

UNITED WISDOM

Anger on another’s behalf: empathy, values and personal history

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-07-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Anger on another’s behalf: empathy, values and personal history

Andrey Zarinsh · Maria Evilkut

Epigraph

“He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him”.

Proverbs 18:13, King James Version. Verse text.

What this article is about

Watching how someone is treated, we may become angry before understanding what they want. Sympathy, resistance to injustice, a shared value or our own history may be involved together. Yet an observer's strong anger establishes neither all the facts nor the preferred action for the person affected. Wanting to protect can help, or quietly take away another's ability to decide their participation.

This article distinguishes feeling on another's behalf, judging a violation and choosing assistance. We consider the scientific distinction between empathic anger and moral outrage without turning a laboratory model into a classification of people. Philosophical and religious texts raise questions about protection, proportionality and speech. Our practical question is what our response indicates, what we actually know, and what would help the person concerned. Answering requires hearing their position, recognising unequal power and examining consequences. Sometimes assistance means action; sometimes it means support that does not replace another's voice with our own.

I. Feeling on another's behalf belongs to the observer

Anger on someone's behalf remains our experience even when their situation evokes it. This preserves connection and separateness together: another's pain may affect us deeply without giving direct access to its entire meaning. They may experience events differently, know facts unavailable to us or choose another response. Difference does not cancel our objection to injustice. It prevents our feeling from automatically becoming their will. Assistance requires connecting two positions rather than assuming one intense reaction can stand for both.

In a hypothetical meeting, a manager sharply interrupts a colleague. An observer becomes angry and wants to object immediately. Afterwards, the colleague confirms the humiliation but says a public dispute would now increase the risk of losing the project. This need not be

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

cowardice or show the observer's ethical judgement mistaken. Event, experience and action within an environment differ. The observer can offer help, ask what participation is wanted and consider safer possibilities. Accusing the colleague of weakness makes protection reproduce the pressure it originally opposed.

In Aristotle IV.5, indifference to insults against friends is not accepted as unconditional virtue. This is a philosophical counterexample to the claim that another's difficulty should never evoke anger. Ancient judgements of dignity and defence, however, do not dictate conduct in a contemporary team. Our narrower question is whether outrage can notice an important violation without establishing the only correct response. In this editorial approach, ethical attention and practical choice require different steps and information.

Separateness matters in close relationships too. A friend may want listening while we plan the offender's punishment. A relative may request accompaniment while we argue on their behalf without agreement. Immediate intervention can sometimes be necessary to stop direct harm, but that circumstance cannot be transferred to every unpleasant conversation. First identify the affected person's present task and our own. If ours is calming our outrage, this does not make us bad; helping another should nevertheless not become a means of solving only that inward problem.

II. Empathy and moral outrage can overlap

Outrage at an act and empathy with its consequences can be distinguished although they often arrive together. One question asks whether someone was hurt; another whether an important moral requirement was intentionally violated. Combinations differ. An unsuccessful attempt to harm can evoke intense anger despite harm being prevented. An accident can evoke profound sympathy without malicious intent. These distinctions do not sort people into moral types. They clarify the subject being judged and what information is still needed.

In Hechler and Kessler's 2018 paper, four studies involving 1,065 participants varied intention to harm and actual harm separately. Anger related more strongly to intention, while empathy related to harmful consequences. We read the abstract, introduction and available excerpts, not the complete methods. Assigned scenarios do not establish that every observer responds identically or recognises intention correctly. The authors address a debate over moral outrage and empathic anger; we do not present the terminology as settled throughout psychology.

In a hypothetical episode, someone learns that an acquaintance attempted to humiliate a vulnerable participant but was stopped. The failure does not necessarily remove outrage: the intention and dangerous relational arrangement matter. In another episode, an error produces losses. An observer can sympathise and request repair without assuming malice. Conflating

these makes every mistake an attack and every failed attack harmless. Accuracy separates intention, action and consequence, preserving uncertainty when intention is unverified.

Practical assistance need not wait for a final determination of motive. One can support the person affected, clarify facts and limit further harm without claiming another's hidden nature. But assistance depends on what is actually happening. Repairing an error, preventing recurrence and ethical condemnation are distinct tasks. All may be needed, or only the first. Our anger's intensity does not automatically measure their necessity. Preserving distinctions gives fairness more room: serious consequences matter without intention, and intentional mistreatment matters even when its worst outcome was prevented.

