

UNITED WISDOM

Anger: Hearing the Signal Without Justifying Every Action

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I12 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Anger: Hearing the Signal Without Justifying Every Action

Epigraph

“Be ye angry, and sin not”

Ephesians 4:26, a short excerpt from the KJV. The edition read and its context, 4:26–32. The Russian article gives the authors’ translation of this fragment.

What this article is about

Anger may draw attention to an event someone considers unacceptable. Experience, an explanation of events, and the response to them are different subjects, however. Strong anger does not prove that another person deliberately broke an agreement; a calm objection does not make an actual breach less real. Calling a feeling a signal is a metaphor for attention to a significant circumstance, rather than an infallible instrument for establishing guilt. This article considers a particular episode: what happened, how it was understood, which impulse arose, and what someone is willing to do next. We turn to Seneca’s distinction between first movement and assent, Aristotle’s question of proportion, and moral instructions in Christian and Buddhist texts. Similarity does not erase their differences. The practical task is to hear our own objection, examine its grounds, and choose an action we can answer for, without requiring immediate freedom from the feeling.

I. A Signal Draws Attention but Does Not Decide the Case

Imagine someone receiving a message: a meeting has been moved despite its agreed time. They become angry and think, “They simply disregard my time.” We can distinguish the information received, the experience, and an explanation of someone else’s attitude. The message can establish that the meeting was moved; anger describes present experience; disregard is an account of the event’s meaning. Additional circumstances may confirm it, but it does not become fact merely because it arose quickly and feels convincing.

“Signal” is useful if it reminds us to pay attention to a situation. It becomes inaccurate when it promises a ready explanation. Anger may concern cancellation, the way news was delivered, a lost opportunity, repeated similar episodes, or several aspects together. A single label cannot select the correct cause and identify which need was necessarily violated. The initial question is smaller: “What exactly feels unacceptable to me in this scene?” The answer can remain approximate and change after circumstances are clarified.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

We should also avoid judging an event's reality by the presence of anger. Someone may notice a broken agreement without intense feeling or become angry later. An objection's validity is examined through what was agreed and what occurred, rather than the reaction's expressiveness. Conversely, a strong reaction calls for attention to experience without granting an automatic right to declare any action by someone else deliberately harmful. These two inquiries can proceed together without replacing each other.

Hearing the signal therefore means preserving its message of significance while postponing a final conclusion where evidence is insufficient. We might say, "Moving the meeting makes me angry; I want to understand why it happened and how to respect agreed times going forward." This does not guarantee a favorable answer. It clarifies three subjects: a feeling, a question about circumstances, and a future agreement. Someone need not settle the whole conflict beforehand to state each without mixing them together.

II. First Movement and Assent to Action Differ

In Seneca's Of Anger II.1–4, Aubrey Stewart's translation, a distinction is drawn between an initial involuntary movement and the mind's subsequent assent. This is philosophical reasoning about anger, rather than an experimental model of the brain. Read it as the author's own position: experience and the development of an answering impulse should not be unconditionally treated as one completed act. The source does not establish that every modern person can always stop any impulse on command.

In a hypothetical scene, a harsh remark already appears in a drafted message but has not been sent. A specific distinction between the text's existence and sending it can be noticed. The person could remove one phrase, postpone their response, leave only a question, or send the original version. This article does not claim that this interval is always equally available. It suggests looking for it where it actually exists, rather than generally promising complete control over every moment of inner experience.

If an act has already occurred, the philosophical distinction does not erase its consequences. "It was the first impulse" does not make a spoken insult unspoken. The work then concerns what the person did and can change afterward. They can acknowledge the particular remark, correct information, or discuss a future format. Anger remains part of the episode's explanation, but it does not perform repair for the person or oblige the other party to forget immediately or accept the proposed account of the cause.

This reading preserves two possibilities at once: avoid making the feeling's emergence a moral verdict against ourselves, and avoid making it a justification of behavior. Anger can be named before choosing a response, during discussion, or afterward. Assessing action requires separate consideration, however. Where was a decision? What was available? Which

consequences followed? These questions are more precise than debating whether anyone should ever feel angry at all, and they allow different possibilities in different circumstances.

