

UNITED WISDOM

Caution and constant readiness for a threat

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-08-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Caution and constant readiness for a threat

Epigraph

> *“Let it be still”.*

Laozi, *Tao Teh King*, §15.3: excerpt from the question about clearing muddy water; James Legge's English translation, Project Gutenberg no. 216. Text.

What this article is about

Imagine someone entering a familiar café and immediately noting the exits. They sit facing the door, hear every abrupt sound, and watch expressions on people's faces. One observer calls this foresight; another calls it anxiety. Neither word yet explains what is happening. Perhaps there is an actual reason for concern. Perhaps the surroundings are safer than before, but readiness remains unchanged. Perhaps a professional habit has switched on during a day off. Without circumstances, we do not know which answer is accurate.

This article distinguishes caution as a particular measure from constant readiness as a state that has difficulty finding an ending. We do not suggest that everyone should relax in the same way or turn attentiveness into a symptom. The threat's object, available measures, the cost of remaining on watch, and the possibility of switching attention all matter. Official information about post-traumatic stress disorder helps mark the boundary of professional assessment; a Daoist text shows the tension between acting early and refraining from excessive intervention. The practical question concerns the right to live in present circumstances without denying the past or surrendering all today's attention to every potential risk.

I. Caution has an object and a scale

Caution is easier to understand through a specific action. A driver slows before a difficult bend. A hiker checks the forecast before heading into the mountains. Someone refuses to give a banking code to a stranger. Each measure concerns a particular circumstance, can be explained, and related to a task. It does not guarantee the absence of every danger, but changes the conditions of a specific risk. Its value does not depend on the action being accompanied by pleasant calm: we can prepare reasonably and still feel worried.

In the imagined café, choosing a seat near the exit is sometimes a convenience, sometimes an appropriate precaution, and sometimes part of burdensome continuous monitoring. One

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

posture cannot tell us which. We need to know what is happening, why the seat was chosen, and how freely the person could choose another. They may simply prefer an end table because it is quieter. Outwardly identical behaviour does not entitle us to assign everyone the same history or explain their state with a single psychological term.

Scale depends not only on the possibility of an unpleasant event, but also on consequences, available means, and conditions. Preparing for an actual threat may require a great deal. In an ordinarily safe situation, constantly monitoring every movement carries a different cost. Instead of “Am I cautious or anxious?” we can consider the task: what does this measure protect against, and how would a change in circumstances be recognised? An answer may not appear immediately. Its absence does not prove the experience is invented; it points to a need to examine the situation more precisely.

II. Readiness needs room to end

Being on watch becomes especially burdensome when no relief arrives. The work check is over, the other person has stopped threatening, the journey has ended, yet readiness remains as if an instant response were still required. It helps to distinguish the end of an external episode from the ability to feel that ending. They may not coincide. This discrepancy is not a moral failure and does not mean someone consciously chooses tension. The article discusses an experience without establishing its sole cause.

Imagine a worker accustomed to answering their manager immediately. On a day off, they still check the phone every few minutes. Actual rules must be clarified first: can urgent work arise, is being on call paid, and are there penalties for not answering? If organisational expectations are unclear, an individual attempt to feel calm cannot replace an explicit agreement. If the shift has actually ended, a different difficulty can be explored: why is that ending not yet felt, and what might help mark the boundary?

Sometimes a clear message that the task has been handed over is enough; sometimes changes to the schedule, support, or working conditions are needed. Sometimes tension remains severe enough to discuss with a professional. These possibilities are not a mandatory ladder requiring everything to be tried alone first. One point matters: constant watchfulness should not be declared proof of exceptional responsibility. A responsible system provides for continuing work, handing it over, and rest. Someone unable to switch off readiness needs understanding, not an obligation to take pride in exhaustion.

III. An actual threat does not become an inner task

When danger continues, protection comes first. Violence, stalking, unsafe equipment, or workplace risk cannot be renamed an inability to trust the world. A person may notice the threat very accurately. Advice to pay less attention could then worsen their position. Inner state and external conditions must be considered together: an experience does not automatically prove danger, but a lack of visible calm does not disprove it. Circumstances and competent help concerning the risk are needed.

