

UNITED WISDOM

When busyness helps avoid an important question

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-12-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

When busyness helps avoid an important question

Epigraph

> *“they cannot stay quietly in their own chamber”.*

Blaise Pascal, Pensées, fragment 139: a short fragment from the English edition Gutenberg #18269. A religious and philosophical argument about diversion, not a universal law of behaviour.

What this article is about

Imagine an illustrative scene. Someone is in their second year of running a small reading club. Meetings happen on Saturdays; a venue must be found, questions prepared, participants notified, and the room cleared afterward. After another meeting, the organiser stays an extra hour rearranging books. At home, they create new questionnaires and change invitation designs. Yet for several weeks, they have not answered a simple question: do I want to lead the club next season? Each task appears useful. Their continuity leaves little room for choosing the continuation itself.

This scene cannot establish that all their work is avoidance. Participants really need an address, the room must be cleared, and a good invitation helps the meeting happen. Perhaps the organiser is tired but wants to continue. Perhaps the question is not ready or depends on having an assistant. Yet they can notice that whenever an opportunity to consider next season appears, another small task presents itself.

This article examines busyness’s function alongside its real substance. We need not declare activity suspicious or oppose work to inner life. We need to find one specific question that tasks repeatedly leave no room for and understand whether limited space can be restored to it. This is an editorial distinction, not a diagnosis, call to cancel obligations, or proven method of behavioural change.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. A useful task can close off another question

Rearranging books in our scene has a purpose in itself. Participants can choose the next book more easily, and the organiser enjoys order. But a task’s purpose does not answer the question of its place in today’s choice. If tidying regularly begins precisely when the new season could be discussed, notice the coincidence. This observation does not establish a hidden motive. It identifies a point where two different tasks compete for the same time.

Busyness becomes interesting for self-examination when it permits postponing a particular decision repeatedly. Someone can honestly list achievements without approaching a question that affects continuing the whole activity. Asking whether the day was productive is insufficient here. Productivity concerns current tasks’ results; choice concerns which tasks should be accepted further. One good answer does not replace the other.

The organiser says: I have not worked out the schedule yet. This may be true. Yet wanting to continue does not always require a finished schedule. First name what must be discovered: how many meetings I am willing to lead, who helps, and which format interests me. If every new document is declared a prerequisite for reflection, preparation risks becoming endless. The question determines the limit, not the number of completed spreadsheets.

A counterexample matters. Someone cannot decide whether to lead the club until the venue confirms availability. Correspondence with the venue owner then directly serves the question. It is acquiring necessary information rather than avoiding choice. The difference lies in which uncertainty the task resolves. An action providing grounds for a decision may bring it closer. If grounds already exist but a decision is delayed again for presentation work, the connection needs clarification.

Work’s value can be preserved without declaring every task equally urgent. Clearing up after the meeting is required today; a new invitation colour scheme can wait; the season question needs a separate conversation. This arrangement does not divide life into elevated reflection and lowly tasks. It recognises different consequences and deadlines. Sometimes postponing one secondary file makes room for an answer without disrupting existing promises.

The first observable sign is therefore specific: which action appears when I am about to return to a particular question? The answer may be entirely reasonable. It may also reveal a repeated substitution. Either way, an example helps more than a general self-label. I changed the invitation three times instead of talking to the assistant is a verifiable record; I always run away from life is an assertion of entirely different scope.

II. An experiment about busyness does not explain every calendar

The abstract of Hsee, Yang, and Wang's 2010 paper reports two experiments in which even a weak justification encouraged choosing busyness. The abstract and edition details were read, not the full text. This limited scientific result does not prove all work conceals an unpleasant question or establish the organiser's motive. Laboratory busyness is not equated with necessary everyday obligations.

The limitation itself matters here. My explanation for acting may be persuasive, but its existence does not yet answer why I chose this action now. A message must be sent to participants; additional versions can be composed endlessly. Examine the connection between a particular action and task, rather than a reason's general honesty. What will another revision change? Who actually awaits that revision specifically?

