

UNITED WISDOM

A bodily signal, a psychological hypothesis, and the need for assessment

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-15-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A bodily signal, a psychological hypothesis, and the need for assessment

Epigraph

> *“I exist.”*

René Descartes, Meditations on First Philosophy, II, §3, a fragment in John Veitch's 1901 translation. A philosophical argument about certainty, not a medical recommendation. [S3]

What this article is about

After a difficult conversation, someone notices an unpleasant sensation and thinks: perhaps this is because of the emotional experience. That sentence already combines an event, a bodily observation, and an explanation. Their coincidence in time does not yet establish a mechanism. An unknown cause, however, does not cancel the sensation's presence or its interference with life. Between denying the body and immediately assigning a diagnosis, there is room for a more precise conversation.

This article helps separate a bodily signal, a psychological hypothesis, and a decision about medical assessment. It offers no way to diagnose yourself through feelings, list of tests for everyone, or promise to eliminate a symptom by understanding its meaning. Official NICE guidance and NHS pages provide narrow medical grounds; Descartes's philosophical text allows separate consideration of the limits of moving from experience to explanation. Hypothetical scenes concern conversation, recording observations, boundaries with relatives, and working with the unknown. These actions can prepare a discussion, but cannot replace a medical decision or delay help that is already necessary.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. A sensation, a hypothesis, and an action answer different questions

A bodily observation answers what is happening in experience: where and when a sensation appeared, how the person describes it, and what it interferes with. A hypothesis answers another question: why it might have happened. Action concerns the next step: what needs clarification and with whom, and what an existing care plan already provides. Sometimes these three answers fit into one sentence and their transitions disappear. An assumption then begins to sound like a fact, while the chosen action sounds like its only possible consequence.

In the opening scene, a conversation and an unpleasant sensation afterwards are known. The person can name a possible connection with the emotional experience while preserving its status as a hypothesis. This is more precise than declaring the body proof of a hidden conflict. They can also say whether the sensation is new or familiar, continuing or changed, and whether it restricts a particular activity. Such language does not require denying emotion to take the body seriously. It supplies different information without making one part replace the others.

Imagine a relative responding: since it started after the conversation, there is nothing to discuss with a doctor. In this conclusion, a temporal sequence acquires authority to exclude other questions. Another relative might immediately name a particular disease on the basis of an acquaintance's similar experience. Both statements go beyond the available information. You need not choose between them; you can return to the subject: the cause is not yet established, and what matters now is to describe the change and understand an appropriate next step in these circumstances.

Distinguishing these levels does not entail an endless pause. An unknown cause is compatible with action sufficiently grounded in the present situation. You can clarify an agreed plan, seek individual assessment, or formulate a question for a professional already involved. You can discuss emotional context without declaring it the final explanation. This article examines how a decision is organised; its medical content depends on a symptom, history, and assessment which a general editorial scene does not contain.

II. Certainty about an experience is not certainty about its cause

In the second Meditation, Descartes seeks an indubitable point of reference in his existence while thinking. [S3] His task concerns philosophical knowledge rather than symptom assessment. We take a limited distinction between what is given in experience and what still needs justification concerning it. The text does not establish a contemporary mechanism of bodily sensations or propose opposing the mind to medical investigation of the body.

For our discussion, you can confidently report: this is unpleasant, I notice this change, it affects an ordinary task. That confidence does not imply equal confidence in its origin. A person has privileged access to describing their experience, but access to experience does not automatically supply all information about a cause. This distinction allows a report to be heard seriously while retaining room to examine its explanatory part.

In a hypothetical scene, someone says a sensation intensified in an office where they felt uncomfortable. A listener can acknowledge both parts. There is no need to demand proof of discomfort before hearing it. Yet one episode cannot settle a medical question. You can clarify what changed and which other information is available. Conversation about feelings remains conversation about feelings until suitable grounds appear for a causal conclusion.

This also guards against the opposite error: if an explanation was not confirmed, the person must merely have imagined the experience. The hypothesis and the reported experience have different statuses. Someone can be mistaken about a connection between events while accurately describing a difficulty. Clarifying the cause should not become a trial of honesty. The right to be heard does not depend on immediately providing the correct theory of your body. This boundary helps a conversation proceed without defending every initial assumption as part of your dignity.

III. Assessment has a specific question and a limit

In NICE NG193 for chronic pain, decisions about investigating disease use clinical judgement in discussion with the person; a changed presentation requires reconsideration of the diagnosis. [S1] These recommendations concern their own area, rather than ordering tests for every sensation. The official search-returned selected recommendations were read; direct opening was unavailable. We do not turn their wording into independent diagnosis of other conditions.

For the editorial scene, distinguish the question addressed by an assessment from a wish for final certainty about everything. Someone can ask what a particular action is intended to clarify, how the answer will affect the plan, and which limitations remain. This question does not deny a professional's competence. It helps you understand a proposal and participate in the decision, instead of imagining that any investigation either explains your entire life or is completely useless.

Imagine two conversations. In the first, someone wants to establish whether a new change belongs to an already known history. In the second, they want a guarantee that they will never again experience an unpleasant sensation. These requests concern different objects. The article does not decide which test is needed in the first case or promise to fulfil the second. It suggests naming an expectation before discussion, so a medical action does not receive an unspoken assignment to provide absolute protection against the future.

A limit also prevents an arbitrary list. An acquaintance had several investigations; this does not establish a place for the same set in your situation. Conditions, histories, and questions may differ. You can bring previous results and ask a specific question about further assessment. A personal record determines neither the necessity nor the lack of necessity of a test. It makes the subject of discussion visible and prevents confusing preparation for an assessment with an assessment already performed.

IV. An unidentified cause does not make a sensation fabricated

The NHS explains that persistent medically unexplained symptoms are real; not finding a cause does not mean someone is pretending. [S2] This is patient information rather than a diagnosis for every reader or a claim that assessment is always complete. You cannot assign yourself the page's label simply because there is no answer today. What matters here is the boundary between an unknown explanation and invalidation of a report.

Imagine someone receiving a result that does not explain their sensation. A relative says: that means everything is normal, so stop talking about it. An answer to one medical question becomes permission to exclude the difficulty from conversation. You can describe the result precisely without expanding it to the person's entire condition. What was investigated, which answer was obtained, and what remains unclear are different parts of the report. They should not be replaced by an overall conclusion about the right to experience discomfort.

Someone might also want to defend their reality by making discovery of a disease compulsory. Uncertainty then becomes a personal defeat: without a name, I will not be recognised. The article does not suggest choosing an illness to obtain recognition. You can ask for an explanation of a result and the remaining plan, describe the sensation's effect on life, and discuss support. Every medical uncertainty need not become proof that a participant is deliberately concealing the truth.

Precise language preserves room for revision. A particular conclusion was obtained at a particular time with the information then known. This differs both from an endless guarantee and from certainty that nothing was done. A report can include a result and continuing difficulty without logical conflict. The article does not assign repeat investigation to every such case; that decision has a medical subject. A result does not require erasing experience from discussion or declaring it exclusively a moral problem.

V. Urgency cannot be established through an assumed meaning

A psychological story does not determine medical urgency. The NHS identifies, for example, sudden chest pain or discomfort that does not go away as grounds for immediate help. [S4] This sign requires the local emergency medical route; examining emotions should not delay seeking help. This example is not a complete way to determine urgency, and absence of the named sign does not prove other symptoms safe.

The example matters because a persuasive everyday hypothesis can emerge before medical understanding. Someone remembers an argument, a difficult day, or a similar previous episode. This information may matter in conversation, but does not by itself authorise declaring a new condition safe. The article does not suggest assessing danger through the strength of a feeling, degree of calm, or success in relaxing. An emotional report can contain important circumstances without cancelling a separate question about help.

The opposite extreme, assigning one degree of urgency to every sensation, also erases distinctions. Bodily events differ in circumstances, history, and recommendations already received. A general text does not know these sufficiently. Therefore there is no instruction here for everyone immediately to attend one service. You can use a medical route appropriate to the specific situation and clarify an unclear plan, retaining the difference between urgent action and later discussion of experiences.

Recording is intended for a situation where it does not delay necessary action. If appropriate help is already required, that route comes first. A record can be made later or to the extent that it actually helps communicate information. You do not need to finish a philosophical reflection, discover a hidden conflict, or convincingly explain the event to yourself before receiving help. The right to it is not awarded for the quality of a story about inner life or made conditional on first overcoming uncertainty.

VI. A report for a professional can be prepared without a ready diagnosis

Preparation differs from trying to become your own diagnostician. Its subject is a clear report about one question. You can separate description of a sensation, its onset, noticeable changes, and the ordinary activity that became difficult. Beside these, retain your own explanation marked as an assumption. This order does not require exclusively technical language. Understandable everyday words may convey experience more accurately than a borrowed term whose meaning you are not sure you understand.

In a hypothetical scene, someone prepares a message but writes only: this is my anxiety. The recipient cannot see what specifically is troubling them or what changed. Another record could

read differently: after the conversation, this sensation appeared; I suspect a connection with my experience; I want to clarify how this change should be assessed. The emotional hypothesis remains, but does not close access to other questions. You need not choose between acknowledging feelings and reporting a bodily event.

It helps to distinguish your observation from other participants' words. You noticed a particular change; a relative suggested an explanation; you previously received a particular conclusion. These statements can sit alongside each other, but have different origins. Family certainty need not be presented as a medical fact. Where a previous result is available, report its actual wording instead of reconstructing from memory a broader promise which nobody made.

Preparation has a sufficient endpoint. A few clear details and the main question are better than endlessly correcting a report towards perfect completeness. You can say you do not remember part of the timing or sequence. Unknowns need not be filled to create an impression of a responsible patient. A professional can ask further questions. The editorial task is to reduce confusion between levels of reporting; it guarantees no particular consultation outcome and does not measure assessment quality through the length of the record you bring.

There is another difficulty: someone may pre-translate their account into the listener's presumed language. To appear rational, they remove mention of the argument; to fit a psychological conversation, they remove a bodily detail. Known information is lost in both cases. You can name an event in ordinary words without tailoring it to a desirable explanation. If a term is unclear, ask what it means. If your hypothesis differs from what you heard, present that difference as a question. This does not require arguing to prove independence; participation also means checking whether the report was understood before agreeing to its further use.

VII. A psychological hypothesis should not become an accusation

A hypothesis about the role of experience sometimes quietly turns into a moral conclusion: if my body responds to my life, I must be living wrongly. An accusation has been added between these claims and needs grounds of its own. The article does not establish the cause of a particular symptom or distribute blame for it. You can discuss emotional context without demanding that your condition be presented as punishment, a message, or a test of sufficient inner work.

Imagine someone describing a difficult period and a listener suggesting that they discover whom they have not forgiven. Such a question may belong to a particular personal or spiritual practice if the person chooses it. It does not become a medical conclusion. Failure to discover a story does not prove resistance, and disappearance of an unpleasant feeling after a

conversation does not establish a universal mechanism. The right to choose meaning remains alongside the right not to receive an imposed account of your guilt.

Another question is possible: which aspect of conversation about life does the person want to examine independently of explaining the symptom? They might want to change an unspoken arrangement about time, request help with a household task, or name an unpleasant remark. These actions have grounds of their own within relationships. They need not be justified by promising bodily improvement. Emotional work gains a clear subject instead of becoming a test you must pass to prove that your difficulty is serious.

If the chosen conversation changes nothing about the sensation, describe its result separately. An agreement may have become clearer while a symptom remains. This does not make the clearer agreement useless or prove insufficient effort. Two results need not coincide. The distinction leaves room both for a medical question and for your life, without forcing every useful change to prove that the cause of a bodily event has already been discovered.

A counterexample matters for cultural interpretation too. In a family, tiredness is regarded as proof of diligence: good work means you should feel exhausted. Someone may value work without accepting this compulsory connection as a measure of correctness. You can respect a family history and examine the present event separately. A familiar general formula does not know every circumstance today. Revising it does not require declaring relatives harmful or your entire culture wrong. It is enough not to commission one story to decide in advance which bodily reports deserve attention and which must be concealed for belonging.

VIII. Support from a relative does not require choosing one cause

A relative can participate in someone's situation without having the correct explanation. They can ask what is needed now: listening, help formulating a question, accompaniment through an agreed route, or a change to a specific household load. Such offers do not establish a diagnosis. They concern available participation. Support becomes more precise when it does not demand prior proof of the event's medical or psychological nature before acknowledging an ordinary human request.

In a hypothetical scene, a partner offers to take over one household task for the evening. This can be an agreed action with a clear timeframe. It does not mean the partner has recognised a disease or confirmed a stress hypothesis. Every explanation need not be obtained before available help is discussed. Equally, the offer gives no right to prescribe someone's entire routine, cancel their decisions, or tell others a private history without consent.

Declining a specific request should not automatically be read as disbelief in a symptom either. The other person may lack time, opportunity, or sufficient information. You can clarify the limit of participation and seek another form. If the listener explicitly mocks the report, that is a

separate fact of communication. You do not need to establish its hidden cause to name an unwanted form. Here we discuss treatment between people, retaining medical assessment within its own area.

A supportive conversation can contain honest uncertainty. I hear that this is difficult; I do not know the cause; I can help in this way. That position promises no more than is available and does not claim a professional's authority. The person need not choose one family theory in order to receive help. Participation remains a shared decision with a clear task and boundary. Neither care nor independence requires immediately resolving every question about the sensation's origin.

IX. Uncertainty can be included in a further plan

A plan need not consist of a completely known explanation. Sometimes its parts are clearer than the cause: a particular conclusion has been received, an action agreed, a question or condition for further discussion remains. The article does not fill these parts with medical prescriptions. It helps distinguish the absence of a final answer from the absence of any next step. An unknown can be named directly in a plan instead of being hidden behind a confident psychological formula.

Imagine that, after discussion, someone knows whom to ask for clarification and which information already obtained to retain. That may be sufficient for the present organisational task. It need not become a guarantee of a future condition. You can name separately what remains open. If the plan is unclear, the question concerns its content: which action was agreed, whom to contact about a change, and what a result meant. Clarification need not begin by accusing every participant of incompetence.

Your own possibilities also have limits. Someone may not have every document, available time, or a clear route. The actual obstacle is then discussed: obtaining a copy, finding a contact, clarifying appointment arrangements, asking for organisational assistance. These actions do not establish the cause of a symptom, but may make a next step accessible. The article does not present a general phrase about care as evidence of existing medical access or declare a lack of resources a failure of personal responsibility.

Revision also needs an object. New information appeared, the reported situation changed, or a previous agreement proved unclear or unavailable. These facts differ from wanting absolute certainty again merely because uncertainty feels unpleasant. A general text does not decide when medical reassessment is necessary; it helps formulate its question more precisely. You can remain open to clarification without declaring an initial hypothesis final or cancelling reasonable action already taken.

X. Precision leaves room for both the body and your life

The person in the opening scene can retain a thought about the significance of the difficult conversation. They need not abandon it in order to discuss the bodily event seriously. It is enough not to present it as the sole established explanation. Separate subjects then appear: the sensation, a medical question, emotional context, and a specific possibility of a relative's participation. Each has its information and limits. None needs to absorb all the others for the conversation to be coherent.

A next step may be small and clearly defined. Send a clear report, clarify a plan, obtain help through the appropriate route, or discuss one household arrangement. Its result should be examined in its own area. Was the question asked, the answer received, the agreed action performed? These do not automatically yield a full diagnosis or final understanding of life. A modest organisational result retains value without promising to eliminate the whole difficulty at once.

You may also find no suitable personal meaning. A bodily event need not end in an attractive story of growth. Absence of such a story does not cancel the right to assessment, support, and respect. If someone chooses philosophical or spiritual reflection, retain its voluntary character and its difference from medical grounds. A personal meaning may help someone live through a situation, but should not present an unknown cause as fact or turn a continuing symptom into evidence of moral failure.

Precision here means three separate possibilities: acknowledge experience, leave explanation open, and act on sufficient grounds. It requires neither complete distrust of feelings nor submission to every interpretation that emerges. The bodily signal receives attention, the psychological hypothesis an honest status, and the medical decision an appropriate subject. Someone retains the right to participate in their life while part of the knowledge remains unavailable, and to receive necessary help without first justifying their whole inner history.

What this means in practice

This editorial practice prepares a conversation where recording does not delay necessary help. It determines neither diagnosis nor urgency and prescribes no investigations. For the chosen episode, record separately what you noticed, which cause you suspect, and which question about the next action remains. If an action is already provided by a received medical plan, do not replace it with trying first to discover psychological meaning.

In the description, retain your own understandable words, known timing, and the change to an ordinary task. Do not fill gaps to be persuasive. Note separately an available conclusion or recommendation and your expectation of the discussion. Check whether that expectation has

become a request to guarantee the entire future. Individual medical assessment requires specific information; a general article does not choose tests or treatment for you.

Name one question for discussion and one possible request to a relative. The question might clarify an answer already received or an agreed route. The request concerns available participation rather than confirmation of your theory. If you wish to discuss experience, define an independent subject: words, an agreement, support. Do not assess the quality of that conversation solely by whether the bodily sensation disappeared.

After the step, record the result at its actual scale and what remains unknown. A report was prepared, a question asked, help received, or an obstacle clarified. This does not clinically confirm the editorial practice. You can finish an organisational task without declaring medical assessment complete. The main distinction remains available: experience requires attention, a hypothesis requires grounds, and action need not await a final explanation when it already has a sufficient subject.

Key quotation

> *“I exist.”*

Descartes, Meditations, II, §3; John Veitch, 1901. The minimal fragment returns to a philosophical question of certainty; it does not explain a symptom's origin. [S3]

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity	Boundary
NICE and the editorial distinction between questions	A decision has a specific subject and area of application.	Clinical chronic pain guidance does not become a rule for every bodily event.
NHS and conversation about acknowledging experience	Uncertainty permits respectful treatment.	Patient information is not assigned as a personal diagnosis.
Descartes and the editorial scene	Knowledge and explanation are considered separately.	Philosophical certainty is neither medical evidence nor an instruction.

The comparison retains different purposes. Philosophy does not justify a medical prescription, and a medical recommendation does not establish compulsory spiritual meaning.

Primary sources

• S1. NICE. NG193: Chronic pain (primary and secondary) in over 16s. Published 7 April 2021; official search-returned recommendations 1.1.1–23 were read, direct open returned 403. Neither the full PDF nor evidence reviews were read.

• S2. NHS. Medically unexplained symptoms. Whole page read; last review 5 June 2024, next review 5 June 2027.

• S3. René Descartes. Meditations. John Veitch, 1901, Lancaster; the whole selected Meditation II and available context were read; not the entire work.

• S4. NHS. Chest pain. Whole page read; last review 8 August 2023, next review 8 August 2026 has passed. Available official version; the emergency signs are not reproduced in full and the UK number is not universalised.

Tags

Bodily signal, psychological hypothesis, investigation, medical assessment, symptom, unknown, experience, cause, observation, clinical judgement, chronic pain, urgency, help, plan, conversation, support, boundaries, independence, diagnosis, respect, preparing a question, access, medical information, philosophy, Descartes, NICE, NHS, 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 examine these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.