III. Personal history adds meaning without passing judgement

Another's episode can recall personal experience. This possible connection should be checked against the person's account, not declared the hidden cause of every instance of anger on another's behalf. Similarity may be obvious through familiar words or power differences; someone may also object to circumstances never personally experienced. Neither similarity nor its absence determines the reaction's ethical value. History can sharpen attention to a violation or make one interpretation overly convincing. Keep both possibilities open and examine what is recognised.

A hypothetical observer sees a teacher interrupt a student and remembers similar treatment. They instantly conclude the student now feels worthless. This may be accurate. Yet the student may mainly feel annoyed, reject the teacher's judgement or see an ordinary argument. The observer knows their memory better than the student's state. Recognising this does not excuse rudeness. They can explain that the exchange appeared humiliating and ask how it was experienced. History then opens contact instead of supplying an answer in advance.

Examining an impression in Enchiridion §20 supplies a philosophical reference for delaying the initial inference. We do not adopt the radical reduction of external harm to judgement alone. Our narrower application concerns moving from recognising resemblance to claiming complete knowledge of another's event. Similar forms do not establish identical circumstances. Difference can improve assistance: another may have a resource we lacked or face a danger invisible when we remember only our own history.

When memory matters, consider it separately from choosing for another. What response did I need then? What do I want for myself now? What does the present participant request? Answers can differ. Wanting past justice restored is understandable, but another person need not play the role that completes our story. Their consent, interests and resources remain independent. Supporting them can coexist with noticing our own tension. This is more complex

than choosing between selfless defence and personal projection, but does not require denying either connection or distinct circumstances.

IV. Hearing someone matters more than occupying their place

Help becomes more accurate when the affected person remains a source of information about their interests. Their account does not exhaust the objective situation: they may lack facts, hesitate or be unable to speak freely. Yet excluding their position risks turning assistance into something done to them. Do they want conversation, accompaniment, an end to mistreatment, a record of events or simply not to be alone? Offering help must not conceal an order to accept it and validate our ethical correctness.

In a hypothetical friendship, someone describes an unfair exchange with a partner. Their friend becomes angry and proposes immediately ending the relationship. The speaker wants to understand the event first and is not ready. This does not make the problem minor; the proposed action and current readiness differ. Clarify what happened and what immediate outcome is wanted. One can object to humiliation without demanding an instant life decision. Where coercion or immediate danger exists, support and safety take priority; an ordinary conversation about feelings cannot be promised to resolve them.

Proverbs 18:13 condemns answering before hearing. This is an ethical teaching of Hebrew wisdom rather than a tested assistance technology. We use it to limit our haste. Listening need not mean accepting every interpretation or promising everything. Clarifying a request for support may be more useful than proposing a completed plan. Support might mean a witness, confidentiality or help forming a question. These are not interchangeable merely because all sound kind.

Refusal remains possible. Offering support and punishing the wrong choice already contains pressure. An observer can state their own limit, such as declining to support retaliatory humiliation while offering accompaniment. This differs from demanding obedience to a plan. Respecting another's voice does not imply unlimited resources for the helper or prohibit ethical judgement. It means connecting through available consent and a clear role. That connection lets anger become assistance answering a real need rather than only the observer's intense feeling.

V. Protection and punishment have different outcomes

Action to protect someone should be assessed by its intended change. Stopping mistreatment, restoring a voice, reducing recurrence and making an offender suffer are distinct outcomes. A fair arrangement may include accountability, but outrage does not grant unlimited punitive authority. Where another's suffering is the principal goal, name that honestly. Doing so does not deny the wrong; it clarifies who benefits, who pays an additional price and what actions are actually available.

In a hypothetical team, an observer could interrupt a manager with an accusation, defend a colleague's opportunity to finish speaking, or afterwards help record the incident. Consequences differ. Accusation may feel decisive but increase the colleague's risk. Supporting a turn may change the conversation directly. Documentation may aid later consideration without stopping the present event. None is universally correct. Compare purpose, role, urgency and the affected person's ability to participate. Immediate harm leaves less time; a rule cannot be based solely on comfortable scenes of extended discussion.

In Quran 42:40–43, responding after injustice accompanies proportionality and praise for forgiveness. Its religious meaning includes divine judgement, not a contemporary investigation procedure. Our comparison concerns limiting response rather than always yielding. Aristotle IV.5 also considers the appropriate target and circumstances of anger. These traditions do not merge into one system: grounds, ends and accounts of virtue differ. Sharing a question about measure does not establish identical answers.

