

UNITED WISDOM

Acknowledging the Irreversible While Retaining Permission to Protest

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-17-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Acknowledging the Irreversible While Retaining Permission to Protest

Epigraph

Even to day is my complaint bitter:

— Job 23:2, opening clause of the verse; King James Version

What this article is about

Mila stopped beside the courtyard path where two old lindens had stood. Their cut trunks now lay on the ground. A neighbour said it was too late to argue: the trees could not be brought back, so she could only accept what had happened. Mila understood the first part. It did not follow that the decision had become right, that remembering the trees meant nothing, or that questions about future cutting were forbidden. Her friend, meanwhile, did not want to join a petition and would not explain her refusal. This imagined scene shows distinct relations to one fact. Someone can acknowledge an event's irreversibility, retain disagreement, and decide separately whether to act further. They may also decline public participation. Comparing selected passages in Epictetus, Job, and Aristotle, we preserve their different grounds rather than merging them into one doctrine of calm. Our subject is a personal relation to the irreversible, not a legal protest procedure, promised restoration, or compulsory useful lesson.

I. A fact does not deliver a moral verdict

“It happened” reports an event. “It was right” evaluates it. “Nothing can be done now” describes present possibilities, and does so comprehensively. These statements can follow one another as though the second and third automatically came from the first. The connection needs separate examination. In our scene, Mila can see that the old lindens are absent; their absence alone does not establish that the decision was right. Keeping the distinction does not demand their impossible return. It refuses to let a completed action provide its own justification. Irreversibility describes a limit to changing a particular fact. It settles neither the moral assessment nor every consequence or future possibility.

Sometimes the fact itself is not established yet. A report may be inaccurate, causes unknown, or evidence conflicting. Acknowledging reality then does not require agreeing immediately with the most confident account. Mila knows the trees were cut, but may not know who decided or on what grounds. Those questions should not acquire answers silently just because trunks now lie on the ground. Separating the known from the unknown makes disagreement

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

more precise: their absence can be named without assigning unverified intentions to people. No investigative or legal method is supplied. The article leaves room for honest incompleteness in an account, which can coexist with a definite response to a change already visible. Uncertainty about a cause need not erase certainty about the particular loss.

Agreement also has different objects. A person may agree with an account of an event, agree to do a necessary task today, or agree with a judgment about the action. Using the same word does not make these decisions identical. Mila might remove a dangerously placed branch from the path while continuing to think the cutting was wrong. Helping with an available task need not amount to signing the earlier decision. Refusing to help does not automatically prove deeper disagreement either. We establish no scale of proper protest. Asking what each agreement or refusal actually covers is more useful. Acknowledgment then stops becoming a vast formula demanding calm, gratitude, silence, and approval all at once.

II. Irreversibility needs a particular object

In this scene the old trees will no longer be those same living trees. That is a definite limit. A photograph may survive, an explanation may be requested, and other trees may still be standing. These possibilities differ, and none can be called a way of returning the whole past. A new linden does not become the old one by being planted in the same place. A record of memory does not restore a living trunk. Yet the difference does not make planting or recording pointless. They have other objects. Protest may concern the judgment of an earlier decision, while care concerns the present courtyard. Confusing objects forces a false choice between total restoration and total meaninglessness.

An irreversible loss must also be distinguished from an action that continues. Something destroyed today does not prove that everything else will be destroyed tomorrow, or that attention to the future is useless. If harm is continuing, describing it as simply past gives an inaccurate account of the present. In our scene Mila asks only about the other trees; the article does not tell her in advance whether further cutting is planned. Acknowledging what was already cut does not settle every future threat. The distinction matters elsewhere too: a completed fact, continuing consequences, and a possible new action belong to different times. They can be separated before deciding, without promising that the distinction itself will stop events or provide control over their outcome.

