

UNITED WISDOM

Being the Accommodating Person: The Cost of Always Saying Yes

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-02-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Being the Accommodating Person: The Cost of Always Saying Yes

Epigraph

“he will not acquiesce but will decline”

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics IV.6, a short concluding clause within a conditional argument about the harm of agreement, in W. D. Ross’s English translation.

What this article is about

Being pleasant, wanting to help, and accepting every request are different things. Within the familiar role of the accommodating person, however, they can merge: a warm reply becomes a promise, a pause seems impolite, and refusal appears to reject the relationship itself. The cost emerges later, when accepted tasks collide and affect people absent from the conversation. Through an invented example, we examine what agreement means, its grounds, and ways to clarify an earlier promise. Aristotle distinguishes considerate interaction from obsequiousness and constant opposition; Mill distinguishes deliberate choice from mechanical custom; Epictetus asks about usefulness and fidelity to one’s purpose. Gospel teaching on plain speech and generosity introduces a demanding religious ground that cannot be reduced to advice to say no more often. These texts allow a particular action to be considered without diagnosing every agreeable person or promising that any refusal will be received well.

I. One short word and several lengthy tasks

Imagine Natalia, a member of a small reading club. This is an invented example for discussion. She enjoys the meetings and willingly helps newcomers. This week, she has already agreed to prepare a book list and welcome a visiting translator on Saturday. She is then asked to lead an additional Friday meeting, read the newsletter, and answer questions in the group chat. She quickly agrees to each request. Considered separately, they seem small. Together, they occupy the same evening, involve different preparations, and create expectations among several people. While those expectations remain in separate conversations, their collision is difficult to see. A collection of apparently modest tasks has become an overlapping set of commitments.

Natalia may have many reasons to agree: interest in the project, enjoyment of company, gratitude, or a hope of mutual assistance. She might also fear appearing indifferent. We cannot know which reason predominates, and will not infer it from one reply. “Yes” is too small a word

to establish an entire psychological history. It is consequential enough, however, for someone else to start making plans. The translator expects a welcome, the additional meeting's organizer considers the matter settled, and the newsletter writer awaits corrections. Agreement has a cost beyond Natalia's own experience. It also affects people whose actions now depend on the participation she has promised.

It helps to distinguish the pleasant moment of conversation from the duration of the action accepted. Answering takes a second; the work takes hours; repairing a failed arrangement may take more time. This does not mean that friendliness necessarily conceals harm. It can express genuine willingness and make cooperation easier. The problem arises when a brief reply is mistaken for a small commitment. To notice the difference earlier, we need to move from an impression to the task's components: what must be done, by when, and alongside which existing promises? This preserves a desire to participate without turning it into a claim of unlimited availability for every subsequent request.

II. A warm tone need not endorse the content

Agreement can mean accepting a claim, permitting an action, taking on an obligation, or acknowledging that a message was heard. These meanings sometimes slide into one another. Natalia writes that she likes the idea of an additional meeting. The recipient understands this as an offer to lead it herself. Or she says she will look at the newsletter, meaning she may open the file later, while its writer expects complete editing by morning. We cannot assign blame in advance: the wording itself admits different readings. Clarification restores distinctions hidden by friendly brevity. An idea can be welcome while participation on the proposed day remains impossible. These are compatible statements about different aspects of the situation.

Courtesy concerns how someone addresses another person: recognizing their presence, responding without humiliation, and noticing their difficulty. It need not endorse the request or promise fulfillment. Someone can listen attentively, decline the proposed date, and identify an available contribution. The recipient then receives both respectful treatment and a definite answer. But form is not inconsequential. Elaborate assurances of willingness, without an actual possibility of acting, can sustain a false expectation. If Natalia repeatedly says she would happily do everything, then adds an unclear condition, the recipient may reasonably struggle to determine which part of the message is dependable. Warmth does not remove the need to make the content intelligible.

Distinguishing tone from content also helps avoid the opposite extreme. Someone tired of their own promises might decide that they must now answer sharply or they will never be heard. Sharpness does not make a task's scope clearer. The recipient may remember the offense and still not know whether the meeting will happen. A substantive refusal names its object: Friday is unavailable; the book list will be prepared as agreed; the newsletter can be read, but not

edited. Such answers cannot guarantee a calm response. Their more limited merit is that they let others account for actual participation, rather than replace one vague promise with an equally vague gesture of opposition.