Assistance can matter without a triumphant exposure. Someone may need to end a discussion without further humiliation, preserve a factual record or retain the ability to refuse next time. These outcomes cannot be judged solely by the defender's satisfaction. If our response is louder than the affected person's voice, check whether they have become background. A less spectacular step need not weaken an ethical position. Caution must also not excuse total inaction where a useful proportionate step is available. Connect anger with a result for another rather than replacing it with dramatic courage or convenient silence.

VI. Friends and strangers require the same question about facts

Closeness can make another's pain more visible without removing the need to examine information. We understand a familiar person's story more easily and may accept their explanation faster. That does not make it false or require suspicion. Distinguish supporting a person from declaring every circumstance established. Recognising their difficulty need not settle another's intention. Listening does not appoint us a judge. Clarification should preserve connection, and loyalty should preserve clarification.

A hypothetical friend says they were deceived in joint work. We know them well but have not seen correspondence or the terms. The first task may be hearing the consequences and identifying needed information. Publicly repeating an accusation before checking distributes risk more widely: the affected person becomes linked to our version, and another to an unverified description. Yet requiring impossible certainty before any support is also unhelpful. Listening, accompaniment and public judgement are different steps requiring different grounds in proportion to their consequences.

Aristotle's discussion of defending friends in IV.5 does not settle equal treatment of everyone. His ethics is historically and socially situated; a contemporary universal norm cannot quietly be inserted into it. Our editorial principle is that a specific factual claim should be examined irrespective of liking the participant. This requires neither equal intimacy nor identical assistance for everyone. It prevents membership of our circle from proving another's guilt, preserving trust alongside distinctions between known, reported and inferred information.

Apply the same question when the affected person is unlikeable. Can a violation be noticed without endorsing their entire character? Protection from a particular humiliation does not mean approval of every act. Available help can be limited to a task and role. This is an editorial ethical proposal, not an experimental finding about universal human nature. It challenges a familiar pattern in which insiders receive understanding and outsiders receive explanations of their own blame. Anger can widen attention when we also examine our exclusions: whom have we denied a hearing, and why?

VII. The helper's voice also needs a measure

An objection can name a violation without appropriating the whole situation. A helper's words have consequences: support, disclosure, increased conflict or eclipsing the affected person's voice. Separate what was witnessed from what was reported and inferred. Having heard someone interrupted differs from claiming that a manager always deliberately humiliates people. The latter may be true but needs broader support. Anger does not make that requirement an irrelevant formality.

At a hypothetical meeting, an observer asks that the colleague be allowed to finish. This identifies an action and available change. Alternatively, they may declare the manager morally incapable of listening. The more expressive statement need not help the present participant. Restraint is not invariably better; sometimes directly naming humiliation or firmly refusing participation is needed. Circumstances, capacities and risks determine the choice. We assess speech by its subject and consequences rather than only how brave or calm it sounds to its speaker.

Gita 17.15 places truthful, agreeable and beneficial speech within religious discipline. Proverbs 18:13 values hearing before answering. Together they suggest editorial questions about knowledge, effects and who bears them. Neither promises that a truthful objection upsets nobody. Considering others must not prohibit naming a violation because the person responsible dislikes hearing it. Benevolent speech and the recipient's agreement differ.

Confidentiality matters too. Wanting to defend someone loudly may prompt sharing their story without permission. Even accuracy can remove their control over who knows about their difficulty. Before spreading information, consider role, consent and substantial consequences. Immediate danger can require a different urgent action, but it is a distinct circumstance rather than blanket permission to publish a relative's experience. Reach does not measure help. Preserving a conversation and preparing specific participation may serve better than making someone a public symbol of our ethical position. Their dignity includes not being displayed for the sake of protection.

VIII. Assistance is assessed through participation and consequence

Anger on another's behalf can begin useful action, but usefulness is established separately. Afterwards examine whether their situation changed: more opportunity to speak, less risk or needed support? Gratitude cannot be required as proof that help was correct. Someone may be unready to assess it, feel mixed emotions or notice an unwanted consequence. A correction concerns the outcome, not an insult to the helper. If support was the goal, hearing correction belongs to the relationship we wanted to create.

In a hypothetical work episode, an observer offers to record facts afterwards and the colleague agrees. The record exists, while the manager's treatment has not changed. This is a limited result: an agreed action occurred and the larger problem remains. Calling everything solved replaces assistance with the end of the whole story. Alternatively, a public intervention may stop humiliation but bring punishment later. Acknowledge the immediate benefit and additional cost together. Neither should disappear to protect a brave act's reputation or justify refusing all participation.