Some activities lack a clearly finished result: preparation, improvement, study, and organisation. They are necessary, but their end is difficult to notice without a chosen criterion. The organiser can continually find useful articles about conducting discussions. If the question concerns wanting to lead meetings, another article need not answer it. Technical knowledge and readiness to continue a role are different subjects. Someone can possess the former and doubt the latter.

Conversely, technique sometimes changes continuation's feasibility. The organiser learned to transfer some preparation to participants and realised the load might become acceptable. Studying the format then supplied new grounds. To avoid declaring all learning avoidance, examine which question it resolved. Self-examination must permit this answer; otherwise its outcome is predetermined: anything someone does will be interpreted against them.

Do not measure activity's meaning by how unpleasant stopping feels. Stopping may be hard because of fatigue, habit, unfinished work, or environmental conditions. One sensation does not establish these possibilities. Observe what is accessible: I intended to discuss the season and started editing the list again. This description already suffices for trying a different sequence, if desired. A complete theory of an inner mechanism is unnecessary.

Scientific support remains modest here. It permits interest in busyness justification's role while editorial reasoning clarifies a particular situation. It does not imply keeping people constantly busy for happiness. Nor does it require abandoning activity to become more honest. The reader receives a question about their action's function, not a ready-made answer about why people work at all.

III. Name the question more precisely than I want to change everything

When tasks stop, an excessively large question may appear: what am I doing with my life? It suits some people. In our scene, it may be so broad that another questionnaire displaces the answer again. Scale can shrink without losing meaning: do I want to lead four autumn meetings with preparation currently distributed this way? Conditions, number of obligations, and the period of choice are now visible.

The question must belong to the person. Others may think they should leave the club or expand its programme. Others' expectations do not establish their desire. They can choose continuation, completion, a pause, or a different format. If conversation is prearranged to seek the sole correct exit, the busy person must protect current tasks from someone else's decision. Help then obstructs the clarity it promised.

Distinguish wanting from feasibility. I want to lead meetings but cannot prepare them alone. Or: I can continue but do not want another season now. The first needs work on conditions; the second, acknowledgement of a decision. Mixing them prompts additional organisation where ending a role would suffice, or a declaration of missing desire where an assistant is actually missing.

There is also a question about the specific format. The organiser loves conversations about books but dislikes constantly organising. Participating without leadership may suit them. This does not make two years' work a mistake or require devaluing meetings. Naming the role reveals which part interests them and which has become unacceptable. Moving from general like or dislike to details is for accessible choice, not complexity's sake.

Sometimes the question requires absent information. Who will lead one meeting? Can notifications be shared? Do participants agree to meet less often? The next task then consists of one request rather than another entire season programme. Preparation's size should match actual uncertainty. If one person's answer is needed, ten new documents need not be created before writing to them.

A well-formulated question also permits no decision today. I do not know whether I want to lead the season yet, but will not promise it before a particular conversation. This differs from silently continuing previous expectations. It communicates a boundary and leaves choice time. Uncertainty becomes part of an agreement rather than a hidden circumstance for which others later pay through suddenly changed plans.

IV. Pascal asks a religious question, not a rule for rest

In Pensées, fragment 139, Pascal considers diversion as distraction from reflecting on one's condition and mortality. This is a religious and philosophical perspective, not empirical causality. Editorial comparison permits asking which thought continuous movement closes off. His broad judgement about human unhappiness is not adopted here as universal fact.

For the organiser, this may concern a small finite question rather than the entire human condition. When I stop improving the programme, I must notice I have not chosen next autumn yet. This uncertainty is unpleasant because others have become accustomed to relying on me. Busyness provides a ready-made role: I am useful, so continuation seems already decided. But today's meeting's usefulness does not answer for agreement to lead the next one.

A religious text cannot become a demand to sit motionless in a room. This image has a different meaning altogether for someone without a separate room, security, or free time. An inner question may appear during a walk, conversation, or household task. What matters is the question's place in choice, not the correct external posture. Silence is a possible condition, not certification of depth or honesty's required form.

