


UNITED WISDOM

# When mediation does not help: the boundary between meeting and coercion

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-10-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# When mediation does not help: the boundary between meeting and coercion

## Epigraph

> *with so many calamities*

Erasmus, *Erasmus against War*, an authorial fragment about the cost of war, in the English version printed in 1907.

## What this article is about

Sometimes inviting a third person seems like a way out of any conflict. They will listen to both people, establish some order and help them agree. The wish is understandable: when another conversation ends in accusations, we want a place where an unfinished thought can finally be spoken. Yet the presence of a witness does not itself make a meeting voluntary. If refusal, openness or an unwelcome answer will bring punishment, a tidy table and a facilitator’s calm voice do not remove that threat. The question comes before agreement: can someone participate without surrendering safety and independence in exchange, and what remains possible when a joint conversation is not suitable now?

This article distinguishes mediation as help with a particular discussion from pressure that uses its name. It does not determine whether a reader’s situation is safe, replace professional assessment or establish a legal procedure. Erasmus’s historical text offers a limited ethical connection concerning the cost of confrontation; current Family Mediation Council materials concern family mediation in England and Wales. Our scenes are fictional and our practical questions voluntary. Immediate danger calls for a local emergency route, rather than an attempt first to demonstrate that you know how to talk. Neither reconciliation nor explaining a refusal to someone dangerous is required.



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

## I. A third person changes the format, but not the whole situation

Imagine the fictional Olga and Ilya. After separating, they cannot discuss the return of some belongings. Their friend Maxim suggests meeting at his home: he cares about both and is sure he can help. For Ilya, this looks like a simple solution. Olga, however, does not know whether she can refuse the proposed place and time. The last time she refused, there were threats. Maxim knows about their mutual irritation but has not heard this part of the story. His goodwill is real; so is the limit of what he knows. A confident promise to settle everything does not remove that limit.

Looking only at the negotiating table, we can easily mistake identical chairs for equal freedom. Each person has paper, each receives time, and the facilitator promises not to interrupt. Yet one may go home without fearing the consequences of what was said, while the other chooses words with an eye on what will happen after the meeting. This conditional distinction is not a diagnosis of the people in our scene. It shows why a conversation's format cannot be treated as a complete account of the conditions of participation. Equal speaking time and a genuine ability to say no concern different aspects of the situation, which need distinguishing before any decision.

There is a more ordinary counterexample too. Two people disagree about a repair deadline and are irritated, but can independently reject a proposal, choose another professional and leave without threats. A third person may help them stay with the subject. Coercion in some situations does not mean every difficult meeting is pointless. Our question is more precise: what circumstances make participation voluntary here? We need neither to idealise mediation nor to treat it in advance as suspect. We need room to distinguish an uncomfortable conversation from participation that someone is not allowed to refuse.

The intermediary's good intention is therefore not a sufficient answer. Maxim can ask what he actually knows how to do, what information is available to him and whether he is promising more than he can provide. Refusing to recognise his limits adds pressure: Olga must now also disprove a kind friend's certainty. Sometimes the most responsible help begins when a friend stops appointing himself the solution. He need not be a specialist to support someone, but support does not require facilitating a meeting or declaring it safe for its participants on the strength of his own impression.

## II. Consent to meet is a separate question

Agreeing with the content of a future decision differs from agreeing to take part in a process. Olga may want her belongings returned without agreeing to a meeting at someone's home. Ilya may want the matter concluded without accepting the proposed arrangements. It does not follow that they have rejected every possible way of dealing with the task. The subject may remain important when a particular format is unacceptable. This distinction releases us from a false choice: either sit at the proposed table or admit to being responsible for an endless conflict. A task and the single imposed way of discussing it are not necessarily the same thing.

Voluntariness is easy to announce. It is harder to preserve when someone exercises the option to refuse. If an invitation comes with a promise to condemn them, withdraw support or publicly portray them as unreasonable, formal permission not to attend loses its meaning. In our ethical distinction, what matters is not only an affirmative answer but the conditions in which it was given. This is neither a legal definition of consent nor a way of establishing another person's history from one message. It is a question about proposed help: is the desired answer being bought with fear of what would happen if the person chose otherwise?

Participation does not mean agreeing with the outcome in advance either. Someone may attend, consider an option and reject it. They may discover that the subject is broader or narrower than they expected. If all this is called sabotage, the meeting becomes a means of securing a signature beneath a decision already chosen. A third person's presence does not justify that substitution. An invitation to discuss should not quietly become a demand to concede. When the result has already been decided and only its wording is open to challenge, it helps to name the process's limits honestly instead of promising an open search for a solution that participants are not being offered.