Ethical texts do not eliminate observation. Aristotle's measure depends on circumstances; Quranic discussion preserves its religious grounds; Gita's speech discipline promises no desired outcome. Their limited comparison maintains attention to a response's subject and limits. Assessing a contemporary step, however, requires contemporary evidence. If a philosophical name conceals refusal to examine consequences, it has become decoration. Explain why an action seemed good while also examining what it meant for the other participant.

Further involvement may need to stop or change. Resources may be insufficient, a form of support may not fit, or the person may decline continuation. This does not erase what was done or establish that anger was false. One can preserve the ethical objection while recognising a role's limits. A modest result may also permit better-informed continuation. Feeling indicates involvement, evidence concerns the situation, consent concerns a shared step, and consequences concern its effects. None replaces the others. Protection then remains a relationship with someone rather than a story about our own correctness.

What this means in practice

When another's episode evokes strong anger, first identify what is known. Did I witness an action, hear an account, read a short message or infer a motive from a familiar pattern? These sources differ in strength, though all can begin attention. A complete picture is unnecessary for listening. Public accusation or consequential action needs broader support. Do not confuse the speed of sympathy with readiness to decide. Sympathy may arrive immediately; choosing involvement may require questions, time and evidence.

Distinguish three possible subjects: harm to a person, violation of a valued norm and resemblance to personal history. They can coexist without forcing a single true cause. Ask what evidence supports, what is inferred and what the person says. Helping write an account differs from intervening in conversation. If their position is unknown, offer something that permits refusal. Intervention against immediate harm is considered separately through urgency, safety and role, not made compulsory for every outrage.

Describe the step through an outcome for the affected person: finishing a thought, accompaniment, a useful record, less contact with dangerous mistreatment or available support. What might worsen for them? What should remain private? Who bears the cost? Where answers are unclear, help can remain limited without promising to resolve the conflict. Under coercion and unequal power, telling someone to speak for themselves is insufficient support. Consider freedom to speak, resources and punishment risk without replacing an external constraint with a supposed inward fear.

Afterwards, examine their view and visible consequences. Missing gratitude does not prove ingratitude; personal satisfaction does not prove benefit. Ask whether the participation fitted and whether anything should change. An unavailable answer remains unknown. A modest result may be a clearer role, agreed support, stopped harm or learning that a method does not fit. It does not end every injustice. It makes further participation more responsible while preserving the protected person's voice, pace and right to correct the helper.

Key quotation

> *“its causes are many and diverse”.*

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics IV.5, excerpt concerning anger, W. D. Ross translation. Context. This recognises varied causes rather than offering a modern psychological classification.

Connections between traditions

Similarities concern protection, listening and measure. Research categories do not replace ethical grounds, and philosophy does not establish an event's facts.

Comparison	Similarity	Limit
Aristotle IV.5 ↔ anger for someone close	Another's humiliation can have ethical significance	Ancient defence of friends does not establish a modern universal norm
Hechler/Kessler ↔ harm and norms	Intention and consequence can be considered separately	Experimental scenarios do not read real participants' motives
Proverbs 18:13 ↔ the affected person's position	Hearing matters before responding	Ethical wisdom does not guarantee effective intervention
Epictetus §20 ↔ personal history	An initial impression can be examined	Actual harm is not reduced to opinion
Quran 42:40–43 ↔ Gita 17.15	Response and speech have limits	Responding to injustice and disciplining speech occupy different spiritual frameworks

Primary sources and research

• Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, IV.5–6 — IV.5–6, W. D. Ross translation; anger and social disagreement.

• Stefanie Hechler; Thomas Kessler. On the difference between moral outrage and empathic anger (2018) — Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 76, 270–282; DOI 10.1016/j.jesp.2018.03.005; abstract, introduction and available excerpts, not full methods.

• Epictetus. Enchiridion, §§1, 5, 20 — §§1, 5, 20, Elizabeth Carter translation; control, judgement and delay.

• Hebrew Bible, Book of Proverbs. Proverbs 18:13, King James Version — 18:13, KJV; answering before hearing.

• Quran; translation displayed on Quran.com. Ash-Shura 42:40–43 — 42:40–43, displayed English translation; proportional response and forgiveness.

• Bhagavad Gita; translated by Swami Adidevananda. Bhagavad Gita 17.15 — 17.15, Gita Supersite translations, especially Swami Adidevananda; discipline of speech, accessible indexed verse text read.

Tags

inner navigation, human experience, emotions, distinctions, life episode, interpretation, responsibility, consent, dignity, safety, boundaries, relationships, dialogue, choice, consequences, uncertainty, attention, ethical judgement, hypothetical example, philosophy, religion, research, United Wisdom, practical reflection, facts, Anger on another’s behalf, empathy

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.