

UNITED WISDOM

Fatigue as a Fact, Rather Than a Moral Characteristic

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-17-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Fatigue as a Fact, Rather Than a Moral Characteristic

Epigraph

> *“nor the battle to the strong”.*

Ecclesiastes 9:11, King James Version. A short English fragment; the Russian version uses our own editorial translation. Religious poetry, not an explanation of fatigue.

What this article is about

In an illustrative scene, the manager of a small workshop comes home after a demanding week. Tomorrow she needs to agree an order; tonight there are still emails to answer. She opens the same message several times and closes it without writing anything. First she says she is tired, then corrects herself: she has simply become lazy. A minute later the discussion concerns her fitness to manage, rather than this evening. The task list remains unchanged, but a trial of her character has been added.

Here, fatigue means a reported state that needs consideration within a situation. It does not yet establish a cause, diagnosis, or precise measure of capacity. This article examines another transition: how a limitation becomes moral accusation, and how to return discussion to conditions, obligations, and available decisions. We can acknowledge fatigue and answer for consequences. We can need rest without first proving our virtue. Medical questions require a separate inquiry; a moral verdict cannot replace it. We are interested in handling something incompletely explained that already participates in life today.

I. A State and a Characteristic Answer Different Questions

A sentence about current fatigue and a statement about a lazy character have different scopes. The first describes today's experience. The second claims to explain a lasting attitude toward effort. Moving between them requires grounds fatigue alone does not provide. In our scene, the manager knows that continuing with emails is difficult tonight. She has not established why this happens or which arrangement now suits her work. Adding accusation is easier than investigating, but ease does not make it more accurate.

A state can be described without a final explanation. For example: today I read more slowly than usual, left two replies unfinished, and want to end my working evening. These are details of an illustrative story, not diagnostic signs for all readers. They allow the task to be clarified.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Which emails need answers now? Who awaits a decision? Can a deadline be specified? Lazy answers none of these questions. It shifts attention from an unfinished action to a personality now supposedly requiring complete correction.

That shift can be especially persuasive when the person has actually made a mistake. The manager promised a calculation by evening and gave no warning of delay. The consequence is real: the customer waited in vain. It does not follow that all her fatigue was invented or that rest should be cancelled as punishment. She can acknowledge the broken agreement and send a short message with a revised deadline. Responsibility becomes more definite when separated from a general assessment of worth. It acquires a subject, an addressee, and an available form of repair.

Distinguish a report from proof too. A personal account of fatigue does not give another person complete access to the state. Yet an inability to verify everything does not mean the report should be rejected. Shared work can address observable conditions: remaining tasks, who can take part, and when a result is needed. Trust here does not require unconditional belief in every explanation. It requires avoiding a predetermined accusation in place of an unknown cause, and not making someone first defend their right to say something about themselves.

Sometimes fatigue is used vaguely. It may mean lack of interest in one job, a wish to end an argument, or a need to be alone. This calls for clarification when clarification matters to the decision. But the conversation need not begin with exposure of a supposed deception. Ask which action is difficult now and what the person is requesting. The answer may change the initial picture. Accuracy permits correction on both sides while preserving the difference between investigating a state and judging the person who named it.

II. An Unknown Cause Does Not Invalidate Experience

Considering a limitation does not always require explaining it completely first. If someone reports that they cannot manage the previous amount today, participants already need a work decision. Timing or task distribution can change while the cause remains open. This neither makes every account true nor requires fulfilling every demand. It simply means the unknown does not make the current situation disappear. A deferred explanation and a necessary action can have different deadlines.

The NHS guidance on fatigue identifies different possible causes and recommends seeing a doctor when unexplained fatigue lasts a few weeks or affects daily life. We checked the guidance now; its own review date is June 2023, with the next review stated as June 2026. This is a currently accessible institutional page, rather than a new 2026 review. It does not establish the cause in our scene.

