

Max Paradox

PROBLEM? RELAX. YOU'VE GOT THIS!

A tongue-in-cheek guide series ;)

Vacation with Friends Sounded Better in the Group Chat

How to Agree on the Budget, Pace, Accommodation,
and Expectations Before a Trip So You Come Home
Still Friends



**We've got a problem. But relax.
It can be solved—and we'll even have something to laugh about.**

Vacation with Friends Sounded Better in the Group Chat

How to Agree on the Budget, Pace,
Accommodation, and Expectations Before
a Trip So You Come Home Still Friends

Max Paradox

PROBLEM? RELAX. YOU'VE GOT THIS!

ALL-IN Rafał Płonkowski
2026
ISBN 9788384833896

CONTENTS

INTRO	5
Chapter 1 - Being Friends Does Not Mean You Travel the Same Way.....	11
Chapter 2 - The Same Trip, Four Different Wallets	19
Chapter 3 - A Place to Sleep Is Also a Place You Have to Live In	27
Chapter 4 - "We'll Be Spontaneous" Is Still a Plan, Just Usually Someone Else's.....	35
Chapter 5 - "I Don't Mind" Is Not Useful Information	43
Chapter 6 - Sometimes You're Not Fighting. Sometimes You're Just Exhausted.....	51
Chapter 7 - Nobody Should Have to Become the Parent of the Group	59
Chapter 8 - Do Not Turn One Irritation Into a Group Investigation	67
Chapter 9 - Decide What You Actually Need to Do Together	75
Chapter 10 - A Ten-Minute Reset Can Save Three Days of Weirdness	83
Chapter 11 - Everyone Gets One Thing That Really Matters.....	92
Chapter 12 - Changing the Plan Is Normal. Surprising Everyone With It Is Not	99
Chapter 13 - A Shared Car Can Turn Into a Friendship Test on Wheels.....	107

Chapter 14 - You Need a Rule for the Moment Someone Says, "I'm Done"	115
Chapter 15 - When One Person Really Is Ruining the Trip	123
Chapter 16 - Not Every Compromise Is a Good Compromise	132
Chapter 17 - You Had a Fight. Now the Important Part Is Not Ruining the Rest of the Trip.....	140
Chapter 18 - Big Problems Usually Start With Small Signals	149
Chapter 19 - Do the Debrief Before Memory Turns Everything Into a Great Story.....	157
Chapter 20 - The Next Trip Should Be Easier, Not Perfect	165

INTRO

By the third morning, the group has developed four completely different definitions of the phrase "a relaxing vacation." One person is dressed, caffeinated, and standing by the door at 8:07 with a backpack, sunscreen, and the expression of someone who has already emotionally visited three landmarks. Another is still asleep because, in their understanding, vacation begins precisely where alarm clocks stop. A third would happily spend the entire day by the pool, except they are starting to sense that this opinion may be considered a moral weakness. The fourth has opened the group chat and is staring at a message that says, "Found an amazing place for dinner tonight!" The restaurant is beautiful. The menu is also approximately twice what they expected to spend. Nobody is fighting yet. Technically, everything is fine. And that is usually how it starts.

Traveling with friends has a strange way of revealing information that years of friendship somehow failed to uncover. You may know someone's childhood nickname, preferred coffee order, relationship history, political opinions on pineapple pizza, and the exact story of what happened at that wedding six years ago. Yet you may have absolutely no idea that they require forty-five uninterrupted minutes in the bathroom every morning, consider walking more than fifteen minutes an unreasonable transportation strategy, or believe that "we should leave early" means 10:30. Friendship gives us familiarity, but travel adds proximity, logistics, money, fatigue, decisions, and an alarming shortage of doors you can close behind yourself. Suddenly you are not just having dinner together. You are deciding when dinner happens, where it happens, how much it should cost, whether

everyone has to come, and why one person has spent twenty minutes reading reviews of a restaurant the rest of you would happily enter based on the revolutionary criterion that it has chairs.

Most group trips do not go wrong because the people secretly dislike each other. They go wrong because everyone assumes that liking each other means wanting roughly the same vacation. It does not. One person sees a week away as a chance to finally do nothing. Another sees it as an expensive opportunity that must be fully utilized, preferably from sunrise until the local attractions physically lock their doors. Someone wants comfort because this is the one holiday they have saved for all year. Someone else wants the cheapest possible room because "we'll only sleep there," a sentence often spoken by people who later discover that sleep is surprisingly difficult on a folding sofa next to the refrigerator. One friend thinks spending freely for a few days is part of the experience. Another has already calculated the trip total down to airport coffee and is privately watching the budget drift away like a suitcase on the wrong baggage carousel. None of these people is automatically wrong. The trouble begins when each assumes their version is obvious.

