

UNITED WISDOM

Desire and the decision to act: the right to an interval

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-16-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Desire and the decision to act: the right to an interval

Epigraph

“suspend any particular desire”

John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding*, Book II, Chapter XXI, §51. A short fragment about the possibility of considering a desire before acting.

What this article is about

The message is already typed. It is precise, angry and, it seems, long deserved. All that remains is to press send. At that moment it is difficult to separate two things: wanting to say everything at last, and deciding to send these particular words at this particular time. It is as though the first has already signed permission for the second. Yet you can want a conversation and choose another form; want to leave and still clarify the terms; feel attraction and promise nothing to another person.

This article considers the interval between an experience and an action. It does not have to be long, calm or filled with intelligent thoughts. Sometimes it is one additional sentence, sometimes an evening, sometimes a refusal to answer immediately. Within it, a desire can remain while the chosen action changes. The reverse is possible too: after considering the matter, a person may act more decisively.

We will distinguish desire, intention, an available opportunity and an action. This distinction can help us name our own position more accurately, but it does not make every decision a controllable process. The scenes below are hypothetical; the questions for reflection are editorial suggestions, not a tested therapeutic method.

I. A desire does not yet say what you are going to do

In the evening, Olga looks at photographs of someone else's trip and thinks: I want to go away. Those words contain no destination, date or decision to buy a ticket. Perhaps she is interested in the city in the picture. Perhaps she wants quiet, an unfamiliar routine or a few days without her usual role. She may not know which interpretation fits best. That does not make the desire unreal. It simply contains less specificity than a completed plan.

If she immediately translates it into an instruction, she may choose an action before establishing its object. A purchased ticket can take her to another city, but it does not

automatically release her from work messages. Switching off her phone makes her unavailable, but does not by itself create an interesting trip. Different actions respond to different parts of a single statement. So the first question can be quite ordinary: what exactly attracts me in this picture, and what do I expect to change in my days?

The opposite mistake is to demand immediate clarity from a desire. A person notices an interest and starts interrogating themselves about whether it is sufficiently justified, respectable or realistic. Until they have an answer, they seem to have no right to want it. But a desire is not an application that must pass a committee before entering consciousness. You can acknowledge its presence without undertaking to fulfil it or promising an exhaustive explanation. That acknowledgement leaves more substance for the later decision.

Olga can write three different continuations of her thought: I want to see this city; I want a few days without work; I want to live differently, but do not yet know how. She is not searching for a hidden correct answer. All three may be true. Writing merely makes the differences visible. Now she can check her leave, discuss availability with colleagues or leave the trip for another season. The initial movement of desire remains part of her experience, while the decision acquires its own conditions and scope.

The difference between today's desire and a remembered earlier decision matters too. If Olga once dreamed of such a trip, she is not obliged to want it now. An old desire can explain her interest in the photograph, but present circumstances require a fresh answer. An earlier choice can be respected without repeating it literally. Otherwise one's biography starts directing the present instead of the person living in changed conditions.

II. A pause does not require proving that a desire is bad

After a sharp exchange, you may want to object immediately. But stopping is often experienced as yielding: if I do not answer at once, I must be accepting the other person's position or betraying myself. This connection makes speed a measure of dignity. You are forced to choose between a hasty act and a feeling of weakness, although the discussion might continue tomorrow, in writing or through a more specific question. Here the interval is primarily for choosing a form, rather than cancelling disagreement.

In II, XXI, §§48 and 51, Locke considers delaying action for examination, qualifying the possibility as applying in most cases. This is a historical philosophical position. It cannot establish the effectiveness of our practice or unlimited control. Our question remains narrow: has desire become a decision that I am ready to call my own?

In a hypothetical scene, Anton wants to answer a colleague who publicly dismissed his work. He does not first have to convince himself that his anger is mistaken. He can acknowledge: this is unpleasant, I want to object, and it matters to me to state a boundary. Another question then

remains: which action will express it clearly enough? A sharp remark, a specific clarification in front of everyone and a separate conversation have different consequences. Rejecting the first form does not destroy the meaning Anton intends to defend.