III. Aristotle: between obsequiousness and opposing everyone

In Nicomachean Ethics IV.6, Aristotle considers behavior in company. At one extreme is someone who praises everything and opposes nothing in order to be pleasant. At the other is someone who contradicts everything without caring about the displeasure caused. The sought mean does not require equal numbers of agreements and refusals. It involves attention to what is appropriate, honorable, and harmful in a particular interaction. This disposition also differs from friendship as affection: someone can act this way toward strangers. Agreement therefore cannot be explained entirely by closeness to the person making the request. The character of the interaction and its consequences require consideration as well.

In the selected section, refusal is appropriate when agreement would produce serious injury or disgrace while opposition causes only slight pain. The epigraph comes from this conditional argument. It does not recommend refusing for independence's sake or treat every inconvenience as sufficient reason. For Natalia's case, the temporal distinction matters: agreement is pleasant now but may disrupt an earlier undertaking. A new requester's minor disappointment and an arriving guest's absence of assistance are different consequences. They should be identified and considered before assuming that a pleasant moment exhausts goodwill. Other participants also have relationships, plans, and grounds for relying on what was promised, even when they are absent from the immediate exchange.

Aristotle also distinguishes obsequiousness without an aim of advantage from flattery for gain. Similar-looking friendliness does not therefore allow certainty about motive. Natalia may want to be liked, expect a return favor, or simply value the club. Our contemporary application is a question about a decision, not a ready label: what am I seeking through this agreement, and what cost do I consider acceptable? Aristotle's virtue ethics retains its own grounds. It becomes neither a clinical classification nor proof that wanting approval necessarily means dependence. Consistent opposition does not, by itself, establish a more mature personality. The content and reasons for an answer must still be examined.

IV. A pause between a request and a promise

Assessing a request sometimes requires information absent from its opening phrase. Leading a meeting might include reading a text, preparing questions, arranging a room, and staying after it ends. Reading a newsletter might mean identifying inaccuracies or rewriting it entirely. If Natalia accepts before clarifying, she agrees to the name of an action without necessarily understanding its scope. A pause does not always indicate unwillingness to participate. It can belong to conscientious decision-making. Questions about timing, preparation, and the expected result allow the requester to explain what is needed and the recipient to identify what they can accept. The task becomes specific enough for a meaningful answer.

A pause should itself be intelligible to the person awaiting a response. Saying “I’ll check my schedule and answer tomorrow” differs from disappearing and from giving an assurance already being relied upon. It names a next step rather than a completed agreement. Uncertainty should not become a permanent means of keeping others waiting, however. If a decision cannot be made, this can be reported along with a request not to count on the proposed participation. The absence of confirmation then becomes a known condition of planning. The additional meeting’s organizer can look for another leader instead of waiting for Natalia to combine incompatible commitments while avoiding every possible disappointment.

Some situations genuinely leave little time for extended consideration. A previously identified scope of participation can help: which tasks can someone accept immediately, and which require checking? This is not a universal refusal chart. The scope depends on the activity and can change. Natalia can quickly point out where a book is kept; she need not confirm a full meeting with equal speed. Calling every approach a small favor erases these differences. They can be restored without accusing the requester. One task needs a brief answer, while another involves hours of work, an existing schedule, and other club members whose plans would also be affected by a new commitment.

V. Mill: one’s own choice can follow custom

At the beginning of On Liberty Chapter III, Mill distinguishes opinion from action and recognizes restrictions concerning harm to others. He then examines individuality and custom. Others’ experience should not simply be discarded: it can provide useful evidence about what suits certain circumstances. Yet that experience may be incomplete, misinterpreted, or inapplicable to one’s own situation. Deliberate choice employs one’s capacities for observation, judgment, and foresight. For this topic, the question becomes why immediate answers are customary and whether that form of communication really requires taking on every new task regardless of earlier promises. Familiarity with an answer’s form does not settle the suitability of its content.

An independent decision need not differ from everybody else's. Natalia can consider a request and agree, just as she would have before. The difference concerns her reasons and understanding of the action accepted: she knows its scope, has the time, and values participating. This yes is no less her own because it matches the group's expectation. Conversely, refusing merely to prove independence may remain closely bound to others' judgments: the person still decides primarily through the image they expect to create. Mill's distinction between mechanical and thoughtful reliance on custom prevents difference from becoming the sole mark of freedom. A custom accepted after consideration can also become one's own choice.