Sometimes someone agrees only to receive information about a possible process. This is not yet consent to a joint meeting, disclosure of personal information or restoration of a relationship. Different steps should not be merged into one irreversible gesture. A person can learn the terms, ask about the professional's role and then decide they do not want to continue now. We do not claim every service operates identically; its particular procedure needs separate clarification. But an ordinary invitation can already remain precise: explain exactly what is proposed rather than treating the first response as permission for everything that follows.

## III. Danger does not become an ordinary disagreement

In the Family Mediation Council’s current material about unsuitable cases, a risk to safety, including domestic abuse, is named as one reason the process may not be appropriate. The page also identifies a registered professional’s role in assessing suitability. This is a primary professional source for England and Wales, not a universal rule for every country. We use its narrow point: family mediation does not automatically suit every case. The page’s legal details, court procedures and funding provisions are not carried into this article or turned into advice to the reader.

If Olga fears threats, she is not asked to conduct a joint experiment to discover whether that fear is justified. A meeting cannot be required first so that it can later be judged inappropriate. Safety is not a reward for a persuasive performance. Ilya or Maxim may understand events differently, but their confidence does not oblige Olga to disclose sensitive information to them. This article establishes neither guilt nor a diagnosis of the relationship. It preserves a boundary: needing separate help should not have to be demonstrated through dangerous contact or a concession someone is not prepared to make.

Immediate danger requires local emergency help in the applicable jurisdiction. If danger is not immediate but there are threats or control, someone may seek suitable separate professional support, considering availability and the safety of making contact. The selected British NHS materials we read address help with abuse and control; the reader’s local services have not been checked here. We offer no global telephone number, guarantee of a protected channel or complete safety plan. Choosing a safe way to make contact matters more than following an attractive sequence of actions that may not fit the actual circumstances.

Requests to tell everything at once deserve particular care. A full account may help a professional, but revealing details before another participant is a different step. Wanting to hear both versions does not entitle a friend to prescribe dangerous openness. Even a well-intentioned question can sound like a condition for receiving support: explain everything first, and then we will decide whether you deserve help. A supporting person can tolerate not having a complete explanation. Their own uncertainty should not automatically become someone else’s obligation to disclose what they do not yet want, or are unable, to share.

## IV. Preliminary assessment differs from a promise of safety

In a blog published by the Family Mediation Council in January 2022, Louisa Whitney describes initial separate meetings and assessment of the process's safety and suitability. She also explains that mediation may not continue, or may be considered with particular precautions, and that assessment remains under review. This describes professional practice in a specific context. It neither establishes every mediator's effectiveness nor promises that any format removes risk. Both points matter: danger needs attention, but a past experience of abuse is not declared here to be an automatic lifelong prohibition on any mediation.

For the reader, this distinction does not become a procedure for making their own suitability assessment. Olga need not decide from this article whether two rooms or separate arrival times are sufficient. Such details depend on actual circumstances and professional assessment, not our ability to imagine a calm meeting. A person can ask how a professional assesses suitability and what happens if the situation changes. Yet the answer does not itself guarantee an outcome. We do not certify someone on the strength of a good description of their work or replace checking local conditions with an organisation's name.

The possibility of reassessment is particularly important to understanding consent. Initial willingness does not prove that every subsequent step will remain acceptable. Someone may learn new facts, hear an unexpected demand or encounter pressure after the first conversation. This does not necessarily make their earlier answer insincere. They decided in a different situation, as it was available to them then. They cannot be required to continue merely to maintain a consistent image: yesterday you thought a meeting possible, so today you may no longer recognise a risk. That logic replaces attention to events with loyalty to a word once spoken, regardless of what has changed.

There are limits to outside assessment too. From a correspondence, a narrated scene or a single episode, we cannot confidently declare a process suitable. We can notice a troubling condition and refuse to intensify it; that differs from a full assessment. A responsible friend need not resolve every uncertainty before stopping their persuasion. It is enough to recognise that they do not know the conditions and offer separate support without demanding acceptance of their decision. Modesty about the role is practical here: it allows someone to stay alongside a person without occupying the place of specialist, judge or final authority on acceptable risk.

## V. Neutrality does not require indifference to conditions

Neutrality is often understood as an obligation to treat every stated demand identically. But equal attention to words differs from equal support for every way of exerting influence. If one participant can discuss a proposal while another must consider a threat for disagreeing, simply alternating their turns does not solve the problem. We are not formulating a professional code of mediation. We are examining the everyday idea that addressing conditions of pressure always means bias. Preserving voluntary participation need not mean endorsing every claim made by the person whose ability to refuse or withhold particular information is being respected.