Before the trip, this is easy to miss because group chats are excellent at enthusiasm and terrible at precision. Someone posts a photograph of blue water and five people respond with fire emojis. This somehow creates the emotional impression that several important decisions have been made. They have not. You have agreed that blue water looks nice. "We'll keep it cheap" is not a budget. "We'll explore but also relax" is not a pace. "We'll find somewhere nice" is not an accommodation standard. "We'll just see

what we feel like doing" is not a plan, although it does contain the seed of a future ninety-minute discussion conducted while everyone is hungry. Even "we're easygoing" proves surprisingly fragile once six easygoing adults are trying to choose one restaurant, one departure time, one rental car, and one person to sleep on the suspiciously short sofa.

The answer is not to turn a vacation into a corporate retreat with a forty-slide presentation titled Shared Leisure Objectives Q3. You do not need a constitution, a finance committee, or a rotating chairperson authorized to settle disputes concerning beach chairs. Overplanning can make a holiday just as exhausting as having no plan at all. What helps is far simpler: make the invisible expectations visible before they become accusations. If one person expects breakfast at eight and another expects consciousness at eleven, knowing this is useful. If someone wants a private bedroom, someone needs a strict spending ceiling, and someone considers two hours in a car an ordinary morning, those are useful facts. They do not have to disappear. They simply have to enter the plan before the plan starts costing money.

This book is about that gap between "we're great friends" and "apparently we should have discussed this before booking." It will help you talk about money without turning dinner into an audit, choose accommodation according to how people will actually live in it rather than how dramatically the balcony photographs at sunset, and agree on a pace that does not leave half the group bored and the other half physically negotiating with their knees. It will also help with the less glamorous realities: the friend who is always late, the person who somehow becomes responsible

for every reservation, the one who says "anything is fine" until anything is chosen, the sudden plan change at breakfast, the disagreement that gets much bigger because everyone is tired, and the delicate discovery that spending time together does not necessarily require spending every minute together.

There is another idea running underneath all of this: a good group trip does not require perfect compatibility. That would be convenient, but it would also require finding several adults with identical budgets, sleep schedules, appetite patterns, energy levels, interests, bathroom habits, tolerance for heat, and opinions about whether twenty-eight euros is a normal amount to pay for lunch. At that point you are not organizing a vacation. You are searching for clones. Real friendship works with differences. The useful skill is knowing which differences need a shared agreement, which can be handled by splitting up for a few hours, which require compromise, and which simply need to be accepted without converting them into evidence that somebody has become "difficult."

You will also need permission to disappoint each other occasionally. That sounds less cheerful than "make unforgettable memories," but it is far more useful. Somebody may want to visit a place you do not care about. Somebody may decline an activity you were excited about. Someone may decide they are done for the day while you still have energy. You may prefer the cheaper option. You may need an hour alone. These moments do not mean the trip is failing. In fact, the attempt to avoid all disappointment often creates much bigger problems, because everyone keeps agreeing, adjusting, smiling, and quietly collecting small resentments until an argument about where to park

somehow includes references to events from 2022. A healthy trip leaves room for people to say what they actually want while the issue is still small enough to solve.

The practical goal is not that everyone gets their preferred outcome every time. It is that nobody has to discover the group's unwritten rules through repeated collisions. You should know roughly what happens when budgets differ, when people want different activities, when somebody changes their mind, when the group is running late, when a shared cost becomes optional, or when one person simply needs to stop participating for the day. Once those rules are clear enough, the vacation gets lighter. You spend less time negotiating the mechanics of being together and more time actually being together. And when something inevitably goes wrong - because flights delay, weather changes, restaurants close, humans get tired, and the apartment described as "cozy" occasionally turns out to have interpreted that word as "you can reach the kettle from bed" - you have a way to respond without treating every inconvenience as a referendum on the friendship.

So before the tickets, the room allocations, the shared expenses, the sunrise excursion somebody will enthusiastically propose at 11:48 p.m., and the first brave declaration that "we don't need a schedule," there is one useful assumption to make: your friends are not difficult merely because they vacation differently from you. And you are not difficult merely because you have limits, preferences, a budget, or a desire to occasionally disappear for an hour without filing a missing-person report in the group chat. The trip gets easier when everybody stops guessing and starts saying the important things out loud. The objective is not flawless harmony. It is much more

realistic and, frankly, much more valuable: to come home with stories, photographs, a few jokes that will survive for years - and still want to see these people again when nobody is holding a suitcase.