III. A Broken Agreement Must Be Established Separately

“I was treated unfairly” requires clarification of its subject. What was the agreement? Who accepted it? Which conditions might have changed? Did the other party know about the expectation that now seems obvious? These questions do not require abandoning anger. They distinguish an actual obligation from an unspoken wish and an unknown circumstance. A clear answer is also possible: a promise was made and not kept. Examination need not end by excusing another person.

Imagine two people understanding “help in the evening” differently. One expected a particular hour, the other any time after work. The first person’s anger is real as experience, but the nature of a breach is not yet established. If a specific hour was stated and accepted, the situation differs. One clarification changes the discussion’s foundation. Rather than a general accusation, there is a question about agreeing on time or an unfulfilled promise. Calling both cases “disrespect” may be premature for a practical decision.

Checking circumstances does not mean endlessly waiting for complete knowledge of another person’s motives. Established facts can be sufficient to identify an unacceptable action and change conditions of interaction. “My message was shared without my consent; I don’t want to provide new information in this format” concerns an action and a next choice. The offender’s intention may remain unknown. A boundary need not prove malice when its subject is already clear. An accusation of a particular intention nevertheless requires grounds of its own.

It helps to distinguish confidence in each statement. “I know the meeting was moved,” “I suspect my time wasn’t considered,” and “I don’t know why they decided this” are different messages that can be held together. If new evidence confirms a breach, the objection becomes more specific. If the explanation changes, the earlier feeling does not retroactively become a lie. Our understanding of the situation changes, rather than the fact that someone experienced it in a particular way at a particular moment.

IV. A Response’s Proportion Is Not the Feeling’s Strength

In Nicomachean Ethics II.6 and II.9, W. D. Ross’s translation, Aristotle considers appropriate measure, circumstances, and the difficulty of responding fittingly, including with anger. This is an ethical task, rather than a scale converting emotional intensity into a permissible level of impact on others. The similarity here concerns examining whom we answer, on what occasion, and how. The authors’ practical format below is not a ready technique supplied by Aristotle.

Feeling very angry does not mean a very harsh response will fit the circumstances. Speaking calmly does not guarantee a reasonable decision either. Proportion is usefully discussed through action: what it changes, whom it affects, whether it addresses the problem, and which consequences it may create. “I want to answer more strongly because the feeling is strong” describes an impulse. “I want to end this arrangement because information we agreed to keep private was shared again” supplies a separate ground for choice.

Proportion need not mean gentleness in every situation. Sometimes a clear refusal, ending a conversation, or requesting fulfillment of an obligation is more appropriate than explaining experience at length. A strong formulation can remain specific: “I don’t agree to this change.” It differs from humiliating a person. We can identify an action firmly without turning firmness into a contest over who can make the other feel more wrong. The response’s practical purpose helps us assess its content.

No universal measure can be established beforehand for every conflict. Circumstances, actual obligations, and participants’ possibilities matter. The article therefore suggests comparing available responses rather than choosing the reader’s ideal reaction for them. One response clarifies facts, another states a limit, a third changes the future arrangement. They may combine. Considering options does not promise anger’s disappearance; it supplies another subject for decision that cannot be reduced to present intensity or the loudest participant’s opinion.

V. Naming Anger Does Not Require Another Person’s Agreement

“I’m angry” communicates the speaker’s experience without determining the listener’s entire response. Another person may acknowledge the message and understand circumstances differently. That difference is not yet denial of the feeling. “I hear that you’re angry; I didn’t promise the time you mention” may open examination of an agreement. If instead the listener says, “You don’t feel any such thing,” they replace someone else’s self-description with their own assertion. A dispute about events should not be mixed with claiming the right to describe another person’s inner experience.

In a hypothetical scene, someone says, “Since I’m this angry, you must apologize immediately.” Feeling is being used as grounds for an obligatory action. Discussion can return to specifics: for which action is an apology requested? What occurred? Acknowledging anger does not resolve those questions automatically. An apology becomes more meaningful when it concerns an actual remark or broken obligation, rather than serving as the only way to halt intensity. The person receiving the demand may also clarify its subject.