Activity can also help sustain a difficult period when direct conversation is unavailable. The organiser continues the nearest promised meetings and decides to revisit the season after completing the current cycle. With clear deadlines and obligations, that may be a reasonable sequence. Distraction is not declared evil in itself. The question arises when temporary support becomes a way of indefinitely ignoring a decision already required by others.

Constant self-reflection need not be demanded. Someone can be absorbed in a book, work, care, or play without checking hidden meaning every minute. Such a demand would make self-examination another heavy obligation. Attention to a recurring place where one important question is repeatedly replaced by something else suffices. A chosen episode preserves a workable scale without turning all life into suspicion.

The philosophical perspective thus remains an invitation, not an accusation. It reminds us that continuous action can have several functions. Determining which applies now requires my participation and specific information. Pascal's religious grounds can be rejected while one's calendar is still examined. Similar questions do not mean agreement with an entire doctrine or prove the unity of all traditions.

V. Real overload requires conditions, not exposure of motives

Imagine another illustrative scene. After a shift, someone collects a child, prepares food, and helps a relative with ordinary household tasks. That evening, there is no energy to consider a new club season. Calling this busyness avoidance turns real load into a moral deficiency. Space may genuinely be absent. Before seeking a hidden question, see which tasks are necessary and who else can participate.

Advice to simply stop transfers the stopping cost to others here. The child still needs dinner; the relative needs help. Reflection does not cancel these circumstances. A replacement at the club can be sought, extra documents reduced, or participants asked to prepare part of meetings independently. These are organisational options, not evidence of inner transformation. Availability depends on others' agreement and real resources that may be absent.

Distinguish an external requirement from a voluntarily added task too. Room cleaning was agreed; the organiser invented the new questionnaire. Both may be useful, but declining them has different costs. Space sometimes appears when someone stops perfecting the optional part and performs the obligatory part adequately. Sometimes that is insufficient, and continuation really concerns distribution of the entire load. A personal attitude change does not repair every calendar.

If a role relies solely on one person constantly exceeding their energy, discussing meaning must include work's arrangement. Someone can want the club without agreeing to be its only support. This disagreement does not destroy care for people. It reveals a previously naturalised condition. The organiser can propose sharing or limiting meetings and hear what participants will support and what cannot be relied on.

Another person may decline an additional task. A help request does not become proof of indifference. The organiser must then assess the format from actual rather than desired support. This outcome must remain possible too. Otherwise, self-examination ends in another busyness loop: persuade everyone, find perfect organisation, prove the project's value, and again fail to decide how much I personally choose.

External scheduling cannot always distinguish overload from avoidance. Both functions can inhabit one day: necessary obligations and an optional addition closing off a question. Choosing one explanation for all life is unnecessary. Note where conditions impose load and where a little freedom exists. Work begins with an available distinction; limited freedom is not declared personal unreadiness for clarity.

VI. Simplicity does not mean cancelling everything complex

In Walden, Where I Lived, and What I Lived For, Thoreau criticises life's dissipation into details and calls for simplification. This is a literary and philosophical position. It offers a question about activity's scale here; his specific ascetic suggestions become neither nutritional advice, a universal norm, nor a verified efficiency technique.

Simplification in our scene could mean one questionnaire instead of three, a clear invitation instead of endless design, or four meetings instead of an indefinite promise to lead forever. Closing the club is unnecessary. Reducing decisions sometimes makes a chosen obligation clearer. Yet it cannot be promised beforehand that cutting tasks will reveal a true desire. The result remains open: continuation, pause, a new format, or still unknown.

Ask who uses each detail. Participants need the address and time; the organiser needs to state the subject; complex colour coding may please only them. That does not make it bad. It can remain as a creative component if freely chosen. But assess it within its purpose rather than declaring it a prerequisite for the whole meeting. I love design is more honest than books cannot be discussed without it.

Some details are necessary and unobtrusive. Venue accessibility, a clear route, or participation for someone using another language are not empty trifles. When reducing work, avoid removing what real participation relies on. Simplicity is no contest in minimal actions. It requires seeing each action's purpose and the consequences of removing it. A short message suffices for one group; another needs additional explanation and support.