Chapter 1 - Being Friends Does Not Mean You Travel the Same Way

The trip is still three months away, and everyone already agrees it is going to be fantastic. This agreement has been reached using remarkably little evidence. Someone shared a photo of a cliffside town, two people replied with heart emojis, another wrote, "I'm in," and one friend contributed a GIF involving a suitcase and champagne. From this, the group has somehow inferred that everyone wants the same pace, the same level of comfort, roughly the same amount of sightseeing, similar meal times, compatible sleep schedules, and a shared understanding of what the word "vacation" means. Nobody has actually discussed any of those things. You have simply established that all of you respond positively to attractive scenery. This is not useless information, but it is roughly equivalent to choosing a restaurant because everyone agrees food is nice.

Friendship creates a powerful illusion of travel compatibility because you already know so much about one another. You know who takes their coffee black, who cannot stand horror movies, who will order dessert even after saying they are full, and who still brings up an embarrassing incident from a birthday party seven years ago. That feels like deep knowledge, and in many ways it is. But ordinary friendship hides an enormous number of practical habits because everyone eventually goes home. You do not normally discover how long your friend needs to become conversational in the morning, how they react after six hours in the sun, whether they consider forty minutes of walking "nearby," or what happens when they have had to make

seventeen minor decisions before lunch. Travel removes many of the polite gaps that keep these differences invisible. Suddenly the person you adore over dinner is also the person standing in the bathroom while everyone else is ready to leave.

The first mistake is assuming that "we get along" means "we rest in similar ways." It does not. One friend may spend all year sitting at a desk and dream of hiking, swimming, driving, climbing, exploring, and returning to the hotel only when the staff begins stacking the chairs. Another may have spent the year rushing between responsibilities and consider a successful vacation one in which nobody asks them to be anywhere at a particular time. A third may want a little of both but define "a little sightseeing" as one major activity every day, while someone else defines it as wandering through a market for twenty minutes after breakfast. None of these people is lazy, difficult, controlling, or doing vacation incorrectly. They simply arrive with different ideas of what recovery looks like. The trouble begins when everybody assumes their own version is so normal that it does not require explanation.

This is why vague travel language is nearly useless. "I like to keep things relaxed." Fine. Does that mean waking at eight but leaving room for changes, or waking whenever your body negotiates a successful return to consciousness? "I'm happy to explore." For how long? Four hours? Ten? "I don't mind walking." Are we talking about a pleasant stroll after dinner or twelve miles across a hilly city while somebody keeps saying, "It's only another fifteen minutes"? People use the same words while imagining completely different days. The more attractive and flexible the phrase sounds, the more interpretations it usually contains. "We'll

play it by ear" can mean delightful freedom to one person and an administrative vacuum to another.

A much better way to compare travel styles is to describe an ordinary day rather than an ideal vacation. Ask everyone to imagine day four, not the exciting first morning when adrenaline has temporarily convinced you that six hours of sleep is plenty. What time would you naturally wake up? When would you want to leave the accommodation? How much of the day would you like scheduled? How long can you comfortably spend moving around before wanting a break? Do you enjoy late dinners? Would three mornings with early starts feel reasonable or miserable? The point is not to build a timetable from the answers. The point is to uncover assumptions while they are still cheap. Discovering before booking that one person hates early starts is information. Discovering it at 6:45 a.m. outside their locked bedroom door while a prepaid tour bus is approaching is theater.

It also helps to stop judging the answers. Group planning often becomes strangely moral within minutes. The person who wants to sleep later is told, "But you'll waste the day." The person who wants to see more hears, "You do know this is supposed to be a vacation?" Someone who likes good restaurants is accused of being extravagant, while the friend proposing sandwiches from a supermarket begins speaking with the calm confidence of a financial reformer. This is how preferences turn into character assessments. The useful question is not whether somebody's travel style is superior. It is whether the styles can coexist with reasonable adjustments. A late sleeper and an early explorer may be perfectly compatible if the early explorer can go for

breakfast alone. They become incompatible only when each expects the other to convert.

There are several dimensions worth making visible because they create disproportionate trouble when left vague: pace, planning, togetherness, comfort, and flexibility. You do not need a questionnaire. Each person can describe where they sit on those dimensions in a few sentences. "I like one main activity a day and enough empty time around it." "I am fine with simple accommodation, but I need a proper bed and a quiet room." "I enjoy spending most of the day together, but I want some time alone." "I am comfortable changing plans, as long as we are not losing money." These statements are far more useful than "I'm easy." Almost everyone describes themselves as easy until the group chooses the one thing they assumed nobody would choose.