It helps to distinguish delaying an action from imposing an internal prohibition. A delay leaves open the possibility of returning to the matter. A prohibition demands that you feel nothing more and never raise it again. From outside, both may look like silence, but their conditions differ. If Anton has arranged a conversation for the morning and knows what he wants to discuss, his pause already contains a continuation. If he is forced to pretend agreement to avoid punishment, calling this a free interval would be inaccurate. What matters is the availability of the next step, not the number of minutes elapsed.

III. An intention needs a more precise verb

The phrase I want change can accompany someone for months. It communicates important dissatisfaction, but does not say what action they intend to perform. An intention becomes clearer when it includes a verb, an object and at least an approximate time: discuss the workload this week; decline one additional task; look at the terms of another course. These formulations do not guarantee performance. They let us understand which action the expectations concern and what its execution will require.

In Icek Ajzen's theoretical clarification of 2020, sections 1.1–1.2, behaviour is specified through action, target, context and time; carrying out an intention also depends on available control. This describes a model, rather than promising an individual reader a result. In particular, a shortage of resources or opportunities can obstruct action. The article does not imply that desire itself is an intention or that precise wording automatically overcomes an obstacle.

Imagine that Sergei plans to change jobs. He wants a different daily life, intends to send his CV and can update it today. But receiving an offer does not depend on him alone. If all these levels are combined, an ordinary lack of response will look like evidence of insufficient determination. Separating them allows a more accurate discussion: has he performed his own step, do the vacancies fit, what conditions are necessary for moving, and what remains unknown? The decision becomes more specific without promising complete control of the future.

Sometimes the precise verb shows that no action has yet been chosen. That too is a result of consideration. Sergei may discover that, for now, he wants to find out about other possibilities rather than resign. His intention then concerns exploring options. It does not have to look as dramatic as the initial phrase. A small action may be sufficient for the present question. What matters is not to declare it the completion of a different, larger decision: looking at vacancies is not changing jobs, and drafting a message is not having a conversation.

IV. An interval can make room for several desires

A person wants to accept an invitation and stay at home. They are glad about the meeting but tired of travelling. If they must immediately identify one authentic desire, the other will have to be called laziness, fear or pretence. Yet both may concern real aspects of the evening. Interest in people does not cancel a need for uncommitted time. The interval lets us avoid judging an entire personality by whichever answer prevails now. We can first see which conditions make the options attractive or burdensome.

In this scene, we do not necessarily need to seek a deep contradiction. Sometimes it is enough to clarify the finishing time, the possibility of arriving later or the format of the meeting. After clarification, one person chooses a short visit and announces in advance when they will leave. Another keeps the evening free. Neither decision conclusively proves that the person is sociable or withdrawn. It concerns a particular situation, rather than their whole future life. Its meaning is clearer when its circumstances, limitations and particular cost remain visible.

Some desires cannot be combined in one action. You want to keep a purchase within budget and buy the more expensive item; continue working and free the evening; hear an answer and avoid the risk of rejection. In such cases the interval does not have to produce a successful compromise. Sometimes it simply makes the loss explicit. The chosen option leaves another attractive option outside it. You can regret that without declaring your decision mistaken merely because it did not satisfy everything at once.

You can ask which cost you are willing to bear now and which you are trying to conceal from yourself. A cost may be financial, temporal or organisational; circumstances determine it, rather than an attractive name for the choice. If the item still appeals after you decide not to buy it, the desire has not been disproved. If you want solitude after a meeting, your agreement does not become false retrospectively. The interval helps you choose a sufficiently intelligible action among incompletely compatible wishes. It promises neither internal unanimity nor the absence of remaining dissatisfaction after an honest decision.

