather than following each notification. Without a rule, Ilya can retain several contrasting examples and raise the question during working time. The aim is understandable expectations, rather than another permanent duty to monitor the chat in order to decline monitoring correctly.

II. Agreement and habitual availability

A schedule may name the end of the day, while expectations also arise from previous replies. If Ilya has engaged quickly each evening for months, colleagues may have incorporated that pattern into their arrangements. Habit does not itself establish a legal or ethical duty of permanent response. It still matters when changing a shared practice honestly. Sudden absence leaves the old expectation intact. Advance notice, tied to when questions will next be considered, can clarify the change.

The expectation may have been explicit: Ilya accepted a particular evening duty or promised availability during a launch. It should then not be described as someone else's arbitrary habit. The scope, duration and conditions need examination. Limited duty need not cover every project question, and a temporary arrangement does not become endless merely because its end was not discussed again. Revising a genuine commitment nevertheless requires speaking with those who rely on it. Personal convenience does not erase consent already given.

The opposite mistake is treating every managerial request as a personal promise already accepted. Authority to assign work, employment rules and actual powers cannot be established from one message. This article gives no legal answer about a particular employee's evening duty. In the ordinary scene, it is possible to clarify whether the request

belongs to the agreement, how other priorities change and who can decide. If Ilya lacks authority to alter the condition alone, acknowledging that limitation is more accurate than simply urging him to feel free.

Habit becomes a discussable arrangement when its time and demands are visible. One evening might contain three replies, two returns to a file and uncertainty about tomorrow's deadline. No measured loss of productivity or diagnosis must be proved. It is enough to show that participation continues after its announced end. The team may choose another arrangement or retain part of the old one, but it now considers particular availability. Permanent reachability becomes an identifiable condition rather than a general complaint.

III. What urgent means

Urgency may mean a short deadline, an important task, a strong preference or a need for acknowledgment. These meanings can mix. Ilya's first question is what waiting until the next working period would change. Which action cannot proceed without the answer? What would actually differ if the information arrived in the morning? This examines the dependency requiring attention today without dismissing the request. A project's importance does not establish that every related comment must interrupt free time immediately.

Waiting may have genuinely significant consequences. An available channel and clear allocation of participation are then needed. Ordinary chat arrangements should not be extended to safety duties or other special regimes. Those decisions require the relevant rules, authority and information. The article does not authorise Ilya to cancel an established on-call obligation. The boundary of its scope matters because similar-looking messages may belong either to ordinary idea sharing or to a situation with very different responsibility for timing and action.

Evening requests may arise from the daytime arrangement. Tomorrow's order might be decided only after a contributor finishes other ordinary activities. Sorting urgent from nonurgent messages would not remove that cause. Information handover, approval sequence or advance preparation can be discussed. This is an editorial organisational proposal, not a demonstrated technique. It matters only where the relevant work can actually change. One notification rule cannot be promised to repair a dependency created by the team's entire schedule.

A missed earlier step may create urgency. Information that could have arrived sooner may now be genuinely needed; its origin still deserves later examination. Helping now and discussing recurrence are separate compatible decisions. Present help need not silently confirm that Ilya will always compensate for another delay. Accusation before clarification does not make a

boundary more precise. The sequence can be described and its point of dependency examined without assigning an intention to exploit someone's time.

IV. Contactability and an expectation of response

A phone remains nearby after work, but technical accessibility does not describe the human agreement. Being able to send a text differs from the recipient's consent to abandon a chosen activity immediately. That distinction can be stated calmly without treating the sender as morally at fault simply for writing. Someone may record a thought when it occurs and expect later reading. The problem arises when this difference is unclear or an immediate answer is expected without an agreed need. Clarifying arrangements is more useful than guessing each sender's intention.

Seneca's letter treats time as something requiring attentive use. The ancient ethical appeal does not define the modern boundary of paid work. It offers a limited occasion to see that small requests also occupy life. This article's own argument concerns consent and clarity: a need for another person's time should be named. Technical convenience and the small size of each request do not settle that question. The historical text yields no universal response rule for every form of employment or cooperation.

A simple rule may treat messages after a certain time as records for tomorrow, apart from an explicitly agreed class of questions. Simplicity does not prove feasibility. Different time zones, working periods and genuine needs must be considered. If one group enjoys a convenient day through another's permanent evening participation, the rule merely moves the difficulty. Ilya can discuss his boundary with that allocation in view, without being required to solve everyone's schedule alone in order to end his own day.

The team's account of someone who does not engage also matters. Lack of an evening reply should not automatically imply lack of interest once the agreed participation period has ended. This does not mean every expectation of a response is unfair. A particular accepted obligation may have been overlooked in discussing the boundary. Two questions help: which expectation has a basis, and how was it communicated? They preserve both parties' dignity without turning an ordinary scheduling mismatch into a story about bad people.