Conversely, a feeling label should not become a condition for considering a complaint. “First say exactly what you feel, otherwise there’s nothing to discuss” may close discussion of a very

specific event. A complaint about sharing private information or disregarding an agreed time is understandable without an emotional examination. Stating the action and proposed limit is enough. Inner experience can be discussed additionally if needed and voluntary. Detailed self-description is not obligatory payment for the right to object to conduct.

A useful response combines respect for the message with independent judgment. “I’m not disputing that you’re angry; I want to understand our agreement.” The speaker may reply, “I’m not ready to examine it now; I’ll return later.” Continuation then needs agreement if required. Neither party must accept the other’s causal account merely to finish the episode. Some questions can stay open while a particular harsh remark is stopped or the next available step is identified.

VI. A Pause Helps Only as an Available Action

A pause sometimes creates an opportunity not to send a prepared harsh response. It is a particular action under particular conditions, rather than a universal way to end anger. Someone may remain angry after silence. Name the goal accurately: postpone sending, finish today’s argument, obtain information, or choose another formulation. If a pause is judged only by the feeling’s disappearance, its practical meaning may be lost even when an unwanted act was successfully avoided.

In a hypothetical conversation, someone could say, “I’m answering harshly now. I want to stop and return to this after dinner.” Identifying a return helps when both parties need a decision. They should not promise a time they cannot meet, however. Sometimes “I’m not ready to continue today; tomorrow I’ll suggest a time” is more accurate. A pause has conditions and consequences. It does not release existing obligations or automatically become punishment of another person through silence.

We cannot assume all participants have equal freedom to end a conversation. Work circumstances, dependence, and other people’s presence can limit options. The article does not determine the reader’s situation from the word “anger.” It suggests looking at which small choice actually exists: avoiding one more remark, turning to one question, stating that a decision is impossible now. If these options are absent, acknowledging limitations is more accurate than promising that any conflict can easily change through one inner decision.

A pause should not indefinitely replace necessary examination either. If a question affects deadlines, shared tasks, or other people’s interests, that subject needs separate consideration. We may remain angry and return to a verifiable message: “Which time shall we agree on?” Calmness is not required as advance permission for every action. Examine whether the chosen step can be performed without the harshness or pressure we do not want to continue, and what remains to be decided afterward.

VII. Religious Instruction Retains Its Own Foundation

In Ephesians 4:26–32, KJV, instruction about anger accompanies requirements for speech, rejection of malice, kindness, and forgiveness grounded in God's forgiveness in Christ. This addresses a community's moral life. The short epigraph cannot be detached from that context and turned into full approval of any anger. There is no experimental promise of relief from a particular phrase or a rule requiring reconciliation in every modern situation.

For our subject, the text opens a question about experience's relationship with moral action. Practical application nevertheless requires separate judgment. A person may share its religious foundation, understand it differently, or consider the text as a cultural source. In each case, identify honestly which conclusion belongs to the work itself and which to its present readers. Similarity between particular questions does not make a reader a follower of the tradition or turn its assertions into scientific findings.

Particular care is needed when discussing forgiveness. It does not establish that an action never occurred and does not by itself answer questions about future trust or access to private information. The article does not demand immediate forgiveness as proof of handling anger correctly. Someone may acknowledge the feeling, discuss responsibility, and choose conditions for future interaction. If they want to consider forgiveness's religious meaning, that is a separate subject rather than the obligatory ending of every conflict.

On this reading, moral discipline is not reduced to suppressing a message. It includes the question of which speech and action a person chooses after anger arises. Outward quiet alone does not prove the matter settled; expressive conversation does not establish correctness. The text offers its own spiritual orientation. The article's task is to preserve that context and show a limited point of comparison, without declaring a theological norm a universal psychological law for all families and relationships.