Nor does every desire require public discussion. You can consider it privately without explaining every hesitation to people close to you. Openness may be useful, but it is not a compulsory price for the right to decide. If an action concerns only your evening and breaches no agreements, your own answer is enough. Discussion becomes important where a choice changes a shared plan, not simply because an inner experience proved more complex than one clear sentence.

V. The other party does not have to wait indefinitely

The right to think exists alongside another person's right to know what they can count on. A friend invites you on a trip and needs to book accommodation. A colleague awaits an answer about a joint presentation. A partner asks whether you are ready to undertake a shared commitment. One person's uncertainty can become a cost in time and money for another. A pause therefore requires an external arrangement as well as internal space. It may be personal in content and shared in its consequences.

You need not reveal every doubt to state a deadline. You can say that you will answer tomorrow evening and allow the other person to proceed without you if they need an earlier answer. Such a response acknowledges both your uncertainty and their conditions. If the deadlines are incompatible, the outcome may be declining this particular proposal. That is not punishment for a slow decision. Sometimes a shared plan simply requires certainty sooner than someone can or wishes to provide it, and no continuation can be agreed.

There is a difference between asking for time and preserving another person's availability without commitments on your side. In the second case, you keep all your options while offering them an endless wait. The interval becomes a privilege paid for by their uncertainty. You can notice this without accusations about character: what answer is already needed for the shared undertaking, who bears the costs of waiting, and what will happen on the stated date? These questions concern the arrangement, not the right to have complex feelings.

Sometimes the decision is postponed again. It then helps to communicate a new fact, rather than merely extend the old formula. If information is missing, you can say which information. If agreement is not yet possible, a limited refusal is more honest than an unsupported promise of a quick answer. Personal reasons may remain personal. But silence should not quietly become confirmation of a shared commitment. For the other person, the absence of an answer remains an absence until the parties have agreed otherwise.

VI. Strong desire is not another person's consent

Attraction is particularly easy to experience as internal permission to proceed to action. Someone may feel that the intensity of their feeling makes their conduct self-explanatory. But desire concerns their experience; another person's participation requires a separate response. Even if there is affection, previous intimacy or an unfinished conversation between them, present consent cannot be inferred solely from those circumstances. Here the interval can be a place for a clear question and for accepting an answer that differs from the one desired.

Imagine wanting to message someone at night after a meeting and propose seeing them again. You can notice the desire, choose an appropriate message and leave room for refusal. No

response gives you no right to invent agreement or demand an explanation. Your own experience need not be declared shameful. It remains an experience, while the decision takes the other's independence into account. Separating these matters is especially important where a romantic narrative tends to turn persistence into proof of deep feeling.

Consent concerns specific participation. A willingness to communicate is not a willingness for every kind of intimacy; a dinner invitation is not a promise of a future relationship. When circumstances change, an earlier decision may require fresh clarification. A pause lets us notice whether we are substituting one answer with another more convenient for us. This is an ordinary question about the limits of an action. It does not require reading another's mind or establishing their true hidden desire against what they are communicating now.

Sometimes a person chooses to take no action and not explain their attraction. That does not invalidate the feeling. Sometimes they propose a conversation, accept a refusal and continue living with disappointment. There is no compulsory beautiful conclusion in which everyone is satisfied. There is more precise responsibility: my desire and my action belong to me; another person's response is not at my disposal. The interval helps maintain this distinction before the action, when it can still be chosen, rather than merely explained afterwards.

VII. The opportunity to stop is unevenly distributed

The advice just take a pause sounds easy where a pause is actually available. But someone may have a one-minute deadline, dependence on an employer, a demand for an immediate decision or no safe place for a conversation. Another situation is fatigue that makes detailed consideration difficult. These circumstances prevent us from evaluating every rapid act in the same way. Independence cannot be measured solely by the time between a question and an answer without noticing the conditions in which someone acted.

A salesperson offers a discount only now. A supervisor demands agreement to an extra shift in front of everyone. Someone close links love to an immediate answer. In all three scenes, the arrangement of the proposal narrows the room for consideration. Sometimes you can request written terms, reject an artificial deadline or move the conversation. Sometimes that is impossible without substantial consequences. It then matters at least to name the restriction accurately, instead of treating the available range of actions as complete freedom equally accessible to everyone.