The next step is to notice where the group differs rather than rushing to prove that the differences are manageable. Suppose four friends are planning a week away. Two want active days, one wants mostly rest, and the fourth is flexible but does not enjoy long drives. You do not need to solve this immediately. First, simply name it. "We seem to have different energy levels, so we probably shouldn't expect everyone to do every activity." That one sentence removes a great deal of future confusion. Once a difference is visible, you can design around it. Some activities can be shared, some optional, and some done separately. If the difference remains hidden, every later decision feels personal. Suddenly one person is "holding everyone back" and another is "turning the vacation into a military campaign," when in reality both were following the plan they thought existed.

The idea that a successful group spends all its time together deserves special suspicion. It sounds warm, but in practice it can become a loyalty test. One person wants to browse shops, another wants a long lunch, two friends want to rent bikes, and somehow the group decides the mature solution is for all five people to do the same thing while at least two of them quietly wish they were elsewhere. Being on the same vacation does not require constant physical formation. Friends can split for three hours and still recognize one another afterward. In fact, a little separation often improves the evening because people return with energy and something new to say instead of continuing the same conversation they began over breakfast and maintained through lunch, transport, sightseeing, and a forty-minute debate about ice cream.

A useful exercise is to sort activities into three mental categories: "important to do together," "happy to join," and "fine to do separately." The first category should stay small. Perhaps there is one dinner everyone cares about, a day trip that was the reason for choosing the destination, or a celebration you genuinely want to share. The second category contains the pleasant extras. The third is where individual interests live without requiring group approval. This is not a rigid scheduling system. It is permission. Once people know that separate activity is legitimate, "I think I'll sit this one out" stops sounding like a rejection of the friendship and starts sounding like a normal sentence spoken by an adult.

Travel compatibility also depends on tolerance for uncertainty. Some people enjoy deciding at the last moment. Others relax only after they know roughly what the next day looks like. Neither approach is more sophisticated. The

spontaneous person often thinks the planner is trying to control the vacation. The planner thinks the spontaneous person is outsourcing all decisions to Future Everyone, who will apparently be wiser, better rested, and somehow already holding tickets. A workable middle ground is to identify which parts truly need advance decisions and which can remain open. If an activity requires booking, transportation, or a significant expense, plan it. If the question is which café to choose on an empty afternoon, perhaps the group can survive the suspense.

Another important difference is the threshold for inconvenience. One traveler thinks nothing of changing buses twice, walking twenty minutes with luggage, and climbing four flights of stairs because the apartment costs less. Another will happily pay more to avoid beginning the trip with an endurance event. These preferences are often hidden inside discussions about money or convenience, but they are really about what each person finds tiring. A good group does not demand identical thresholds. It makes trade-offs consciously. Perhaps you accept a less central apartment because everyone agrees the savings matter more. Perhaps you pay extra for location because independence matters more. What causes resentment is not the compromise itself but discovering later that different people thought they had agreed to different trade-offs.

The minimum version of this conversation can be done in ten minutes. Each person completes three sentences: "On this trip, I really want...", "I will struggle if every day involves...", and "I am completely fine with sometimes...". The answers do not need to be elegant. "I really want at least two slow mornings. I will struggle if we're out all day every day. I am fine with people doing things without me."

That already tells the group something concrete. Someone else might say, "I really want to see a lot. I will struggle if we make every decision at the last minute. I am fine with going out early by myself." Suddenly what looked like a clash becomes design information.

Plan B is for the group that refuses anything resembling a "conversation about travel styles" because it sounds too formal. Do not call it that. Use actual choices. When comparing two accommodations, ask, "Would you rather pay more to be central or save money and travel in each day?" When discussing an excursion, ask, "Would leaving at seven be okay, or should we choose something that starts later?" When somebody suggests a packed itinerary, ask, "Do we want days this full regularly, or just once or twice?" People often reveal their preferences more honestly when responding to a real option than when asked to describe themselves in the abstract.

The goal is not agreement. That point matters enough to repeat. If the conversation ends with everyone saying the same thing, wonderful, but that is not the standard of success. Success means you know where the differences are and have a rough idea of how to handle them. One person may still want more activity. Another may still want more downtime. You simply stop treating those differences as surprises. The best groups do not magically want the same vacation. They know when to move together, when to divide, and when not to interpret someone else's preference as a criticism of their own.

Your next practical move is simple: before booking anything difficult to change, ask everyone to describe one ordinary vacation day from waking up to going to bed. No words like "relaxed," "spontaneous," or "a good mix." Use

times, energy, activities, meals, and breaks. Those details will tell you more about travel compatibility than ten years of knowing who everyone's favorite band is. Friendship tells you that you like these people. A little specificity tells you whether you should share a seven-day itinerary with them.