Maxim may fear that not arranging a joint meeting will be seen as taking sides. Yet supporting a separate request for help differs from declaring every judgment Olga makes correct. He can refrain from judging the entire history while also refraining from persuading her to enter the proposed format. Another's safety should not become our means of demonstrating fairness. If a friend needs a joint scene in order to feel impartial, their need begins to govern the participants. It helps to notice this shift before the intermediary's dignity becomes another task for people already occupied with a difficult question.

Another substitution appears when every limit is called censorship. Defining a meeting's subject does not forbid someone to have feelings or their own account of the past. For example, returning belongings need not include discussing every reason for separating. Yet rules cannot be applied selectively: allowing one person accusations while forbidding the other a response in the interest of calm. Our distinction offers no ready-made meeting procedure. It shows that a limit is useful when it helps maintain an agreed subject, rather than concealing pressure under a demand to behave politely and preserve a favourable impression of the process.

Indifference to consequences does not become neutrality through a change of name either. A friend who says only today's agreement matters may overlook participants' situation tomorrow. They need not foresee everything and cannot control others' lives. But it does not follow that consequences have no bearing on the choice of format. Whether a person can refuse, and what follows refusal, belongs to the ethics of participation. This question does not require deciding in advance who is right. It requires not treating a signature or verbal agreement as sufficient proof that another option was genuinely available to the person.

## VI. Peace cannot be measured only by the absence of objections

In the selected authorial argument, Erasmus compares war's destructive cost with the possibility of less costly agreement. The text concerns historical criticism of war, not modern family mediation. Its language of peace and Christian community cannot be transferred wholesale to our circumstances. We take a limited question about the cost of confrontation while preserving a distinction: outwardly ending an argument may cost someone dearly if they were forced to yield. This last point is our ethical development, not a safety-assessment protocol established by Erasmus or a proven result of negotiation.

If Olga is silent and Ilya is satisfied with the decision, an observer may easily feel relief. Nobody is arguing, the meeting is over, and Maxim has not wasted his evening. But silence does not tell us how the result was obtained. It may accompany free agreement, exhaustion, fear or a decision not to object for now. We cannot establish the cause from outside and should not guess it as a diagnosis. We can, however, avoid treating silence alone as definitive evidence of voluntariness. Human dignity extends beyond the successful conclusion of an evening, especially convenient to someone who will not bear the decision's later consequences.

The reverse distinction matters too. Disagreement at the end does not necessarily mean the conversation failed. Perhaps unacceptable options, missing information or someone's unwillingness to discuss the subject became clearer. Sometimes there is only disappointment, with no noticeable benefit; we should not attribute hidden success to every difficulty in advance. Yet a result is not exhausted by agreement. If someone may freely refuse, the process should not require removing that freedom for the sake of an attractive conclusion. Open discussion really can end without a common decision, and that fact alone does not make the person who refused a violator of some promised agreement.

The image of peace becomes particularly dangerous when used as a moral scorecard. You would not meet, so you chose hostility. You rejected the proposal, so you are not mature enough. Such language turns an ideal into an instrument of control. A wish not to cause unnecessary harm does not necessarily entail a duty to restore intimacy. Someone can seek a calmer way of resolving a limited task while not wanting a shared conversation about feelings. This article does not assess virtue by the number of meetings attended. It asks what is being required under the promise of peace and whether refusal is available without additional punishment.

## VII. Separate help need not lead back to the table

When a joint meeting is unsuitable now, there is a temptation to treat every other kind of help as preparation for it. A separate consultation then ceases to be a place for independent choice and becomes a way of making someone a more convenient participant. Those aims differ. Support may help someone clarify their position, available options and limits without leading to reconciliation. We do not guarantee this result or prescribe a particular kind of help for everyone. But the value of seeking separate support should not depend on whether someone subsequently agrees to the format others originally proposed.

Maxim can change his own offer. Instead of inviting both people, he can tell Olga he will not arrange a meeting without her agreement and ask what manageable help she needs now. The answer may be small and unlike a resolution of the conflict: help finding information, company at a suitable time, not repeating the conversation to others. There is no universal script here either. Not every contact or search for information is safe in every situation. Support therefore begins with room to clarify, without requiring acceptance of help in the form most convenient to the supporting person.

Ilya can also receive separate support without Maxim becoming a carrier of pressure. Sympathy for Ilya’s confusion does not entitle him to pass every request for a meeting to Olga if she has refused that channel. Help remains human when it includes a limit. Maxim can listen without promising to obtain another person’s desired answer. Nor must he justify threats or help bypass refusal. His role needs precision: I can be present with you in this difficulty, but I do not control another person’s consent and will not extract it to prove our friendship.