In a hypothetical example, a woman fears meeting someone who has already threatened her. If others suggest sitting beside that person to discover everything is fine, this is not a neutral exercise. She may refuse the meeting and seek appropriate safety measures. The article does not create an individual protection plan or give legal instructions. It marks a boundary: voluntary attention to experience must not become an obligation to contact a source of harm to demonstrate maturity.

There can be less obvious harmful conditions too. A team faces no physical threat, but mistakes bring public humiliation and rules change retrospectively. Continually monitoring the manager's mood may have an understandable purpose there. It may also cost the person dearly. Recognising its function does not mean approving the conditions. A question about switching attention does not cancel questions about agreements, support, and the possibility of changing the environment. The editorial distinction avoids two premature conclusions: explaining everything through surroundings or reducing everything to personal anxiety.

IV. The past can matter without becoming today's evidence

Previous experience enters our assessment. If someone has faced a threat, wariness may be understandable; this is no reason to demand immediate trust. Yet a particular past episode and a particular present event remain different. The same sound today may have another source. This is a point about examining circumstances, not a promise that comparing two moments logically will dissolve tension. Sometimes that very comparison is difficult for now.

NIMH's official PTSD publication notes that some people may feel stressed and on guard after danger has passed; its arousal and reactivity symptoms include being easily startled and feeling on guard. A diagnosis requires professional assessment of a combination of symptoms. This information does not establish PTSD in a reader who chooses a seat by the door. Nor does it establish that every experience of wariness results from a traumatic event.

In editorial discussion, both times should remain visible: what happened then and what is known now. You do not have to reconstruct a traumatic experience in detail alone for an exercise in this article. It is enough to acknowledge that earlier danger may make today's

episode particularly difficult and identify available support. Comparison should not turn into a trial of your reaction: “Everyone else has forgotten; why am I still like this?” A threat's ending does not prescribe the same recovery period for everyone. If the state interferes with life, help is appropriate without proving the past was severe enough.

V. The body need not explain itself in words first

Someone may notice readiness before formulating a reason: it is hard to stop watching the door, a loud sound abruptly interrupts conversation, or rest seems impossible. Describing what is observed is more precise than immediately assigning a hidden explanation. “I turned around several times” and “My safety system is impaired” are statements at different levels. The first can be examined in an episode; the second requires specialist grounds. The popular alarm metaphor can help conversation, but frequent use does not turn it into a physiological diagnosis.

Imagine friends meeting: one person stops hearing the conversation's meaning because they notice every surrounding sound. They can say so without a required account of their past. Perhaps changing seats or ending the visit would suit them; perhaps they want to stay and ask everyone to speak more quietly. Each option depends on circumstances. Leaving cannot be declared in advance to be avoidance that must be overcome. Nor can changing seats be promised to resolve the state. A small everyday choice remains a choice, not treatment.

Respect for an experience does not rule out a health assessment. New, marked, or concerning physical symptoms should not automatically be explained as stress. Medical assessment is discussed with a qualified professional; an acute threat to health calls for emergency help. This boundary protects against both self-treatment and an article's excessive certainty. Our text helps name an observation and the conditions in which it occurs. It does not remotely determine the sensation's cause, its treatment, or how safe it is to ignore a particular symptom.

NHS's chest-pain guidance specifically cautions against self-diagnosis and describes situations requiring immediate medical help. Here it provides a limited counterexample to explaining every bodily signal as anxiety; the article does not reproduce a detailed clinical pathway.

VI. Preparation and continuous monitoring offer different possibilities

A safety measure can exist outside a person's continuous attention. A clear communication procedure, functioning equipment, an agreed person responsible, and an available exit can structure a situation. This does not mean every technical measure is sufficient or can replace human judgement. Yet it matters to distinguish a prepared support from continuously searching for signs of trouble. Sometimes monitoring is necessary precisely because supports are absent. The useful question then concerns what is missing in the arrangement, not the amount of anxiety.