V. Naming the boundary concretely

Ilya can begin with the existing arrangement rather than a sweeping announcement of unavailability. He currently replies after the day ends, regularly returns to work materials and wants an agreed time for ordinary questions. This makes an action discussable without requiring agreement on a judgment of the team's entire culture. A statement solely about fatigue may lead to debate over whether he rests enough. Naming the actual participation period makes schedule and expected work the subject.

Next comes the proposed change: ordinary questions may be considered in the morning, with a specified channel for an agreed exception. Ilya should avoid promises he cannot sustain, such as a precise response time for every question or unlimited participation triggered by a particular word. The proposal must fit known scheduling and genuine obligations. Without the other party's agreement, it is not an established shared rule. It remains a proposal requiring clarified conditions, rather than a display of confidence.

Ilya can ask which dependency prevents the proposal. A colleague may need a confirmation of information before the next action rather than a full evening answer. Another participant may be needed for a particular period. Clarification permits comparison of options. It does not require trading all free time to retain some other portion. Ilya can name a limit, and the team can name its real consequences. A joint decision depends on conditions and actual authority, not on one person's duty to persuade everyone at any cost.

Disagreement does not itself prove that the boundary was badly expressed. Needs or powers may conflict. It then matters to identify what was decided, what remains open and who must make the next decision. In an ordinary situation, a brief accessible record can preserve shared understanding of the following evening. It is not evidence for a moral trial of a colleague. Where threats, coercion or serious risk exist, such a conversation does not replace suitable protection or professional clarification of conditions.

VI. An exception should not become an unspoken norm

After agreement, Ilya may occasionally be able to answer in the evening. The reply should not silently change the general expectation. He can indicate that participation is possible today while the usual arrangement remains. This does not require refusing goodwill. An explicit exception allows help without creating permanent availability. Nor should every late message count as an exception because its sender calls it urgent. Its basis is the agreed need and the action required before the next working period.

Repeated exceptions require examining the rule alongside Ilya's willingness. The boundary may sit poorly in the shared schedule, a need may have become permanent, or urgency may

mean different things to contributors. A real change can justify revision. Consistency need not require keeping an unsuitable arrangement unchanged. Revision should nevertheless be communicated and agreed where possible. Repeated departures without discussion leave the parties with different rules and turn the boundary into another source of misunderstanding.

The selected Seneca chapter describes an orator ending business after a particular hour. This is a specific Roman example, not a command to finish modern work at one universal time. The broader chapter concerns alternating activities. What matters here is an identified measure, rather than adopting a Roman hour or every neighbouring suggestion. Ilya seeks an arrangement suitable for his team. Its form can differ, provided contributors understand when an ordinary request will be considered.

Availability also includes freedom from explaining every evening in detail. Once a rule is agreed, Ilya need not produce a persuasive personal reason each time he stops. His participation already has a period. A separate promise or changed response time still requires a significant update. The arrangement combines predictability and revision. Free time does not become a privilege to earn on every occasion, while disappearance does not become a permissible answer to every inconvenient expectation.

VII. A boundary for every contributor

A personal boundary may seem successful until it becomes clear who filled the gap. If all evening questions now go to a less visible colleague, the shared need remains. Fair discussion identifies required participation periods and their allocation. Everyone need not have an identical schedule; roles can differ. The basis, feasible consent and cost should be clear. Permanent availability does not become invisible merely because the person providing it does not complain.

The absence of complaint does not show equal access to free time. A colleague may have household obligations, another activity or a condition unknown to the team. Allocation need not require disclosure of an entire private life. People should be able to state availability without justifying it through intimate detail. Someone unavailable after a certain time need not prove the worth of their chosen activity in a moral contest. Actual obligations still receive concrete consideration alongside privacy.

The brief Analects passage portrays the teacher at ease when unoccupied. It establishes no contemporary schedule and promises no tranquillity from a boundary. In this comparison, life outside continuous role performance helps us question uninterrupted busyness as the sole worthy form of participation. The resulting arrangements belong to present discussion rather than the ancient text. The image neither requires colleagues to enjoy free time nor makes their inner state a measure of ending the day correctly.

Ilya's next question may be small: after the change, who considers genuinely necessary evening requests? The answer may involve knowledge handover, a changed deadline or an explicit duty role. These should not quietly become another unlimited project attached to his request. Scope and responsibility for agreement can be identified. His boundary belongs to shared organisation without requiring him alone to compensate for every difficulty. Organisational responsibility belongs with authority; it is not automatically assigned to whoever first noticed the problem.