A shared task may nevertheless remain. Belongings, documents or necessary information do not disappear because someone refuses a meeting. Yet a task’s existence does not grant unconditional access to a person. A possible way to address it needs to consider actual circumstances, local professional help and applicable rules, without deriving a ready-made procedure from this article. We intentionally do not determine either party’s legal obligations. Our subject is the boundary of help: not turning a continuing task into a pretext for imposed intimacy, or promising that any indirect channel automatically protects participants against further pressure.

## VIII. The intermediary can decline the role too

A helping person may recognise that the proposed role does not suit them. This may be unpleasant for Maxim: he has already promised to settle everything and wants to retain his friends' trust. But an earlier promise does not create an ability he lacks. Changing the offer is more honest than continuing for his reputation's sake. He can explain a limit without blaming the participants: he does not know how to assess these risks and will not facilitate a joint meeting. This is not a universal professional withdrawal procedure, but an example of a friend ceasing to present goodwill as a sufficient basis for intervention.

Refusal does not require abandoning a person with their difficulty. Someone can retain manageable separate support, if wanted, without becoming a mediator. Yet this does not entail an obligation to remain indefinitely or fulfil every request. A helping person also has available time, competence and limits. Recognising them need not be disguised as a diagnosis of friends: you are too complicated, so nobody can help you. It is more accurate to describe one's own capacity. A limit on the role then avoids becoming another judgment of participants' worth or a promise that another professional will certainly solve what their friend could not.

There is a condition of trust as well. If Maxim has heard personal information, withdrawing from facilitation does not mean he is free to circulate it to explain his decision. He can avoid discussing details with the other participant instead of justifying himself through someone else's history. Particular professional confidentiality rules differ and are not established here; the article offers no promise of legal protection. But in everyday support, entrusted words need not become currency for our own credibility. Not everything known to a helping person has to be shared with others so that they accept the limit as reasonable and stop demanding an immediate joint conversation.

Finally, recognising a limit lets someone stop claiming an impossible power. Maxim cannot guarantee that nobody will become angry after a meeting, that a message will not be passed on or that refusal will be calmly accepted. He can take responsibility for his own actions and promises, rather than the whole subsequent history. This is not a reason to abandon every form of care. It makes care more precise: not promising protection he does not provide, not basing support on certainty about another's behaviour, and leaving room for someone to choose another way of receiving help, even if that choice disappoints a well-intentioned friend.

## IX. Sufficient help may look unfinished

We are accustomed to stories in which a third person helps two others finally understand each other. They leave with a new decision, thank the facilitator and put confrontation behind them. Life need not end with that scene. Sometimes a reasonable outcome is not to arrange a meeting now, to obtain separate information or to leave a question without a common answer. This does not always bring relief or promise the disappearance of conflict. Yet a completed story and an acceptable step concern different things. A person should not become material for an attractive ending merely because an unfinished story inconveniences everyone who tried to help.

In our fictional scene, Maxim can cancel his invitation and recognise that he lacks sufficient conditions for a joint meeting. Olga need not then tell him everything or thank him for choosing correctly. Ilya may remain dissatisfied. We add no happy ending to prove the approach's power. The scene's point is smaller: a friend's refusal to intensify pressure need not depend on participants' immediate approval. It may be an accurate action within his role even while the task of returning belongings remains unresolved and the next route still needs separate clarification.

This distinction gives mediation a modest scale again. It is neither a cure for every hostility nor a maturity test everyone must pass. In suitable circumstances, it may be one way to discuss a particular subject. Other circumstances require another route, and sometimes, before anything else, help with danger. This article does not construct a list of safe and dangerous people. It distinguishes proposal, subject and conditions of participation so that the word help does not quietly remove the ability to refuse something offered as the only reasonable option for everyone without exception.

The more precise this boundary becomes, the less we have to demand from the ideal of dialogue. It can remain valuable without becoming an obligation to speak under any circumstances. Care for peace can include refusing a meeting used to apply pressure. Respect for both people can include recognising different conditions without presenting our observation as a final verdict. Our own help can be limited, honest and unable to conclude the whole history. It is enough not to call voluntary participation an obstacle to the process, or promise that a third person's presence alone makes every conversation safe.

## What this means in practice

If you are simply considering a possible meeting and circumstances permit reflection, you can separately name its subject. Not the whole relationship's history, but the particular question proposed for discussion. Then distinguish three things: whether you want the task addressed, whether you are ready for the proposed format and what you are willing to discuss. The answers need not match. This small written or mental exercise is voluntary and need not be shared with another participant. It does not determine the situation's safety or test whether you are reasonable enough to deserve support.