In a hypothetical group going for a walk, participants know the route and where to meet if separated. This agreement does not guarantee there will be no mistakes, but distributes work. If one person continually watches where everyone is, they can discuss whether that is actually their duty. Perhaps someone needs accompaniment and the role is necessary. Perhaps nobody assigned responsibility and the person silently assumed it. Clarifying the role changes the practical task without requiring an assessment of their character.

Preparation can expand endlessly too. A tenth fallback sometimes adds a useful possibility, sometimes consumes resources needed for the main task. Assessment should concern the specific risk and consequences. Dangerous activities have specialist standards; an everyday article does not reduce them. In ordinary life, one can ask which supports are already available and which actually are missing. Sometimes the answer leads to external action; sometimes it shows that another list does not address the central difficulty. In the latter case, a need for support can be acknowledged directly.

VII. Foresight need not look like suffering

In some conversations, calm is mistaken for indifference. If someone does not visibly worry, they seem insufficiently serious. Constant readiness then receives a social reward: it demonstrates care. Yet experience and the quality of action are not the same. Someone may worry and forget something important, or act calmly and attentively. This is an editorial distinction, not a scientific claim about which people are more reliable. Particular reliability is assessed through actions and results.

Imagine a family preparing for a trip. One member has arranged documents and a plan, then reads a book. Another says, “You are too relaxed.” Different grounds are possible: they found an omission, do not know about the preparation, or are frightened themselves. It helps first to establish what specifically remains undone. A concrete gap can be closed. If visible worry alone is required, tension becomes another obligation. This demand does not automatically

improve documents. It changes the interaction's atmosphere and may require a separate conversation.

Something similar happens internally: rest seems like betraying the future. The person is not simply anticipating danger; their state must prove they overlooked nothing. A more careful question is which necessary action is now missing. This is not a magic way to stop worrying. Sometimes there is no answer and tension remains; sometimes an actual task appears. But the demand to suffer loses its status as the task itself. Caring for the matter allows seriousness and recovery where conditions permit; no facial expression alone proves care's moral quality.

VIII. The Daoist text holds two directions

In §15 of the *Tao Teh King*, traditionally attributed to Laozi, the description of ancient masters includes caution compared to crossing a winter stream, and the image of muddy water clearing through stillness. Section 64 speaks of acting before disorder arises. We read sinologist James Legge's English version, Project Gutenberg no. 216. This is a classical philosophical and religious text with particular translation choices, not observation of a clinical sample. Its imagery does not establish a physiological model of anxiety.

The tension is interesting for our topic: prepare early and do not intensify every movement with another intervention. The editorial comparison does not turn these lines into a rule that waiting is always better. Actual danger may require early action; additional intervention in excessive control may sometimes add no benefit. Those examples belong to our article. The Daoist text cannot become universal advice for everyday risk management without losing its connection to the way of Dao and the figure of the sage.

Reading the water image as a demand to remain silent before violence is particularly inappropriate. Water can be a metaphor for attention, but a person has interests, a body, and the right to seek protection. Non-intervention in one scene and refusing to protect oneself are different actions. If a reader finds in the image permission not to rush every inner change, that is a personal application. It does not prove the ancient author described their condition or make inner calm a compulsory criterion of a successful life. The comparison remains meaningful precisely where boundaries are preserved.

IX. The right not to be the sole observer

Constant readiness is sometimes organised around the belief that nobody else will notice danger. Perhaps that is close to the truth: one person alone holds the role and others are untrained or unreliable. Help then concerns actual distribution of resources rather than being asked to trust without grounds. But where competent participants are present, it matters to establish whether responsibility can be shared. Delegating does not cancel duties. It makes visible who is responsible for what and how handover occurs.

Imagine an adult caring for an ill relative. Attentiveness may be necessary. Yet one person has difficulty providing everything continuously. Specialist recommendations, available services, and agreements with relatives are needed according to circumstances. This article does not suggest leaving someone without necessary care for the sake of rest. It distinguishes care from an unattainable arrangement in which one participant has no right to sleep or relief. Even a strong desire to help does not make that arrangement sustainable.