A psychological account therefore should not take the place of medical inquiry. Perhaps the manager dislikes a particular order. But the existence of an unpleasant order does not establish the origin of all her fatigue. Project conditions can be discussed separately from preparing information for a doctor if the situation meets the stated grounds for seeking care. Editorial reflection does not require choosing one final story between body and psychology. That division is too crude: someone can remain uncertain about causes while accurately reporting what is happening with their work.

A temporary decision also need not resemble treatment. Moving a nonurgent email to tomorrow is a decision about the email. Arranging cover for one meeting is a decision about the meeting. Their outcomes can be checked against the completed task and agreed conditions. We cannot promise that these actions will remove fatigue, because this article establishes no such result. That absence of a promise does not make them pointless. A small organisational change can suffice for today's agreement even while the question about the state remains unresolved.

Sometimes someone fears that acknowledging an unknown cause makes them less convincing. They quickly invent an explanation: age, work, or lack of discipline. Yet a supposition can create another obligation to follow an untested account. If weak will has been declared the cause, every rest now looks like yielding to weakness. A more honest sentence leaves room for inquiry: continuing is difficult now, I do not yet know the cause, and this is what I can agree for this task. Uncertainty becomes part of the report instead of grounds for cancelling it entirely.

III. Past Endurance Is Not a Permanent Contract

Having managed before does not establish today's capacities. The earlier result was obtained under particular conditions. The workshop once had fewer orders, different deadlines, and a colleague handling purchases. Duties now look familiar, but their composition has changed. A memory of an easy past can conceal this difference. Useful comparison needs to restore conditions instead of demanding that today's person conform to one successful image of themselves.

Consider one particular earlier evening. How many tasks remained, who participated, and what happened outside work? This is no invitation to compile an endless chronicle. Noticing differences capable of changing the decision is sufficient. The manager discovers that she once answered customers three days a week, whereas she now does so every day and during weekends. The same name, work, refers to different arrangements. Comparison with the past ceases to be moral proof and becomes a question about the present amount.

There is an awkward alternative too: demands have decreased, yet fatigue remains noticeable. Everything then cannot mechanically be explained by the number of orders. Preserve the absence of a convenient account. A workload decision can rest on the present state and known requirements, while the cause receives further appropriate inquiry. Someone need not create a convincing overwork story to acknowledge a limitation. Otherwise only those able to present an impressive list of difficulties earn a right to change pace.

Past endurance sometimes becomes a family role. Someone who organised trips and celebrations for years hears that they always did it better than anyone else. Praise becomes a demand to continue. Yet being able to perform a task differs from agreeing to perform it now. Previous care can be appreciated without giving its provider a lifelong duty. In an illustrative family, a new discussion begins by dividing actions: who buys food, who invites guests, and what need not be arranged this time at all.

Declining the previous amount can bring regret. Someone may have valued their endurance and experience the change as a loss. They need not be persuaded to celebrate a new rhythm immediately. Some capacities may be precious and have not returned. Yet regret requires no further demonstration of past abilities at the expense of tonight. Relating to a loss and deciding the next action remain separate questions. This permits changed conditions without obligatory denial of what once mattered.

IV. Fatigue Need Not Be Earned Through a Sufficiently Hard Life

Comparing others' workloads does not measure one's own state. In our scene, the manager thinks of an acquaintance who works and cares for two children. Her own evening then seems insufficiently demanding to justify fatigue. Yet another's story does not reveal what is possible here. Perhaps the acquaintance needs help too; perhaps her support arrangement differs. Turning accounts into a competition eases neither life and does not distribute tasks in the workshop.

Such comparison carries a hidden cost. Someone starts choosing words to appear sufficiently burdened. An ordinary report of a limit gives way to a detailed list of misfortunes. The helper, in turn, finds a harder case and defers responding. Conversation becomes a test of the right to need something. It can return to specifics: what needs doing, what participation is available, and which response is possible. This is an editorial way to discuss a request, not a claim that every family or institution has unlimited resources.

When help is insufficient for everyone, a choice is necessary. The workshop cannot, for example, give everyone time off simultaneously. But a limited resource should be named as a resource. Which tasks can move? Should the order's scope shrink? Who decides the priority? Discussing these conditions differs from saying that one person is really tired while another

insufficiently deserves a pause. Particular cover can be declined without declaring the requester's state nonexistent or turning an absent solution into a character assessment.