That choice does not occur in an empty space. Natalia's refusal may affect someone already promised assistance or an undertaking for which she shares responsibility. In the selected passage, Mill retains qualifications concerning others' rights and interests; his defense of individuality does not authorize indifference to them. "I'm choosing myself now" therefore does not yet explain what should happen to an earlier agreement. A new request, an accepted obligation, and a way to communicate change must be distinguished. This article concerns an ordinary invented case. Actual contracts, workplace rules, and possible sanctions require separate knowledge that philosophical reflection alone cannot provide. The distinction makes the question more precise rather than supplying every answer.

VI. The cost to people who were not asked

A pleasant answer to one person can consume time already promised to another. Natalia agrees to lead Friday's meeting and delays the book list. The member responsible for ordering books knows nothing about the new meeting and expects the earlier result. From that person's perspective, the task has not changed. Agreement's cost therefore includes more than Natalia's tiredness or the new requester's disappointment if refused. A third party's plans also depend on the given word. Ignoring that person makes goodwill selective: someone present receives a clear yes, while someone absent receives concealed uncertainty they will discover later. Their absence from the conversation does not make their reliance less real.

Aristotle's comparison of slight immediate displeasure with more consequential harm helps pose this question. Mill's attention to deliberation adds the need to anticipate affected interests. This is our contemporary connection, not a claim that their philosophies are identical. We can ask which actions have already begun on the basis of a promise and what a new agreement would change. Sometimes another participant agrees to a revised date; sometimes the task can be divided; sometimes the new request must be declined. Confidence alone makes none of these options appropriate. Their suitability depends on information, resources, and agreement with those who would bear the consequences. Pleasant intention does not replace that coordination.

Wanting to help remains valuable, but it gives no permission to allocate someone else's time. Natalia cannot promise another member's newsletter work without asking them. She can suggest discussing a replacement rather than presenting it as settled. The distinction seems small while that member agrees; if they decline, it determines the whole situation. One person's participation cannot automatically be charged to another. An honest reply therefore includes what is unknown: this part can be done, while the rest has no confirmed performer. The answer may disappoint. It still lets people plan around established actions rather than a chain of wishes treated as agreed obligations. What remains unresolved becomes visible while alternatives are still possible.

VII. Plain speech and demanding generosity

In Matthew 5:33–37, teaching about speech occurs within a discussion of oaths. The short formula about yes and no is not scheduling advice. It belongs to religious exhortation whose meaning cannot be replaced entirely by a modern preference for convenient communication. We use it to consider whether a recipient knows what participation has been promised. If Natalia is unsure that she can lead a meeting, solemn assurances do not create the possibility. Plain specificity can provide more information than elaborate declarations of goodwill. This is our application; it does not claim that the Gospel passage originally concerned a reading club or procedures for communicating about work. Its religious context remains distinct.

The continuation is particularly important. Matthew 5:38–42 concerns nonretaliation, clothing, the second mile, giving, and borrowing. This demanding generosity differs from familiar contemporary advice to protect one's schedule. Extracting only no can turn a sacred text into convenient support for a position already chosen while overlooking tension with neighboring verses. For a religious reader, that tension may open a separate question about the meaning of giving. In our comparison, it means that plain speech and the amount of voluntarily accepted generosity are different subjects. A definite promise can be substantial. Its short expression does not explain why someone chose to undertake it or what grounds they recognize for doing so.

The selected passage gives us no basis for declaring all traditions supporters of one refusal norm. Nor does it prove that someone must endure danger to preserve an agreeable image. A particular case requires identifying the action and the grounds on which it is accepted. Natalia can value the club and deliberately allocate more time. She should then honestly coordinate changes with people already promised something else. Generosity can involve a cost that someone chooses to accept. It should not be described as if the cost were absent or could silently be paid by a participant who was not there when the decision was made. Chosen giving and concealed transfer remain distinguishable.

VIII. Usefulness and fidelity to an accepted purpose

In Enchiridion § 23, Epictetus considers turning one's purpose toward pleasing another. Section 24 moves to assistance for friends and what someone can provide. His Stoic understanding of one's proper good differs from Aristotle's mean and Mill's individuality. Nevertheless, a question about participation's cost is clear: if assistance requires abandoning fidelity, what exactly will the friend receive? External goods are not thereby assumed meaningless. The question examines how they are acquired and whether qualities regarded as essential to friendship are preserved. Being useful need not mean satisfying every request in the proposed form. The recipient's desired resource does not settle every ethical aspect of the action taken to supply it.