Sometimes only the promise can shrink, not current work. The next meeting is announced and needs preparation. The next season is unagreed. The organiser can fulfil the former and stop automatically accepting the latter. Freedom appears at the boundary of a future obligation rather than through suddenly abandoning today's one. This limited step respects both one's question and those relying on an existing promise.

Simplicity therefore concerns accuracy, not an empty calendar. A full week may correspond to chosen tasks. A free evening may go entirely into finding another task list. External quantity does not establish meaning. More important for self-examination is whether a necessary question has room and its answer can change at least one future agreement. If no decision is permitted, reducing tasks alone will not restore authorship of choice.

VII. The pause must belong to the person asking

Half an hour can be freed while the pause still becomes another performance requirement. The organiser decides they must find a final answer and become completely certain within it. Uncertainty feels like failure, prompting return to spreadsheets. That expectation is too large for a limited conversation. A pause may yield only a more accurate question, one condition, or understanding that information is needed. This smaller result can nevertheless affect the next action.

Choose a form suitable now. Some write a few sentences, some find talking to an assistant easier, some think during a short walk. No best method is established here. Form matters if it preserves one’s own answer. If a conversational partner immediately persuades continued leadership, the discussion becomes an organisational meeting. State beforehand that the present need is understanding the choice, not composing a new programme.

Content can be limited too. Today I examine meeting preparation, without trying to decide whether I am good or chose the right path two years ago. Large assessments easily seize a small question and make it unmanageable. Deciding next season need not answer for the past’s dignity. If the club ends, previous meetings can remain meaningful; if it continues, every experience of fatigue need not be declared mistaken.

An unwelcome answer need not immediately become public. The organiser can first tell an assistant they want to end their role and examine transferring existing promises. Private reflection is compatible with responsible notification. It must simply not support new promises that already contradict an accepted decision. Personal conversation time and notification deadlines can differ while that difference does not conceal consequences for others’ plans.

After pausing, someone may want to continue. This answer is permissible even if an observer considers the club unnecessary. Self-examination must not serve predetermined load reduction. The organiser may understand meetings matter and agree to a defined load. Make that agreement specific: which meetings, preparation, and review point. Chosen busyness differs from automatic continuation because the answer genuinely allows other options.

If the question is too difficult now or conditions unsuitable, stop the exercise. That does not prove escape. Naming what is missing or defining a small next request is enough. Self-examination is voluntary. Someone need not supply an inner answer on others’ timetable; future shared obligations nevertheless need agreement accounting for what remains unknown.

VIII. Reconnect action to a chosen continuation

The reflection’s purpose is not ending activity. It is having action respond again to a chosen task. The organiser can clean the room because it was promised, compose an invitation because a meeting will happen, and decide the season separately. Each task then has comprehensible grounds. It need not simultaneously protect the whole role from possible change. Work’s usefulness remains alongside the possibility of revising its future extent.

An interim answer may emerge: I will lead four meetings, create no new questionnaires, and discuss a second organiser by month’s end. This plan promises no permanent balance and resolves no entire question of meaning. It changes one agreement according to real conditions. New information may appear in a month. It can be considered without declaring today’s answer final truth about oneself and one’s life.

Ending is also an answer. The organiser proposes a last meeting, transfers materials to those wanting continuation, and retains the right to attend as a participant. This outcome need not look like ceremonial liberation. It may feel sad, awkward, or difficult to explain to familiar conversational partners. Ending a role can remain a sound decision alongside these feelings. Inner calm is not obligatory proof of its correctness.

New tasks may follow a decision too. Transferring the club requires a contact list and clear format description. Busyness serves the chosen ending here rather than cancelling it. The calendar becomes fuller for several days although the question has received an answer. Judging the result solely through fewer tasks is therefore inaccurate. Consider whether actions connect to a definite decision and lead toward its limited fulfilment.