Someone may know clearly that they want no action on this matter now. That decision need not include agreement with the past. Mila's friend may retain her opinion while declining a petition, meeting, or account. Her refusal need not be explained as tiredness, fear, or insufficient maturity. An opportunity to act and an obligation to act are different claims. Irreversibility itself creates no duty to extract benefits from whatever possibilities remain. A person may simply know what happened for a while, without selecting a public position or

turning memory into a project. Such a pause does not make the event good or prove that they have stopped caring. It lets present life exist without requiring every minute to confirm a particular attitude.

III. Epictetus: more than factual acknowledgment

In chapter VIII of the Manual, Epictetus proposes wishing occurrences to be as they are. That is stronger than acknowledging that a particular event has happened. Knowing and directing one's wish remain different. In XI, loss is described as returning what was given; XXXI concerns gods who govern the whole wisely and justly. Read together, these selected passages cannot be portrayed as merely a neutral technique for accepting any fact. Assent is connected with a particular understanding of world order and piety. A contemporary reader needs to see that ground before deciding what they accept. This article does not require Mila to wish for the cutting, or call it just, in order to acknowledge honestly that the trees are gone.

Epictetus also addresses the loss of loved ones and property. His image of returning gives an event a particular place in relation to the giver. For someone who shares that ground, it may have its own meaning. Replacing the word loss with returning at another person's instruction is not the same as freely accepting that understanding. It is particularly misleading to present it as compulsory language for someone else's grief. Mila is not asked to prove that the trees never belonged to her and therefore cannot be regretted. The historical image helps explain the source, rather than removing a contemporary person's permission to call a loss a loss. Attentive reading need not turn every philosophical judgment into a rule imposed on oneself or a neighbour.

Neighbouring chapters include claims connecting distress with opinions and severe descriptions of family duties. They are not used here to blame someone for being harmed or require endurance of continuing violence. That is an explicit limit of our contemporary comparison, not a claim that the entire ancient text already contains our boundaries. Preserving a source means more than selecting a convenient line: it also means identifying where its historical teaching differs from our proposal. For the irreversible, this yields a useful caution. The word acceptance should not conceal a whole set of demands whose grounds a reader does not share. Factual acknowledgment is narrower than Stoic assent to the whole and its occurrences.

IV. Job: complaint within a relation to God

Chapter 23 of Job does not begin with calm agreement. Job speaks of a bitter complaint and a wish to present his case before God. In this selected chapter he does not regard the question as closed simply because suffering already exists. The text shows religious speech in which complaint remains within a relation to God. That does not turn Job's speech into a universal contemporary licence for every form of protest. This is a particular biblical voice with its own convictions and fear. For Mila, the comparison means only that the existence of a fact and the continuation of a question need not exclude each other. Her courtyard does not thereby repeat the book's plot, nor must her neighbour become a biblical interlocutor.

In verses 8–9 Job says he cannot find God; subsequent verses retain fidelity to God's way, before expressing fear. This sequence offers no simple passage from complaint to serenity. Reading the complete selected chapter prevents a strong isolated line from becoming a promise of an immediate answer. The reference to testing and gold belongs to Job's speech in its religious context. It does not authorize telling a contemporary reader that every loss will purify them or produce growth. We claim no reading of the whole book or its resolution. Within the selected passage, question, fidelity, and uncertainty coexist. They remain together without an artificially accelerated ending or a guarantee that someone must verify through their conduct.

For someone who does not share Job's faith, the chapter can remain an interlocutor rather than a ready-made personal prayer. For a believer, it does not prescribe the compulsory form of their present speech either. One reader wants to speak, another remains silent, and a third finds no addressee. We do not make those differences signs of correct or incorrect spirituality. The comparison protects the possibility of not closing a question through someone else's “it had to be this way” when the person does not affirm that themselves. The contemporary freedom to speak or remain silent is formulated editorially here. It cannot quietly be assigned to every line of Job. Both text and reader retain their particularity.