The next question concerns conditions of refusal. Can you decline to attend, withhold details or reject a proposal without threats and prescribed punishment? If asking this aloud is itself unsafe, the article does not suggest asking another person as an experiment. In immediate danger, seek local emergency help through an available safe means. With threats or control, separate professional support may be needed. Particular availability has not been checked and channels are not guaranteed. You need not conduct a joint meeting as a preliminary condition for seeking help or show a dangerous person notes made for your own reflection.

If you are inviting others, consider checking your own promise. What can you actually provide: time for conversation, attention to its subject, your own refusal to pass on personal information? What can you not provide: someone else's reaction, absence of risk, a finished agreement? You can remove a promise to settle everything and accurately state your role's limit. If you discover that you cannot assess the necessary conditions, declining to facilitate while retaining other manageable help is permissible. This does not guarantee gratitude and does not replace a professional process, but lets you avoid appointing yourself the solution without sufficient grounds.

After reflecting, one available step, or a decision to do nothing for now, is enough. You need not send everyone a new plan, obtain approval of your refusal or restore intimacy. These questions are neither a tested technique nor a complete safety plan. If they increase pressure or distress, you can leave them aside. The article's practical point is to distinguish a task from an imposed way of addressing it. Help can be real without a joint meeting; a joint meeting should be assessed by actual conditions rather than an attractive name, and nobody must agree merely to make the story look finished.

## Key quotation

> *with a far less price*

Erasmus, *Erasmus against War*, the author's comparison of the price of war and agreement. This historical phrase does not justify yielding under threat.

## Connections between traditions

In the selected passage, Erasmus compares war and peace through their cost to people. This is a Christian humanist text with historical rhetoric, not a study of modern family meetings. The limited connection is attention to the price of confrontation. Our distinction between voluntariness and coercion is not attributed to him as a finished professional procedure.

In Romans 12:18, the call to peace is related to possibility and what depends on the addressee. The chapter we read belongs to religious exhortation. It establishes neither a modern support plan nor an obligation to return to dangerous contact; our connection concerns the limit of personal power over relationships.

In section 1 of the *Enchiridion*, in the translation by Elizabeth Carter that we read, Epictetus distinguishes what depends on us from what does not. This is Stoic discipline with its own demanding understanding of judgment and freedom. Here it helps limit an intermediary's promise to their own action, but does not establish that changing a judgment removes someone's need for protection.

Erasmus and Romans share Christian attention to peace, yet their genres and circumstances differ: historical polemic about war and apostolic exhortation are not a single mediation code. We do not treat this resonance as agreement among all traditions or as evidence of the proposed practice's effectiveness.

Epictetus directs attention to limits of our own control; Erasmus to confrontation's destructive cost. These different emphases can be compared without merging their foundations. Current FMC and NHS materials do different work: they identify particular professional and support boundaries. They do not verify an ancient or Christian text's metaphysics, and historical texts do not establish a modern service's safety.

## Sources

1. Erasmus, *Erasmus against War*. Boston: Merrymount Press, 1907, introduction by J. W. Mackail; a reprinted early English translation whose translator is not established here. The header, selected editorial context and authorial paragraphs on war's cost were read; not the entire treatise.

2. Family Mediation Council, *When Mediation Might Not Be Suitable*. The current substantive section and England and Wales scope were read on 7 October 2026. Legal details are not applied to the reader; video and links were not checked.

3. Louisa Whitney / Family Mediation Council, *Family Mediation Week — Monday's Myth*. 17 January 2022. The complete substantive text on preliminary assessment was read; not a safety guarantee or assessment of a particular situation.

4. NHS, *Domestic violence and abuse*. Reviewed 23 June 2026. Selected sections on help, control, threats and leaving were read in this batch; British jurisdiction, local availability and linked material were not checked.

5. Romans 12, Updated World English Bible. The chapter was read; a limited connection with 12:18, without direct quotation.

6. Epictetus, *Enchiridion*, translated by Elizabeth Carter. Attribution and section 1 were read; a limited Stoic connection, without direct quotation.

## Tags

mediation, intermediary, coercion, voluntariness, refusal, consent, safety, threat, pressure, boundaries, meeting, help, separate support, professional assessment, neutrality, subject of discussion, responsibility, separation, conflict, peace, cost of agreement, dignity, independence, Erasmus, Epictetus, Romans, FMC, NHS, ethics, United Wisdom

## 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 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.