Some questions remain open longer. What do I want to do on Saturdays without the club? Will I miss the role? Which new activity will appear? The freed space need not immediately be filled with another project. Other work can also be chosen if it suits an interest. Neither emptiness nor activity has a predetermined correct meaning. Someone gains the possibility of asking before the next promise rather than only after accumulated fatigue.

Busyness stops being the sole answer when a question is permitted beside tasks. I can be useful while still choosing how much to participate. I can value the club and end my role. I can lack complete knowledge and clarify the nearest obligation. Such clarity does not eliminate life’s complexity; it returns a small part of choice to where another task previously appeared each time.

What this means in practice

Choose one question regularly postponed beside tasks, if there is room to consider it now. Formulate it within the next decision: which role, extent, or promise am I choosing? Start without assessing all life. Record one action usually appearing instead of returning to the question. If it is truly necessary, preserve its necessity: self-examination must not cancel real obligations.

Ask which uncertainty the action resolves. Am I obtaining a needed answer, fulfilling a promise, improving a chosen result, or continuing preparation without an ending criterion? Several functions can coexist. One hidden cause need not be named. A small limit can be set: after sending this message, I will add no new questionnaire and will return to the season question. Account for real consequences for others.

If a little space is available, choose a comfortable form: notes, conversation, or walking. An answer may be a decision, a clarified question, or a list of missing information. Check whether the pause is becoming an examination in final certainty. If data are needed, formulate one request to someone able to answer. If resources are absent, name a condition or reduce the extent. Declining the exercise remains permissible.

Look separately at future promises. What is already agreed and must be fulfilled? What is accepted automatically although no decision exists yet? Preserve the former and clarify the latter. If necessary, communicate a comprehensible boundary without describing the inner process in detail. Others' plans deserve accuracy; your private story need not become public. Others' help requires their agreement, rather than proof of correct support.

After the chosen step, assess a limited result. Did a more accurate question appear? Did one obligation change? Did a task begin serving a definite decision? A smaller calendar and immediate relief are unnecessary. If nothing changed, examine conditions and the formulation's suitability. Other help or more time may be needed. The practice is not diagnostic and promises no universal effect; it leaves the answer and further choice with the person.

Key quotation

> *"Our life is frittered away by detail".*

Henry David Thoreau, Walden, Where I Lived, and What I Lived For: a short English fragment. Literary and philosophical criticism, not a ready-made rule for every calendar.

Connections between traditions

Perspective	Comparison	Significant difference
Hsee, Yang, and Wang	Brief scientific support for a question about justification of busyness.	Only abstract read; laboratory results do not establish everyday motive.
Pascal	A religious perspective asks which thought movement distracts from.	General anthropology becomes neither universal fact nor a demand for immobility.
Thoreau	Offers a literary question about excessive details.	Simplicity does not cancel necessary care or become an ascetic prescription.

These are editorial connections; different grounds establish neither shared doctrine nor exercise effectiveness.

Primary sources

• S1. Christopher K. Hsee, Adelle X. Yang, Liangyan Wang. Idleness Aversion and the Need for Justifiable Busyness. Psychological Science 21(7), 2010, 926–930, DOI 10.1177/0956797610374738. Abstract in PubMed search results and metadata read; direct opening returned no abstract; full text not read. Rights UNKNOWN.

• S2. Blaise Pascal. Pascal's Pensées, E. P. Dutton, 1958, T. S. Eliot introduction; Gutenberg #18269. Text translator not established in read title/catalogue. Fragment 139, selected neighbouring fragments, title, and part of introduction read; not the whole book. Public domain USA, not worldwide clearance; introduction not quoted.

• S3. Henry David Thoreau. Walden, Gutenberg #205, updated 20 February 2026. Selected Where I Lived, and What I Lived For lines and catalogue read; not the whole book. Public domain USA.

Tags

busyness, question, choice, action, role, continuation, obligations, overload, autonomy, boundaries, time, pause, simplicity, details, work, care, reading club, voluntary participation, preparation, conditions, resources, help, Pascal, Thoreau, Walden, diversion, philosophy, scientific limitations, self-examination, 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 coauthor 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.