VIII. Refusing to Continue Hostility Does Not Mean Accepting Harm

In Dhammapada chapter XVII, verses 221–234, F. Max Müller's translation, anger is considered alongside moral discipline, control of body and speech, and orientation toward liberation. Verse 223 proposes answering anger with love and evil with good. This is religious instruction in a particular text, rather than proof that every modern breach should be endured. The edition read supplies no ready decision about boundaries in the reader's situation and does not replace examination of actions.

In the authors' practical task, a narrow distinction can be considered: refusing to add humiliation differs from agreeing to continue previous conditions. Someone may avoid sending

an insult while ending an exchange of private information. They may reject retaliatory harshness while requesting fulfillment of a particular obligation. This is our contemporary comparison, rather than a claim that the verse describes each such option in detail. The historical source keeps its own purpose; a particular choice requires knowledge of circumstances.

Neither should someone be required to feel love immediately before their refusal of a harmful act counts as real. Outward action may be chosen before inner experience changes. Avoiding a retaliatory insult also does not prove all consequences removed. If private information was already distributed, access and correction remain questions. If a promise failed, consequences for shared work need consideration. The response's moral form does not erase the original objection's subject.

This distinction prevents two premature conclusions. The first declares every limit hostility that must be overcome. The second treats any harshness as necessary defense because the event was unacceptable. Particular options remain between them, which someone can assess independently. We can speak clearly, end a conversation, and change an agreement without universally justifying humiliation. We can preserve an unresolved question without declaring our feeling the sole source of knowledge about what occurred and what is now permissible.

IX. A Harsh Act Calls for Specific Responsibility Afterward

If action has already caused harm, subsequent work begins with describing it specifically. Rather than only "I lost it," try "I sent an insulting message," "I published someone's private correspondence," or "I ended the conversation without communicating a change to our shared task." Different actions have different consequences. Naming anger does not combine them into one case with identical repair. Someone needs to understand what they can acknowledge, stop, or change, and what a single message can no longer restore.

In a hypothetical scene, after a humiliating remark, someone might say, "I called you that word. It was my remark, and I don't want to justify it by saying I was angry." The original disagreement can then be discussed separately. Acknowledging harshness does not mean accepting the other party's correctness on every issue. It restores responsibility for one's own action. The listener may accept the message, reject it, or need time; an apology is not a contract for the speaker's obligatory immediate relief.

Correction should be chosen according to the actual consequence. If false information was shared, it needs correcting before those who received it. If shared deadlines were broken, the future arrangement needs discussion. If someone merely repeats "I already apologized," consequences may remain unanswered. The article supplies no universal set of reparative

acts. It suggests not replacing them with an account of emotional strength or a demand to forget the episode so the speaker can feel sufficiently good about themselves again.

Examination may also reveal limited possibilities. Not every consequence is reversible, and not every response from another person can be obtained at will. Responsibility then includes acknowledging that limit honestly and refusing to continue the same conduct wherever that choice exists. Anger may remain connected to the original event. But what someone themselves has already done also determines the next step. These subjects can be considered together without using either to make the other disappear from conversation.

X. A Decision May Be Clearer Than the Feeling’s Cause

Someone need not finish explaining their anger before every practical step. Sometimes they already know they do not want to send an insult, want to check an agreement, or intend to change access to private information. Why experience became this strong may remain open. This does not make action arbitrary when there is a specific ground for it. A complete internal history and sufficient information for a limited decision are different requirements that should not automatically be tied together.

Compare the desired result with the chosen response’s form. If the goal is information, a message may contain one clear question. If the goal is a limit, it may contain a refusal and conditions for future communication. If the goal is acknowledging one’s harsh remark, explaining the other party’s wrongness should not swallow that acknowledgment. The comparison guarantees no outcome because the other participant retains their own choice. It identifies what action someone actually proposes, rather than a general wish to discharge intensity at any cost.

A decision also permits revision. New information may change a causal account, clarify a request, or prompt rejection of an earlier option. Revision does not mean the original anger was unreal. It shows that experience did not become a final judgment of facts. If information confirms a breach, the feeling need not grow stronger for the objection to remain valid. The response’s grounds remain in circumstances, rather than solely in present intensity or the elegance of an explanation.