Natalia's fidelity can be considered at several levels. She wants to support the club, keep her word to the invited guest, and avoid misleading others about her involvement. A new agreement can support one intention while undermining another. "Did I help?" therefore needs a complement: whom, in which task, and with what consequence for something already accepted? Sometimes an honest statement of inability is more useful than hopeful conversation sustained until the last moment. This is not a rule that refusal is superior. If participation is possible and deliberately chosen, agreement may express the same fidelity to the undertaking. The content matters more than whether the answer takes a positive or negative form.

Maintaining a relationship also differs from maintaining an earlier role. Someone can remain an attentive club member while no longer answering every question around the clock. Others may accept the change, oppose it, or ask about the new arrangement. Their response is neither always convenient nor controlled by Natalia's intention. An explicit duty arrangement requires discussion; assumed constant availability requires identifying that it was assumed. Revising a role involves the relationship's history. One sentence does not erase it or make others wrong simply because they became used to earlier participation. The habit itself nevertheless warrants examination: was it actually accepted by everyone involved, or did repetition become mistaken for a continuing agreement?

IX. Clarifying an agreement already given

Sometimes the collision is noticed too late: a promise has already been made. New understanding does not erase the earlier answer. Natalia can explain that she underestimated preparation for the additional meeting and cannot lead it at the agreed time. Reporting the change before the other person discovers the missing result is useful. The message identifies the accepted task, the difficulty found, and an alternative if one exists. The conversation may be uncomfortable, and not all disruption can be repaired. Acknowledging a mistaken estimate nevertheless offers more grounds for a decision than vague silence or a sudden declaration that nobody is entitled to expect anything. What has changed needs to be communicated.

An alternative remains a proposal. Natalia can prepare questions but cannot lead the meeting. The organizer can decide whether this is suitable, postpone the event, or seek another leader. Displeasure cannot automatically be declared an unhealthy reliance on the accommodating person. The organizer may have invested time and invited participants on the basis of a confirmed answer. Respecting that response does not require accepting every accusation, but it does require accounting for the plan’s dependence on the promise. Here a specific responsibility for change differs from a verdict on the entire person. The former can be acknowledged without endorsing the latter. Rejecting a label does not replace explaining what will now happen.

The earlier misunderstanding can then be examined. Did Natalia fail to clarify scope, overlook her schedule, accept “it will be quick” without checking, or recognize the collision without naming it? These possibilities call for different changes. One needs a preparation question, another a review of promises, and another a more precise answer. The review need not conclude with a rule to refuse everybody. Willingness can be preserved while the moment of decision changes. The next agreement should describe a real possibility, rather than become another means of restoring a pleasant impression quickly and postponing the next conflict for a few days. The question concerns an actual undertaking, not a performance of a newly independent identity.

X. A relationship in which both people are visible

An accommodating role can make one participant nearly invisible: their agreements are known, while their capacities, interests, and limits are not. The other participant can also be poorly understood. They appear only as a requester, though they may value precision, prefer an early refusal, and be willing to share the work. Natalia cannot discover this while every approach ends with the same answer. A definite yes, conditional participation, or refusal gives the relationship more content. Closeness is not thereby promised. Clarification can expose a substantial mismatch in expectations. That mismatch now concerns named conditions open to discussion, rather than an assumption that each person already understands the other without words.

A good agreement need not become joyless calculation. Natalia can enjoy leading a meeting, stay longer voluntarily, and demand no exact compensation for every minute. The problem of endless agreement is not generosity itself. It arises when participation is accepted without distinguishing choice, commitment, and an assumed duty to be liked. Deliberate generosity can know its cost and consider affected people. The same amount of work can be chosen in one situation and ambiguously imposed in another. Understanding the difference requires information about conversation, conditions, and one’s own decision. A single label for someone who often helps is not sufficient. The quantity of assistance does not disclose its entire meaning.

“How can I become less accommodating?” can finally be replaced by a more specific question: what am I agreeing to, and what can the other person rely on after my answer? This preserves attention to relationships without promising unlimited involvement. Different actions become visible: agree fully, accept a part, clarify conditions, request time, revise an earlier arrangement, or decline. They cannot be ranked permanently. Appropriateness depends on content, grounds, and consequences. A person becomes visible through more than no. Their presence can also appear in a deliberate yes that understands the task, chooses a scope of participation, and respects the people making plans on the strength of that word.