In Ecclesiastes 9:11–12, outcomes depend on more than superior capacities. This is a religious observation about the human lot, rather than a study of work capacity. Here it offers a limited comparison: outcomes are not a complete measure of a person. No medical explanation follows. Our scene retains a separate editorial question: why should the amount completed today determine whether the manager may report her state and change tonight's plan?

All comparison need not be eliminated. Another person's example sometimes helps reveal an available arrangement. A colleague keeps one day free of meetings, and the manager considers that option for herself. The difference lies in comparison's purpose: learning about conditions or passing judgement. Transfer is not guaranteed because circumstances differ. A useful detail can be taken, its applicability checked, and the remainder left aside. Another's life becomes a possible source of a question while retaining its right not to serve as a standard for every other life.

V. Responsibility Begins With a Particular Consequence

Acknowledging fatigue does not cancel relationships with those who expected action. In the workshop, the customer needs a calculation and the colleague needs a purchasing decision. Their expectations exist too. If this article only freed the manager from unpleasant feelings, the question would remain unresolved. Responsible discussion connects two facts: continuing in the previous way is difficult now, and other participants need clarity. A choice must follow about what can be communicated, transferred, cancelled, or limited within the particular agreement.

The recipient does not always need a full explanation of someone's state. A customer may need only a deadline and the available part of the calculation. A colleague mainly needs to know who is authorised to order materials. A detailed confession sometimes creates a further expectation of sympathy instead of clarifying the work. Privacy can remain while information about consequences is provided. This is no prohibition of openness. It distinguishes the purposes of a message: discussing experience, asking for participation, or clarifying a particular obligation.

Some consequences cannot be fully repaired. The evening deadline was missed, a trip failed, or another person incurred expense. A new promise then must not erase the past. Acknowledge what happened and discuss available compensation or changed future conditions. Fatigue explains only part of the account, if its connection is established at all; it does not automatically excuse any act. Answering for damage nevertheless does not require agreeing that endless further work is now necessary to restore human worth.

Checking one's right to promise is especially important. The manager can extend a customer's deadline but cannot dispose of a colleague's evening. Transferring a task requires consent or an accepted work arrangement, rather than merely her relief. If no free participant exists, another scope or deadline must be chosen. Care for oneself becomes more than a slogan when it considers consequences for others. Here it means considering one's state among actual conditions, without assigning another person the role of a free, inexhaustible supply of energy.

Sometimes the most responsible step is to decline a new obligation in advance. Someone remains able to perform a one-off request but knows they are not choosing a permanent arrangement. They need not await an obvious failure before saying so. One available action does not equal agreement to repeat it. A definite boundary can be stated: I will answer this question today, but will not take on daily evening support. Fatigue thus participates in organising future agreements instead of appearing only after an accepted promise is broken.

VI. Rest Need Not Become Another Test of Usefulness

A pause can be chosen without promising immediate increased efficiency. In the illustrative workshop, the manager ends her working evening but begins measuring whether her rest is sufficiently good at home. A book must develop her, a walk deliver a required result, and a conversation bring clarity. Ending work thus preserves its previous logic of assessment. The article does not establish which form of rest this person needs. It asks whether activity can end without giving every free minute a measurable productive return.

In Of Peace of Mind, XVII, Seneca permits rest for the mind. This is a philosophical argument within a historical discussion of tranquillity, not contemporary medical advice. We do not transfer the ancient text's associated recommendations to the reader's health. What matters for our argument is the possibility of treating an end to strain as a permissible part of life. Yet permission for today's pause here does not depend on Seneca's authority: it rests on the possibility of agreeing present actions and obligations.

Rest can be unpleasant because the unfinished remains visible. The calculation lies on the table and messages remain in the phone. Stopping activity does not mean completing every task in the universe. What has been left can be named separately, along with a condition for returning if one has actually been accepted. For example: I will continue the calculation tomorrow morning and am taking no new evening orders today. Such a note helps particular organisation but is no obligatory ritual before every pause.