Hearing anger from this perspective means acknowledging it as part of experience while distinguishing event, interpretation, impulse, and action. Seneca, Aristotle, Christian instruction, and a Buddhist verse supply different foundations of moral discipline. Their proximity does not produce one proven theory of emotion. The authors’ reflection format remains limited: choose an episode, preserve what is known and unknown, and consider an available response. A more specific decision may count as success even while the feeling persists and the conflict remains unfinished.

What this means in practice

Choose an episode you are willing to consider without continuing the argument itself. Record what occurred in verifiable terms: a message, a change of time, a particular remark, an unfulfilled part of an agreement. Beside it, name experience as accurately as you can now. Then separately record a causal account: “I suspect that…” If the account is unclear, say so. No universal explanation about a violated need or hidden pain needs inserting merely to fill a line.

Separate an impulse from what has already been done. “I want to send a harsh phrase” and “The harsh phrase has already been sent” call for different next steps. In the first case, consider whether postponing sending or changing content is possible. In the second, acknowledge the particular act and its consequences. Do not judge the work solely by reduced anger. A clearer message, an avoided insult, or corrected information can matter while experience persists, without promising one note will solve the problem.

Compare two available responses according to purpose and consequences. What clarifies the agreement? What states a limit? What corrects your own remark? If needed, agree on a pause and conditions of return you can actually fulfill. Do not demand immediate love, forgiveness, or calmness as permission for a specific decision. Strong feeling does not choose the response for you either. Leave room for other people’s interests and the actual situation’s limitations.

Finish with one possible step and one open question. For example: “I’ll clarify the agreed time now; I don’t yet know why it was moved.” Or: “I’ll acknowledge my insult; we’ll discuss the original disagreement separately.” This is a voluntary authors’ reflection format that can be shortened or postponed. It is not a test and does not prove you must feel differently. A sufficient result is seeing more clearly which present action you are willing to answer for and which information remains necessary.

Key quotation

“overcome anger by love”

Dhammapada 223, F. Max Müller’s translation, Sacred Books of the East X, 1881; Project Gutenberg 2017. The instruction retains chapter XVII’s religious context and does not establish a modern obligation to endure harmful conduct. The Russian article uses the authors’ short translation.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Actual similarity	Limit of the similarity
Seneca II.1–4 and distinguishing impulse from action	First movement is not unconditionally equated with completed assent	The philosophical distinction does not prove a universal ability to halt any response
Aristotle II.6, II.9 and a response's proportion	Circumstances and the form of action matter	Ethical measure is neither a scale of feeling strength nor a modern technique
Ephesians 4:26–32 and responsibility for speech	Anger is considered alongside moral requirements for action	The foundation is community life and God's forgiveness in Christ, rather than an experimental promise
Dhammapada 221–234 and refusing to add hostile harshness	Anger relates to discipline of body, speech, and mind	Liberation's goal does not replace a decision about particular modern conditions of communication
All texts considered and the authors' format	Intensity alone does not automatically justify a reaction morally	Distinct foundations remain; there is no common scientifically proven theory here

Primary sources and research

• Seneca, Of Anger II.1–4, Aubrey Stewart's translation: first movement and assent. Translation attribution was checked against the 1889 edition.

• Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Book II, parts 6 and 9, W. D. Ross's translation: circumstances and a response's moral measure.

• Ephesians 4:26–32, King James Version: anger, speech, kindness, and forgiveness's religious foundation. The short Russian quotation is the authors' translation of the English fragment read.

• Dhammapada, chapter XVII, 221–234, F. Max Müller's translation: moral discipline and verse 223. The text, Sacred Books of the East X edition (1881), and Project Gutenberg information were checked; this edition was used. The article claims no new empirical research on anger.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Tags

anger, emotions, feelings, signal, attention, interpretation, causal account, fact, agreement, expectation, impulse, action, responsibility, speech, measure, proportion, pause, personal boundaries, consent, consequences, correction, Seneca, Aristotle, Ephesians, Dhammapada, Max Müller, moral discipline, uncertainty, autonomy, 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 test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.