If an answer must still be given quickly, the interval may be small. You clarify one condition, choose a temporary arrangement or state that you are promising only a particular part. This is not a universal way to protect yourself: the other party may reject the clarification. However, clarity about the scope of your decision already helps prevent mentally turning a constrained

response into voluntary agreement with every subsequent demand. A particular action does not imply an unconditional willingness for any continuation.

After an event, you can also return to the conditions. Which deadline was real, what information was withheld, and what could be arranged beforehand in a similar situation? Such consideration differs from a demand to remain composed at all times. It aims to change available opportunities, rather than condemn someone for a second that has passed. Sometimes the next step is an agreement about the decision process or help from another participant. Sometimes all that remains is acknowledging cramped circumstances. The absence of an ideal pause does not make the entire experience a personal failure.

Small organisational changes sometimes expand that range beforehand. A family may agree not to schedule a shared trip before checking calendars, or a working group may collect written responses by a specified time. These are hypothetical arrangements for particular participants, not universal recipes. Their point is to include time for consideration in the shared undertaking, rather than make it depend each time on the personal courage of whoever first asks everyone to stop.

VIII. Endless consideration also has consequences

The interval serves a decision, but it can grow into a separate task that never ends. A person compares courses, selects words for a message and rereads the conditions once more. Each new option promises to remove the final risk. While no decision has been made, they can preserve an image of the future in which nothing has been lost. Yet time is already passing, an offer may disappear and the other person keeps waiting. The absence of an action does not always leave the situation unchanged.

It helps to distinguish what another round of thought can still provide. Is an answer needed to a specific question that can be answered? Will it change the possible actions? Or are you seeking a guarantee that no available source promises? This is no reason to hurry yourself according to someone else's timetable. But it lets you notice when consideration has stopped clarifying the decision and become a demand for complete protection against regret. Ordinary decisions often simply have no such guarantee.

In a hypothetical scene, Irina chooses an evening course. She knows the price, schedule, programme and cancellation terms. What remains is finding out whether the group will like her and whether she will regret the choice. Those questions cannot be completely settled before participation. She can prefer a trial session, decline or accept a limited risk. Each option has its own cost. Here the interval's task is to establish which uncertainty she is prepared to live with, rather than turn a future experience into a pretested, controllable result.

Once a decision is made, you can treat it as effective within its stated scope. You need not reconsider your whole life after the first inconvenience. At the same time, new circumstances may justify returning to it: dates, price, workload or the nature of participation have changed. Distinguishing a new fact from another round of old doubts may be more useful than demanding absolute certainty. A decision can be sufficiently clear today and revisable tomorrow. That is precisely why it matters to remember what was chosen, on which terms, and with which consequences still unknown.

For clarity, you can keep one line stating the basis of the choice. Not a report on the quality of your character, but a note: these conditions are known, I accept this risk, and this question remains open. Later it can help distinguish the original arrangement from something added retrospectively. Sometimes that addition creates unnecessary disappointment: the decision never contained a promise of universal approval, although memory has supplied one.

IX. Acting after a pause is also a form of freedom

Sometimes articles about self-observation quietly make calm postponement the only good outcome. Someone consequently learns to consider a desire but becomes embarrassed to fulfil it. A firm answer seems insufficiently reflective, joy suspicious, and a direct refusal too quick. Yet the interval does not have to cool everything that arises. It can confirm: I really do want this conversation, am prepared to accept this work, or intend to decline the proposed participation. Consideration does not make determination less legitimate.

What matters is that the chosen act corresponds to your decision in its present scope. If the aim is to state disagreement, you do not necessarily have to settle the entire history of a relationship at the same time. If the aim is to try an activity, you need not promise permanent devotion to a new pursuit. You can act energetically while leaving future questions open. This specificity differs from hastily expanding promises: today's agreement to one step should not quietly become agreement to every possible continuation that nobody has yet discussed.