Sometimes free time produces none of the expected relief. Rest should then not be declared wrong, nor a smile demanded as evidence of gratitude. Uncertainty, a personal loss, or unfinished work may remain. Perhaps the state requires another inquiry. This article

establishes no cause. Ending one activity and changing experience are different outcomes. The evening can be free while lightness has not arrived. That keeps the account accurate without making absent relief into another moral failure.

The right to pause also need not mean solitude. Some want a quiet conversation; others prefer not to answer. A format can be clarified without requiring proof that it restores energy. In an illustrative couple, someone says they are not ready to discuss conflict today and offers another time. The other person may clarify when the conversation will happen. Respect for a limit thus joins clarity in the relationship. A pause remains a chosen condition instead of a universal way to disappear from every obligation forever.

VII. Help Is Needed by a Situation, Not a Moral Category of People

A help request becomes clearer when it names an action. Instead of saying she is now weak and can do nothing, the manager asks a colleague to check one calculation before noon tomorrow. She retains her part and discusses another's. Agreement is not guaranteed, but the recipient has something to decide. Help does not require first classifying oneself as someone who has lost independence. Today's need may have a limited duration or become lasting; both possibilities still require their own conditions.

Someone can need help and remain competent elsewhere. The manager knows the order better than her colleague but does not choose to perform every stage alone. She passes on the calculation while retaining the design decision. Distributed work says nothing about the price of her dignity. It says who does what. Sometimes a helper expands participation: since a person is struggling, all decisions must now be made for them. Without agreement, care becomes lost authorship. A particular request gives no unlimited access to a life.

The helper's right to decline remains too. The colleague may be busy or lack necessary information. A negative answer does not always mean disrespect for fatigue. Distinguish unavailable resources, disagreement with a format, and disregard for a person. These lead to different next decisions. Another participant, changed timing, or a smaller scope may be possible. If no options are available, that is a real limitation of the situation. It need not be explained through an insufficiently persuasive request or a hidden inability to receive care.

Some help is hard to request because of an institution's arrangement. An application requires extensive justification; a manager accepts reports only during an obvious crisis; cover exists only on paper. Changing personal wording may then fail to solve the problem. Our workshop can examine its arrangement itself: who allocates workload, how temporary limitations are reported, and what follows a refusal. These are organisational questions, not a psychological

portrait of workers. A person's authorship includes seeing the environment instead of explaining every impasse through their character.

Sometimes gratitude becomes a promise of unlimited future return. The manager accepts help checking a calculation and immediately offers to work every weekend for her colleague. Conditions of reciprocity deserve definite discussion. She can thank them, return participation in an available form, and avoid creating a debt that cancels her limit again. Care need not become bookkeeping of equal hours. It also does not release anyone from honesty. What matters is which expectations were actually agreed and which were self-assigned from fear of being unworthy of received participation.

VIII. A More Accurate Account Leaves Room for the Next Choice

Acknowledging fatigue need not immediately change an entire life. In our story, the manager messages the customer, agrees a check, and ends evening work. Some tasks are still difficult the next day. This does not refute the distinction between a state and character. It shows that one organisational step addressed a limited task. Check whether the revised deadline was met, whether the amount suited the arrangement, and what remains unknown. The outcome proves neither healing nor personal incorrigibility automatically.

Fact in the title requires care too. Someone reports their experience; an observer has not received an instrument to verify the entire inner state. Yet the report has a place in a shared situation. It can affect agreements and become a subject of clarification. Preserve this modest certainty. We need not declare the cause clear or require accepting every account in every proposed form. We need to distinguish what is known from supposition, and consequences from a verdict.

Sometimes fatigue coexists with not wanting to continue a particular undertaking. Two discussions then await: present energy and future participation. Rest will not decide whether someone wants to retain a project. Acknowledging reluctance, conversely, does not cancel the state. The workshop manager can reduce evening replies and later reconsider the order format. Different deadlines and grounds for decisions appear. No part needs to explain an entire life before another part is permitted to exist.