Asking to hand over part of the work may be difficult: someone fears being considered weak or an error occurring. The question can become specific: which task is entrusted to whom, for how long, and what does the receiving person know? A reasonable handover includes information and limits of competence. Where no suitable person is available, the problem remains real and calls for other resources. Acknowledging absent help is more accurate than blaming yourself for being unable to relax. Inner work cannot create a second worker, relative, or professional solely by changing an attitude.

Help need not begin with transferring the whole role. Sometimes another person can do one particular part: bring supplies, clarify a schedule, or stay nearby during a difficult call. The request can be small yet concrete. An answer then becomes an agreement that can be checked rather than a demand to prove love by taking responsibility for everything. Agreeing to one task does not make someone responsible for every future outcome. This limitation protects both the person asking and the person helping.

X. A safe episode need not immediately feel safe

Someone can understand that a meeting ended well and still remain tense. This is neither a reason to rewrite facts towards catastrophe nor to deny the experience. “Nothing threatening happened in this meeting” describes available circumstances. “I still cannot rest” describes a state. Both statements can remain alongside each other. Their coexistence helps avoid using a feeling either as the sole witness to an external event or as an argument against the person. An accurate double description is needed, not an immediate declaration of a winner.

In a hypothetical example, someone returns after a difficult conversation. The other person accepted the proposal, the agreement is recorded, and there are no new threats. They continue mentally preparing responses. They can notice that today's external task is complete without demanding immediate inner adjustment. If they wish, they choose a quiet activity or support available to them. If tension intensifies and obstructs life, the question of help remains open. Neither continuing reflection nor an unsuccessful attempt at distraction entitles the article to diagnose or promise one correct way to recover.

Sometimes a sense of safety draws on repeated experience of dependable relationships and clear conditions; no particular path can be prescribed for everyone. Someone may need an environment change, professional discussion of persistent symptoms, or clarification of a duty. Avoiding a new obligation matters: “Now I must prove I can relax.” This can make rest another test. Instead of judging your own correctness, the article suggests looking at circumstances, available actions, and support. The external threat's end matters; the inner state deserves attention without accusations of ingratitude for a safe day.

XI. A small boundary requires appropriate conditions

Everyday observation can begin with an episode where risk is low and instructions are respected. For example, someone wants to understand what happens after a work call ends. They notice whether new messages exist, what is still required, and which actions continue automatically. This is not an exercise in tolerating danger. It describes the transition between a task and free time. If conditions prevent stopping work, that limitation must first be acknowledged instead of displaying a wished-for picture of calm.

One can choose a small boundary: close a completed document, hand over an agreed task, or note the time of the next work check. Such a boundary must fit actual duties. Someone on call does not disconnect because an article suggests it. Someone whose working conditions are unclear can discuss them first. If the chosen measure does not help, that is information, not a failure of character. Perhaps it is too small for the situation or addresses the wrong object altogether. An action is assessed against its task without promises of universal effects on a state.

There is a right to decline observation. Sometimes attending to tension makes things harder, and continuing is unhelpful now. You need not force yourself to recall a threat, repeatedly measure anxiety, or turn notes into new surveillance. Voluntariness includes stopping, changing scale, and seeking support. Where difficulty is marked, professional discussion may be the first step rather than a reward after completing independent work. A reader need not prove a practice suitable by continuing despite deterioration.

It can help to discuss observation with someone close beforehand: “If I want to leave a noisy place, please do not turn it into an argument about courage.” This request does not require agreement with every explanation. It concerns support in a particular episode. People can also agree how to communicate a need for a pause without telling everyone present a personal history. Privacy becomes part of suitable conditions. Nobody should gain access to someone's past merely because they notice tension or offer help.

XII. When constant readiness deserves separate help

If being on guard persistently interferes with sleep, work, relationships, or daily activities, it is worth discussing with a qualified professional. According to NIMH, a mental health professional assesses possible PTSD; the combination of symptoms and circumstances matters. This reference does not mean every such experience is PTSD. A conversation can start with observation rather than a label: what happens, when it began, what it obstructs, and whether danger continues.