VIII. Checking an agreement through action

After discussion, the actual practice matters alongside the rule's wording. Do ordinary questions wait until morning, or still demand evening participation? Is the channel used for its agreed purpose or any inconvenient delay? These observations are not an experiment proving a boundary's effectiveness. They show whether action matches agreement. A mismatch calls for examining a particular episode and possible clarification. One unsuccessful evening does not establish that ending the working day is meaningless.

Ilya may return to the chat without an external need. That observation need not become an accusation of weak will. He can identify the action: checking a promised result, finding missing information or merely ensuring nothing changed. A genuine obligation may need a defined working period. Without a significant question, he can retain the arrangement without demanding an immediate end to his interest in the project. An internal impulse differs from an external requirement, even when both occur together.

The boundary may differ across periods of life. A changed role, project or capacity can require a new agreement. Clear revision should remain distinct from silent expansion. Ilya may accept a limited period of additional availability with known conditions and authority to agree, or propose another option where resources are absent. The article does not choose his job or employment arrangement. It examines participation without presuming that technical connection already determines a right to someone's entire time.

The end of the day becomes clearer when three things are named: accepted obligations, remaining availability and the resumption of ordinary work. This guarantees neither agreement, tranquillity nor convenience. It reduces reliance on guesses and makes dependencies more visible. Free time need not mean disappearing from relationships, and responsibility need not mean replying to every signal. Concrete adult agreements can be examined, revised and limited according to the actual circumstances of shared life.

What this means in practice

Choose an ordinary recurring evening exchange. Do not use the exercise to cancel professional on-call duty, decide how to respond to a safety threat or navigate coercion independently. Such situations require separate information and appropriate authority. Here the focus is clear availability in ordinary cooperation.

Identify what arrives after work. Separate an idea recorded, an information question, a work request and a report of a real dependency. For one example, establish which deadline concerns the reply and which concerns the result. Missing information becomes a question to clarify; do not choose a convenient interpretation instead of discussion.

Check the expectation's basis: explicit consent, temporary duty or a habit of quick replies? Keep genuine obligations visible. Then propose a period for ordinary questions, an exception with a separate channel and who must agree to the change. A proposal is not yet a shared rule.

Discuss one particular dependency. Could advance information, a changed sequence or another responsible participant help? Do not promise constant readiness to make a boundary seem friendly. State the feasible and uncertain. Without authority to change a condition, identify who can decide and which next step is possible.

After agreement, examine one subsequent episode. Did action match the rule? Did an exception remain explicit? A mismatch sends attention back to a particular condition. The exercise may end with an open question and guarantees no tranquillity, behavioural change or legal settlement. Its limit is a more accurate description of participation and expectations.

Key quotation

> *would not attend to any business after the tenth hour*

Seneca, Of Peace of Mind XVII, short excerpt concerning Asinius Pollio, Aubrey Stewart translation. Roman hours are not transferred into a contemporary schedule.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	What it clarifies and where transfer ends
Seneca, Letter 1 / attention to time	An ethical question about the use of life; no determination of paid time or contemporary rights.
Seneca, Of Peace of Mind XVII / an identified end of business	A specific example of limited business availability; not a universal finishing time.
Analects VII.4 / life outside continuous role performance	A portrayal of ease when unoccupied; not a guarantee following a schedule change.
Historical texts / a present agreement	Channels, timing and exceptions are editorial proposals; traditions are not treated as one employment theory.

Primary sources

• Seneca. Moral Letters to Lucilius, Letter 1, Richard M. Gummere translation, Wikisource. Continuous §§1–5 were read, web lines 114–122; the epigraph is the opening sentence of §3. The linked edition's title page names Gummere, first printing 1918 and reprint 1925; no full facsimile collation is claimed.

• Seneca. Of Peace of Mind XVII, Aubrey Stewart translation, 1889, Project Gutenberg 64576. Continuous Chapter XVII was read, web lines 1614–1630. The key quotation is the short excerpt at line 1623. Roman hours, wine advice and gendered judgments are not contemporary recommendations.

• Confucius. The Analects VII.1–12, James Legge translation, Project Gutenberg 3330. Continuous VII.1–12 were read, web lines 172–188; only VII.4's portrayal of the teacher when unoccupied is used. Historical roles establish no contemporary employment duties. Full texts are not ingested; worldwide rights in the named editions are not asserted.

Tags

working day, availability, messages, boundary, time, obligation, consent, agreement, habit, urgency, deadline, reply, result, notifications, cooperation, team, authority, exception, on-call duty, allocation, free time, privacy, clarity, expectations, participation, Seneca, Confucius, schedule, responsibility, revision

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.