In a family or team, a useful result can be a revised way to communicate. Someone names a limit before failure, participants know how to respond, and consequences are discussed without humiliating labels. This promises no absence of conflict. Someone may dislike the change, resources remain limited, or a decision require abandoning something important. But the conflict acquires a subject. Instead of asking whether a person is good enough to rest, participants discuss a realistic amount and how to distribute the cost of change.

Returning to the initial evening, we see the same manager and the same unfinished calculation. What changed was the way of talking, rather than proof of her moral worth. Fatigue, an unknown cause, a missed deadline, and an available action can now be named separately. This preserves responsibility and limits accusation's scope. Someone remains a participant in life even when they cannot match their previous pace today. The next choice may be modest, but it no longer first requires winning a case against their personality.

What this means in practice

Take one episode in which a report of fatigue quickly became a character assessment. Record separately what you noticed or reported, which action became difficult, and which general characteristic you added. You need not prove that characteristic was never true. Examine whether it helps address today's task and on what grounds it relates to this particular state.

Next name participants and consequences. Who awaits a reply, which deadline was accepted, and what has already happened? Choose one available form of clarity: announce a delay, decline a new promise, request particular participation, or state that no decision has yet been made. Check your right to allocate another person's time. Unavailable help is a limitation to consider, rather than further proof of your inadequacy.

Leave the cause open where it is unknown. For medical inquiry, use the particular grounds for seeking care given above and current local care conditions. Work observations can be retained without self-diagnosis. This practice concerns language and agreements; it neither establishes fatigue's cause nor treats it.

After the chosen action, note its limited outcome. Is it clearer who does the calculation? Was a deadline agreed? Did the working evening end? Note any change in the state separately. These answers can differ. The email was sent but fatigue remained; help arrived but regret for the earlier pace persists. Such a record need not conclude positively. It permits continuing from what actually happened while retaining a right to pause and a need to answer for a particular action.

Key quotation

> *“Men’s minds ought to have relaxation”.*

Seneca, Of Peace of Mind, XVII, Aubrey Stewart translation, 1889. Our own editorial translation appears in the Russian version. A normative philosophical argument, not a medical guarantee.

Connections between traditions

Basis	Comparison	Significant boundary
Ecclesiastes 9:11–12, KJV	A possibility of not reducing a person's value to an outcome.	Religious poetry does not explain an individual's fatigue.
Seneca, Of Peace of Mind, XVII	Rest can be permissible within an active life.	A historical argument does not replace medical information or today's work conditions.
NHS guidance on fatigue	An unexplained state can need separate inquiry.	Institutional guidance establishes neither moral status nor individual cause.

These are editorial comparisons between different kinds of support. They establish no shared doctrine, cause of fatigue, or effectiveness of the proposed conversation.

Primary sources

• S1. NHS. Tiredness and fatigue. Complete substantive page read on 5 October 2026; last reviewed 2 June 2023, next review due 2 June 2026. Institutional medical guidance, not a new study; individual applicability is considered separately. The specific page's licence was not established: UNKNOWN.

• S2. Ecclesiastes. 9:11–12, King James Version. Two verses and version information read, not the whole book. A historical English version, not the Russian Synodal text; our translations are marked. Public domain in the US; KJV's territorial status is not declared identical everywhere.

• S3. Lucius Annaeus Seneca. Of Peace of Mind, XVII, in Minor Dialogues, Together with the Dialogue on Clemency. Aubrey Stewart translation, George Bell and Sons, London, 1889; Project Gutenberg 64576. XVII, title information, and catalogue read, not the entire collection. The catalogue states public domain USA, without establishing worldwide permission.

Tags

fatigue, moral assessment, character, state, limit, responsibility, rest, help, agreement, workload, pace, past capacities, dignity, medical inquiry, unknown cause, comparison, working evening, workshop, deadlines, privacy, cover, reciprocity, consent, consequences, choice, Seneca, Ecclesiastes, NHS, self-observation, 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.