You can prepare one example instead of trying to tell your entire life immediately. Someone describes being unable to stop monitoring the phone after a shift, or abrupt sounds regularly disrupting conversation. There is no need to prove the cause in advance. External conditions and health information matter to a professional; this article does not determine which examinations are required. If a particular professional is unsuitable, another accessible competent route can be sought. Money, time, and service limitations are real and should be named directly rather than blaming someone for not wanting to care for themselves.

The opening café question now becomes more precise. A person can choose a comfortable seat; they need not sit with their back to the door to test courage. They can notice actual danger and leave. They can discover there is no threat while tension still calls for support. Caution and constant readiness need not be separated by labels of good and bad character. Their function, circumstances, and consequences distinguish them. Caring for safety includes protection, sharing responsibility, resting under suitable conditions, and receiving help when the inner watch does not end on its own.

What this means in practice

For voluntary observation, choose one everyday episode without obvious danger. Describe only what can be noticed: where you were, what you monitored, what had to be done, and when the external task ended. Then name the known threat separately from a supposition about threat. Do not force yourself to prove all wariness unnecessary. If actual unsafety appears, protection and appropriate help become the subject, not an attempt to reduce attention to events.

Consider one available support: a clear agreement, a role handover, correcting a specific condition, or talking with someone able to help. It should fit your situation without overriding mandatory precautions, care for a dependent person, or professional rules. If nothing suitable is available, that can remain an honest unknown or limitation. You need not manufacture the appearance of independence in place of an absent resource. Sometimes the next step is a competent service or professional, not another note about feelings.

After the episode, compare the external result and state. Is the task complete? Have circumstances changed? Did readiness decrease, remain, or intensify? The answer is not a judgement of the person's correctness. A lack of immediate relief does not automatically make a safe episode dangerous. Yet persistent tension should not be ignored. If observation worsens your state, stop; detailed reconstruction of a traumatic experience is not an assignment in this article or necessary for understanding its distinctions.

If constant readiness substantially restricts life, discuss it with a qualified professional. You can arrive without a self-assigned diagnosis and describe concrete consequences. An immediate threat to life, violence, or acute health danger requires help where you are and safety measures; reading and everyday exercises yield to those needs. Neither Daoist imagery nor philosophical interest requires enduring a threat. This practice clarifies circumstances and choices of support; it does not treat PTSD or test a person's ability to become calm.

Key quotation

> *“order should be secured before disorder has begun.”*

Tao Teh King, §64.1, James Legge's translation; short excerpt. In this article, the line preserves room for preparation alongside §15's stillness image; it is not a universal standard for risk assessment.

Connections between traditions

Sources	Meaningful comparison	Boundary
Tao Teh King, §15 ↔ §64	Stillness and early preparation coexist within one text	Not two clinical methods or an instruction to endure danger
Daoist limits on intervention ↔ the editorial distinction between preparation and monitoring	Additional action should relate to its object	Everyday examples are the authors' application, without claiming an ancient psychological theory
NIMH clinical information ↔ the everyday right to finish a shift	Circumstances and the consequences of persistent readiness matter	PTSD is professionally assessed; attentiveness or a seat by the door does not establish a diagnosis

The map is limited to the sources read. Other religions and schools are not represented and are not declared to agree.

Sources

• *Tao Teh King*, §§15, 64, James Legge's translation. Project Gutenberg no. 216; the named sections and edition information were read. Caution, water imagery, and early action; philosophical support, not medical evidence.

• NIMH. Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. Definition, symptoms, continuing danger, professional assessment, and treatment sections were read. Used only for careful description of being on guard and the boundary of assessment; no treatment is prescribed.

• NHS. Chest pain. The entire short page was read. Limited support for avoiding self-diagnosis of a physical symptom; British numbers and pathways are not represented as international.

Tags

caution, safety, threat, wariness, readiness, watchfulness, responsibility, rest, attention, PTSD, professional help, Laozi, Tao Teh King, James Legge, Daoism, preparation, past, present, bodily experience, circumstances, boundaries, support, delegation, care, switching attention

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity between traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline.
Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki