

UNITED WISDOM

When to stop a practice and discuss it with a professional

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-24-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

When to stop a practice and discuss it with a professional

Epigraph

> *“Consider these things”.*

Epictetus, The Encheiridion, chapter XXIX, translated by George Long. A short fragment concerning the conditions and consequences of a choice; the Russian rendering was made for this article. The philosophical context is not a medical instruction.

What this article is about

After an activity, someone says, “I feel worse, but perhaps that is how it is supposed to be.” The sentence already combines two different reports: a description of a change and an explanation still to be examined. Sometimes it reflects a wish to preserve an important practice. Sometimes it follows a facilitator's advice, a fear of disappointing a group, or the thought that stopping proves weakness. Yet a voluntary activity can be ended before its causes and meaning have been finally established.

This article concerns that boundary. Here, practice means a chosen activity involving attention, reflection, or contemplation; the research discussion refers to the specified meditation practices and mindfulness programmes, rather than every activity at once. We will distinguish unpleasant experience, duration, impact on everyday life, and the urgency of help. An article cannot establish a diagnosis, prescribe treatment, or decide who is suited to a particular school. Hypothetical scenes show how to report a difficulty more accurately and choose an appropriate interlocutor while retaining the right to change a decision.

I. Stopping does not require a final theory

Imagine someone who has followed recorded attention instructions for several evenings. During the latest session, they experienced marked distress and switched off the recording. Now a question troubles them: were they entitled to stop when the cause remained unknown? Perhaps the activity was involved, perhaps the events of the day, or a combination of circumstances. That uncertainty should indeed be preserved. Permission to end a voluntary action, however, does not depend on having proved its causal role already.

Someone can say: I am ending this activity now because I do not want to continue in this state. The sentence makes no claim about harm from an entire tradition and supplies no diagnosis. It

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

states a current boundary of participation. If the activity is part of prescribed care, changes to the plan should be discussed with the treating professional; this article does not suggest independently stopping medication or other care. The possibility of reporting difficulty remains important in that setting too. Silence does not make a plan more accurate.

In practice, a promise to finish a course can obscure the right to stop. Someone has paid, set aside time, and told friends about their decision. Stopping seems to diminish everything already done. Past expenditure, however, does not tell them which next step is suitable today. They can keep the course materials, describe what is happening, and discuss further participation separately. A decision to continue need not be made at the most difficult moment, in front of the whole group, or under the threat of losing a facilitator's approval.

Stopping also does not require a public explanation of every detail. An organiser can be told that participation has ended and a separate conversation is needed; personal information is disclosed voluntarily for a clear purpose. Another participant can help contact an appropriate person without acquiring the right to prescribe continuation. A particular decision on a particular evening is at the centre of this scene. It should not become a test of worth, loyalty to a school, or the person's general capacity to attend to their inner life.

II. Describe the experience and its consequences

“Unpleasant” can name very different events. One person found the sitting position uncomfortable. Another felt upset after thinking about a conversation postponed long ago. A third reports that for several days after a session they have slept poorly and found ordinary activities difficult. These accounts call for different clarifications; forceful language does not replace an account of the circumstances. Useful questions concern what happened, when it started, what continued after the session, and which part of everyday life changed.

For example, a participant says they felt strange. They can be invited to name accessible features in their own words. They might describe distance from things, increased tension, difficulty concentrating, or bodily discomfort. There is no need to choose a religious term or clinical label for them. If suitable words are missing, that too can be reported to a professional. Concrete information helps: when the session began, how long it lasted, what the person did afterwards, and what became harder than usual.

Duration and severity should remain distinct. A brief experience might have been frightening; a less vivid change might have interfered with ordinary life for a long time. Duration alone establishes no diagnosis or universal threshold of acceptability. It does help a listener understand an account. Someone can say whether the event ended with the session, recurred later, or is continuing now. The description need not be perfect. It can be clarified in conversation without postponing help until a polished record is ready.

The starting situation matters as well. What was happening before the session, had similar difficulties occurred earlier, and had sleep, workload, or prescribed care changed? These questions matter for assessment, but should not be used to explain everything in advance through the participant alone. A previous difficulty does not prove that the practice was uninvolved; its absence does not prove the reverse. A short sequence of events preserves both possibilities. It provides material for consideration instead of a ready-made accusation against the person or the method.

III. After does not always mean because of

When deterioration follows a session, the timing deserves attention. But sequence alone does not establish a single cause. Work, relationships, sleep, or health may have changed on the same day. Several circumstances sometimes act together. To end a voluntary activity, someone does not have to rule out everything else. A confident claim about the cause requires more grounds. Separating these tasks avoids an unnecessary choice between ignoring an experience and explaining it too quickly.

It is particularly important not to turn checking a cause into a personal trial. Someone may think: I will repeat the exercise and see whether I feel bad again. This article does not propose that check. Repeating an activity accompanied by substantial distress is not required to establish proof. Assessment of causes and a subsequent plan belongs in a conversation with an appropriate professional. The available history can be reported without another deterioration, while the question of resuming remains open until it has been discussed.

In the first chapter of How We Think, Dewey considers seeking additional grounds for a suggestion. Here, his philosophical distinction, chapter I, section 4, helps name an explanation's status: it is still being examined. It provides no medical protocol and does not require enduring distress for inquiry. The article's editorial application concerns conversation: an observed change can be separated from how the person, facilitator, or group interpreted it.

The distinction does not make an account less serious. Someone can state confidently that they slept badly after a session and say honestly that they do not know the cause. Advice to continue and their own doubts can be recorded separately. A professional need not receive a finished theory from a participant. It may be more helpful to see where reports coincide, what remains unknown, and which decisions have already been made. Accuracy makes it possible to discuss options while attending to what actually happened.

IV. Research does not supply a personal risk percentage

Lindahl and colleagues' 2017 study specifically investigated challenging meditation experiences among Western Buddhist practitioners. Purposeful selection supported descriptions of experience; it did not yield a frequency among all practitioners. This limit is explicit in the methods and limitations. The entire paper was not read; original interviews were unavailable. This article does not transfer the selection to children, every religion, or any attention activity.

In the abstract read from Britton and colleagues' 2021 study, experiences after variants of an eight-week MBCT programme were assessed on several dimensions, including duration and effects on functioning. This concerns a particular sample and instrument. The APS publisher abstract is not a stand-alone scale for our reader. Van Dam and colleagues' 2025 study likewise separates definitions of experiences and impairment; the selected methods and limitations do not permit causal conclusions from a cross-sectional survey.

A modest conclusion matters for an everyday decision: inserting any percentage found online into one's evening cannot supply an answer about one's own condition. A number concerns who was asked, when, how, and about what. Participants can read the sources, but discussion of their situation still needs its circumstances. A research reference does not entitle a facilitator to dismiss an individual report. Nor does it allow every unusual sensation to be declared established harm without further consideration.

A safety conversation is therefore better built around available information and competent assessment. What is the person reporting now? How has everyday life changed? Which actions need attention immediately, and which can be discussed without urgency? Research uncertainty does not mean help must await completion of all science. It means promises and explanations should be proportionate to their grounds. People retain the right to stop, ask questions, and choose a next step without a statistical label assigned through a general article.

V. Philosophical demands have limits of application

In chapter XXIX of The Encheiridion, Epictetus proposes considering conditions and consequences before a commitment, then compares the philosophical path with an athlete's demanding preparation. The text also judges inconsistency harshly. The chapter read in Long's translation belongs to a Stoic moral argument. It does not establish clinical safety criteria for contemporary meditation. It cannot show that someone must continue an activity while their health deteriorates.

This distinction matters because discipline can easily become the answer to any complaint. A person may indeed meet difficulty while learning something new. Declaring every difficulty

useful in advance, however, ends the inquiry into what is happening. In a hypothetical scene, one participant is tired of an unfamiliar schedule, while another reports continuing distress. The same appeal to endurance obscures a difference that calls for conversation. Historical authority does not supply the missing information about either person.

The useful part of the moral question can remain: which commitments am I making, and do I understand their conditions? When choosing a course, this means learning its content, how difficulties are discussed, the facilitator's competence, and the possibility of ending participation. Such information guarantees no result. It supports a more intelligible choice. If conditions change or substantial new information emerges, a decision can also be reconsidered. Responsibility for a choice includes attending to changes, rather than only keeping the original promise.

A conversation with a tradition can be critical and respectful at once. We can hear its demand for consistency, preserve the context, and decline to apply it to a question for which it provides insufficient grounds. An ancient text need not be assigned contemporary consent rules or made the author of a present medical recommendation. The comparison here shows a limit of transfer. It allows learning about commitments without turning a philosopher's words into permission for other people to control a participant's health.

VI. How to tell a facilitator about a difficulty

Someone can begin briefly: this change occurred during this activity; it continued afterwards; I am now ending participation and want to discuss further action. The sentence names the event, consequence, and decision. They can add which information is available to the facilitator and what help is already in place. There is no need to apologise in advance or prove the exercise dangerous for everyone. If writing is easier, the message can be kept privately and sent to a chosen recipient after its content is checked.

Brown University's official MBSR and MBCT material describes discussing risks, contact with a teacher, and possible referral for additional support. It is a specific institutional example, rather than an account of every facilitator. It suggests questions for one's own setting: who considers difficulties in this course, how can that person be contacted, and what follows a report? A promise of kindness is better accompanied by an intelligible way to obtain help.

A facilitator's response can also be clarified. If they call the event a necessary stage, someone can ask for the grounds of the claim and the competence within which it is made. If they advise consulting a professional, the questions are which kind and how urgently. A suggested change in practice needs to be considered alongside medical care where that exists. Agreeing to a conversation does not automatically mean agreeing to resume. Someone can hear an explanation and leave continuation undecided.

Sometimes the conversation fails. A report is dismissed, silence before the group is demanded, or accepting an explanation becomes a condition of respectful treatment. Someone can end that conversation and seek another appropriate route to help. The article does not judge every member of a school from one episode. It preserves a boundary: a person need not obtain this facilitator's approval before reporting distress to another competent interlocutor. The history of that request may help further consideration of the situation.

VII. Choose the interlocutor for the question

Professional also needs clarification. A teacher within a tradition can explain its language and rules. A course facilitator can clarify instructions and the organisation of participation. A health professional assesses health questions within their training. Several conversations may be needed for one case. One person may combine roles, but that should not be assumed from confident speech, follower numbers, or years of personal practice. Competence relevant to the current question is what matters.

For example, someone wants both to understand an experience's meaning in their tradition and to discuss disturbed sleep. These questions can be named separately. A religious explanation does not replace health assessment; a medical conversation need not resolve all the person's theological questions. They can exist alongside one another when further actions are coordinated and significant information is not concealed from those providing help. The participant can clarify the limits of each conversation and decide which personal details to disclose to whom, for which purpose.

Before a consultation, a short record may help: the chosen activity, duration, onset of the change, what continued afterwards, its effects on activities, and current care. This is an editorial suggestion for communicating clearly, not a diagnostic test. If there is no record or someone cannot make one, seeking help remains possible. The interlocutor will ask the necessary questions. Accuracy matters, but should not become a barrier that leaves a person alone until they can describe everything perfectly.

Where care is already prescribed, the treating professional can be told about an added practice and emerging difficulties. This article does not suggest independently changing medication or a plan to test the practice. Nor is it helpful to change many conditions at once on miscellaneous advice: reconstructing events will then be harder. A specific care plan is determined with an appropriate professional. The concern here is preparing a conversation and having the right to raise a question, rather than selecting treatment from general material.

VIII. When discussion must not delay urgent help

When a person's life or safety is in immediate danger, local emergency help is required. The NHS urgent-help page identifies inability to maintain safety as grounds for immediate action. Its numbers concern England; another country needs its own emergency route. In that situation, help should not be delayed to continue an exercise, read an article, or establish the spiritual meaning of events.

Urgency concerns what is happening now, rather than only confidence in an explanation. Someone may not know whether their state is connected to the activity. They need not first obtain a facilitator's agreement with their account. Where a trusted person is available, they can be asked to help contact a local service and explain the situation. This does not make the trusted person a professional or replace assessment. Their participation can provide concrete assistance in arranging the necessary contact.

There is also a need for urgent professional advice when a question cannot safely wait for an ordinary conversation. The route depends on the country and its system of care. General text cannot decide which level of help a particular person needs; that requires assessment of the situation. Someone uncertain about urgency can report that uncertainty to an appropriate service or professional, rather than assigning themselves a reassuring or frightening label without assessment.

A group should know its arrangements in advance. Who helps contact a service, where are the necessary contact details, and how can someone end the session? These organisational questions can be discussed before a difficult event. They do not guarantee the absence of distress or replace competence. A clear agreement does avoid spending time arguing about the right to request help. Care appears in available actions, rather than only a promise to listen attentively to the experience later.

IX. A next step can be agreed without promising to return

After stopping and talking, someone may want to restore familiar routines quickly. They miss the activity, the group, or a sense that their path continues. These are understandable circumstances of choice, but do not yet answer the question of further practice. It helps to separate the wish to return from an agreed plan. A plan can include further assessment, discussion of conditions, or a decision not to resume this activity. The article prescribes no length of pause and promises no change that will make a practice safe.

In a hypothetical scene, someone is offered a shorter exercise. Shorter alone does not establish suitability. What matters is who proposes the change, which information they considered, and how it relates to current care. A person can ask those questions without

agreeing immediately. If resumption is discussed with an appropriate professional, the chosen next step and the way to report another difficulty should be understood. This describes an agreement, rather than a universal algorithm for independent experimentation.

Keeping the earlier record may also help. When circumstances improve, the difficult evening can seem less significant. Its history is still needed for an accurate conversation, especially about a causal explanation or change of plan. At the same time, the record should not become a duty to measure every sensation continually. People can agree which information is needed and how to report it. Time for ordinary life remains; observation serves a specific task that can end or be reconsidered.

Another form of participation is possible too. Someone may prefer reading, conversation about a tradition, or not joining this course. These activities are not offered here as treatment or as a proven safe replacement. They are discussed according to their own meaning and conditions. What matters is abandoning the demand to preserve the earlier method merely out of loyalty to an earlier decision. Sometimes a next step ends a relationship with a particular practice; sometimes the question remains open pending necessary help and information.

X. A changed decision does not remove respect

Conversations around a practice easily produce roles: the strong participant, the doubtful beginner, the person who could not endure. Such labels can obscure what happened. Someone reports a difficulty, changes their participation, and seeks suitable help. That description is enough to begin a conversation. Ending an activity does not establish personality quality, a spiritual position, or an attitude towards every member of a community. Someone can retain gratitude for an earlier experience while choosing a different boundary today.

A loved one or fellow participant can take a concrete position: I hear your decision; which available help do you want now? The answer might be a request not to discuss private information, help finding a contact, or simply no persuasion to continue. The other person can also name the limits of their help. They need not explain the cause or take on a professional role. Support can consist in respecting the decision and helping with an ordinary action that is actually available.

A substantive conversation need not deny the value of practices to acknowledge limits. Reading about potential benefits, taking distress seriously, and preserving uncertainty about a particular cause are compatible. They answer different questions. A problem arises when general benefit cancels an individual report or an individual difficulty becomes a final conclusion about everyone. Accuracy requires neither defence of a method at any cost nor a general verdict based on one case.

The concluding formulation can therefore be simple: I ended this activity; this is what happened; this is the question I want to discuss with an appropriate professional. It leaves room for further understanding without promising answers still unavailable. Inner life includes the right to ask questions, change a decision, and obtain help. A practice finds its place in that life when its conditions can be named, its limits discussed, and ending participation does not deprive a person of respectful treatment.

What this means in practice

This section offers preparation for a message, rather than another attention exercise or an independent safety test. To discuss a difficulty, note some accessible details: the activity, when the change began, what continued afterwards, and what it interfered with. Separate description from explanation. A sentence about a sleepless night reports one thing; a suggestion about its cause is another. You can include the explanation given to you and which part you are unsure you agree with.

Next, name a decision already made: you ended the session, stopped participating, or want to discuss the plan with your treating professional. Repeating an activity associated with deterioration is unnecessary to confirm a cause. Prescribed care should not be independently cancelled on the basis of a general article. If making a record is difficult, a conversation can begin without it, with that difficulty stated. Access to help should not depend on the ability to prepare a detailed document.

Choose an addressee according to the question. Explaining a religious context, organising a course, and assessing health require different competence. The message can ask what the interlocutor can assess and which next step they propose. Clarify how to report continuing difficulty. A decision to resume need not be made immediately and does not follow from a consultation itself. The subsequent plan is discussed with an appropriate professional on the grounds of the specific situation.

In immediate danger to life or inability to maintain safety, seek local emergency help; discussion of causes should not delay action. In other cases, urgency is assessed by an appropriate professional or service. These notes can remain private and be disclosed for a clear purpose. Their aim is to help report events and raise a question, rather than diagnose yourself, measure spiritual maturity, or prove your right to end a voluntary activity.

Key quotation

> *“Further inquiry”.*

John Dewey, How We Think, chapter I, section 4. A short fragment about seeking grounds for judgement. Here, philosophical reasoning is not made a demand to repeat an activity associated with deterioration.

Connections between traditions

• **Epictetus, chapter XXIX:** considering a commitment's conditions; Stoic demands cannot be transferred into medical instructions to endure deterioration.

• **Dewey, chapter I:** an explanation's status can be separated from description; philosophical inquiry does not replace health assessment.

• **Lindahl 2017, Britton 2021, Van Dam 2025:** distinct research methods and measurements. They form no single personal percentage and establish no cause for this episode.

• **Brown University, NCCIH, and NHS:** separate institutional frameworks for support and care; they represent neither every spiritual school nor every health system.

• **The editorial bridge:** report events, name a decision, and choose a competent interlocutor. The compilers propose this for conversation, rather than as the sources' common protocol.

Sources

1. Epictetus, The Encheiridion, XXIX, George Long translation, Project Gutenberg 10661. The selected chapter and translator label were read; not the complete collection. A printed edition date was not established in the read metadata.

2. John Dewey, How We Think, 1910, chapter I, section 4. Selected paragraphs and edition information were read; not the whole book.

3. Lindahl et al., 2017, PLOS ONE, DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0176239. The abstract, purposeful selection, interview methods, limits on causal/population conclusions, and rights were read. Not every section or supplement; original interviews are unavailable for ethical reasons.

4. Britton et al., 2021, Clinical Psychological Science, DOI 10.1177/2167702621996340, APS abstract. Publisher abstract and metadata were read, not the full text; failed PubMed access and PMC browser checks are not counted as reading.

5. Van Dam et al., 2025, Clinical Psychological Science, DOI 10.1177/21677026241298269. Abstract, selected methods, measurements, limitations, and rights were read; not the whole text, supplements, or data. A cross-sectional online survey, rather than a causal trial.

6. Brown University, MBSR & MBCT: Benefits and Risks. The two-page text was read, including orientation, contact, and support. No document date was established in the read text; not every listed study was read.

7. NHS, Where to get urgent help for mental health. Urgency sections and the review date, 26 April 2023, were read; the next review was scheduled for 26 April 2026. The page's current numbers concern England, not every country.

8. NCCIH, Meditation and Mindfulness: Effectiveness and Safety. Selected safety cautions and ordinary-care boundaries were read; the underlying review was not read in full and is not used for a personal risk percentage.

Tags

practice, meditation, mindfulness, stopping, consent, boundaries, decision, safety, help, professional, competence, observation, description, interpretation, causality, uncertainty, everyday life, sleep, research, Lindahl, Britton, Van Dam, Dewey, Epictetus, Stoicism, discipline, support, conversation, urgency, respect

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 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.