After a message is sent, the desire may remain, change or give way to a different feeling. That does not cancel responsibility for the words, but neither does it require endlessly proving that they coincide with your entire inner experience. In ordinary life, people make decisions with incomplete clarity. The dignity of an action is not measured by the absence of mixed feelings. It can be considered through more concrete features: what was promised, what was done, whose boundaries were affected, which consequences now require attention, and what needs clarification.

Let us return to the message waiting to be sent. It may remain a draft, become a short question or be sent almost unchanged. No outcome is predetermined as correct for everyone. The interval has done something else: desire has stopped automatically determining the form of

action. Now you can say why you are writing, what you are ready to say and which response you have no right to demand. Sometimes freedom appears in an unpressed button. Sometimes it appears when the button is pressed after your own sufficiently clear decision.

What this means in practice

Choose an ordinary situation where a decision is still available: a message, invitation, purchase or additional commitment. Do not turn observation into another examination. First name the desire without evaluating its worth. Then separately formulate the action you are considering. If the two sentences coincide, clarify the verb, timing and scope of the promise: a feeling itself may be broad, while an action concerns particular circumstances.

Look at which information can actually change the choice. If necessary, clarify one condition. If your action affects someone else, state an answer deadline and leave them free to decide without you. Also check whether real time for consideration exists: artificial pressure and a necessary deadline call for different responses. Do not attribute complete control to yourself where an important part of the result depends on people, resources or conditions.

After that you can act, decline or set an intelligible return to the question. The observable result is a more precise decision and its limits, rather than compulsory calm. If the desire remains, it does not disprove a refusal; if the action happens, it does not prove final clarity about your whole life. Useful consideration offers a way to connect your action with what you are prepared to choose now and honestly leave the unknown unknown.

If an error emerges after the step, you can specify its object: a condition misunderstood, an unavailable deadline promised, or someone else's boundary affected. A concrete correction is more useful than a general verdict on your ability to decide. Where necessary, it includes an apology, a new deadline or withdrawing from further participation. The interval before action does not release you from this later work; it provides one more opportunity to consider an act before its consequences appear.

Key quotation

> *“fair examination”*

John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding*, II, XXI, §48. This brief fragment provides a reason to ask about the conditions of a decision, rather than requiring infallible self-command.

Connections between traditions

Reference	Subject	Point of comparison	Limit
Locke, II, XXI	Examination before action	Desire and a chosen act	Historical philosophical position
Ajzen, 2020, 1.1–1.2	Specific intention and control	Decision and available opportunity	Theoretical behavioural model
United Wisdom editorial team	Hypothetical everyday scenes	Pause and agreement	Untested practical suggestion

The comparison identifies different questions. It does not establish one doctrine, agreement among all cultures or therapeutic effectiveness of a pause.

Sources

1. John Locke. *An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding*, Volume I, Book II, Chapter XXI, §§47–51. Project Gutenberg text, digital edition catalogue, No.10615. Selected paragraphs concerning the quotations and argument, and edition information, were read; not the whole book. The catalogue names the second edition as its basis while retaining MDCXC in the title. This is no claim to a physical first edition. Public domain in the United States; other jurisdictions were not checked.

2. Icek Ajzen. "The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions." *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies* 2 (2020), 314–324. Author-hosted PDF, DOI. Initial pages and sections 1.1–1.2 were read; not the entire article or cited studies. The author's theoretical clarification. No reuse licence was confirmed: UNKNOWN; brief original paraphrase, without direct quotation.

Tags

desire, decision, action, interval, pause, intention, choice, independence, consent, boundaries, responsibility, agreement, time, resources, opportunity, uncertainty, attraction, refusal, promise, message, invitation, everyday life, self-observation, Locke, Ajzen, philosophy, behaviour, decision conditions, United Wisdom, dignity

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 examine these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.