What this means in practice

1. Unpack one yes. Take an ordinary, nonurgent request you are willing to examine. Record what was accepted: an idea, action, date, method, or merely an intention to consider it. Separately note what the recipient might have understood and what information was missing. A mismatch need not immediately make them demanding or you insincere. First locate the unresolved meaning. This voluntary author-created exercise establishes no hidden motive and promises no change in the relationship.

2. Notice the third party. Identify accepted tasks affected by the new agreement. Who relies on the result? Which hour or resource must be shared? Which changes remain unconfirmed? You can prepare a question about scope or draft a reply naming your available contribution. Do not promise someone else's action before their confirmation. If no new action is needed now, noticing the overlap and considering it in the next decision can be enough.

3. Check the answer's content. Before sending a message, read it from the recipient's position: can they distinguish what is confirmed, proposed, and unknown? Afterwards, separate their response from a verdict on your entire identity. Displeasure may concern a real change in plans; a label may exceed that event. This practice demands neither constant refusal nor disclosure of personal reasons. It aims to make agreement and its cost intelligible while preserving freedom to choose the participation you genuinely intend to accept.

Key quotation

> *"Yea, yea; Nay, nay"*

Matthew 5:37, an internal fragment of the verse in the King James Version. It occurs in teaching about oaths; the selected continuation, 5:38–42, also addresses demanding generosity.

Connections between traditions

1. Agreeableness and a purpose governed by approval. Aristotle distinguishes obsequiousness, flattery for gain, and constant opposition (IV.6). Epictetus questions turning one's purpose toward pleasing another (§ 23). Their comparison helps examine the grounds for a particular agreement. Stoic good and Aristotle's mean are not identical, and one outward answer does not establish its motive.

2. Custom and agreement's consequences. Mill allows thoughtful use of others' experience while examining its suitability (III, the selected discussion of choice and custom). Aristotle distinguishes present pleasantness from more consequential harm (IV.6). The connection separates a customary warm answer from undertaking work. It measures no productivity and does not require difference from others for independence's sake.

3. Refusal and a definite word. Aristotle's mean differs from opposition to everyone (IV.6); Matthew considers plain speech in the context of oaths (5:33–37). Our modern comparison asks whether an answer has an intelligible scope. It creates no contractual scheme from the religious passage and does not permit forgetting its continuation about generosity.

4. Fidelity and demanding giving. Epictetus asks what assistance friends expect and what it costs fidelity (§ 24); Matthew calls for giving beyond an ordinary measure (5:38–42). The

tension between their grounds remains. These passages supply no common refusal norm: religious generosity and the Stoic assessment of external goods retain different positions.

5. Deliberation and deferred harm. Mill connects personal choice with judgment and foresight (III, the selected account of choosing); Aristotle allows slight displeasure to prevent more serious harm (IV.6). This supports examination of colliding promises. The hypothetical application proves neither that refusing always improves relationships nor that earlier commitments disappear.

6. Intelligible speech and others' interests. Matthew 5:37 provides a religious ground for definite speech; Mill begins Chapter III by distinguishing opinion from action affecting others. Our application names confirmed participation and uncertainty so that people can plan. This is an author-created connection, not a legal contract or a measured behavioral technique.

Primary sources

Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics IV.6, W. D. Ross's English translation. The whole selected section on interaction, pleasantness, opposition, and consequences was read. The epigraph is a short clause in its conditional argument; the Russian rendering is ours. This is virtue ethics, not a clinical description of a modern personality type.

John Stuart Mill. On Liberty, Chapter III, original English in the Project Gutenberg edition. The selected opening was read from the opinion/action distinction through custom's experience and deliberate choice. Qualifications concerning others' rights and interests are retained. Neither the complete chapter nor the entire treatise is considered here.

Epictetus. The Enchiridion, §§ 23–24, Elizabeth Carter's English translation. We reuse our actual complete reading of these two sections during this work. The adopted discussion concerns approval and usefulness to friends. Stoic grounds are not replaced with a contemporary psychological theory; no Greek collation was undertaken.

Matthew. 5:33–42, King James Version. All ten selected verses were read, including the oath context and continuation on generosity. The key quotation is a short fragment of 5:37; its Russian rendering is ours through KJV. This religious text does not establish the efficacy of a contemporary refusal technique.

Tags

agreement, accommodating person, agreeableness, courtesy, obsequiousness, flattery, approval, promise, commitment, refusal, plain speech, choice, custom, individuality, cooperation, responsibility, consequences, third parties, scheduling, task scope, generosity, fidelity, relationships, limits to participation, Aristotle, John Stuart Mill, Epictetus, Matthew, ethics, 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.