V. Disagreement need not deny reality

Mila can say both that the old lindens cannot be restored and that their cutting provokes her protest. The second statement does not become false because the first is true. Protest may preserve an evaluation, request explanation, or draw attention to consequences. It need not promise to reverse what already happened. Calling someone a person who argues with reality merely because they disagree is therefore too broad. The object of disagreement needs to be understood. If Mila demands photographs showing the trees alive today, she demands an inaccurate account. Asking for an explanation has another object. This article predicts no outcome of such a request. It distinguishes denying the known from questioning an evaluation or subsequent action after acknowledging what is known.

Disagreement sometimes involves no approach to the decision-maker. Mila keeps a photograph and dates it while declining a meeting. That may be memory of what was lost rather than an attempt to obtain an answer. She need not automatically be assigned a hidden hope of returning everything, or a duty to turn the photograph into public evidence. One object permits several relations. That multiplicity does not prevent precision: the old lindens can be remembered specifically, without claiming that new trees replace every associated event. In this article, permission to protest includes retaining an evaluation privately. It does not require every disagreement to be presented to others, its sincerity demonstrated, or the most visible form of participation selected.

Disagreement with an event also grants no unlimited right to someone else's response. Mila's friend need not sign a petition, discuss photographs, or confirm that the loss matters on the same scale. Another neighbour may remember the trees differently. Those differences do not remove Mila's own relation, but her relation does not appropriate their voices. Protest is separated from a demand for unanimity. This boundary belongs to the contemporary editorial frame, rather than the shared literal teaching of the selected ancient texts. It permits a question to continue without making others compulsory witnesses. An evaluation can be retained, a fact named, and refusal to participate respected together. None must cancel the other two for the sake of an attractive collective position.

VI. An available action does not mean control over the outcome

In Nicomachean Ethics III.3, Aristotle connects deliberation with what can be done by the agent. He distinguishes things not dependent on such action from possible means. For our question, it is useful not to assign one letter control over the entire outcome. Mila can write a question, retain a copy, and decide how much time to devote. One decision cannot secure an answer, neighbours' agreement, or a change in a future plan. An available action remains an action without a guaranteed result. Yet lack of guarantee does not prove that it is required either. Participation needs a personal decision, not merely an available means, and not a promise that an ancient philosopher endorsed every contemporary campaign.

In the selected section, Aristotle considers means while the end is already assumed. That matters: “Do I want to pursue this at all?” is not his literal question here. We add it separately so that the possibility of protest does not become a duty to carry out every available step. Mila might want an explanation, care for the future courtyard, preserved memory, or none of these for now. These ends need not be reduced to one. If she chooses a particular question, means can be considered within her time and consent. If she chooses none, failing to send a request does not imply approval of the cutting. Separating end, means, and fact keeps personal life from becoming a permanent project to correct everything that happened.

Considering means may reveal that the earlier end, in its chosen form, cannot be achieved. Aristotle's passage includes a limit to searching for an impossible means, rather than requiring endless demonstrations of determination. The same old trees cannot be replanted in our scene; new planting can be considered separately. Changing an end need not become a comforting victory. Mila may say a new tree would be valuable and that the earlier loss remains. She may also decline planting. We provide no uniform procedure for civic action and guarantee neither the safety nor success of a request. The example concerns narrower honesty: action relates to a present possibility, evaluation to an event, and the outcome may remain unknown even after a definite decision to participate.

VII. Bearing witness does not require continuous public speech

A question to the past sometimes remains as testimony. Someone records what disappeared, what was said, what is known, and what remains unestablished. This differs from trying to make the fact vanish. A record may matter personally without becoming a public document. Mila captions the photograph: two lindens beside the path, taken before the cutting. She need not add an unverified account of another person's intention. Nor must she share it immediately for memory to count as genuine. A precise record can leave a question open without daily dispute. This article sets no rules for preserving legal evidence or conducting investigations. It concerns personal testimony, which need not grow large to preserve a particular connection with what was lost.

Another choice is to record nothing. Memory does not always require a material carrier, and declining a record does not prove agreement. Someone may not know whether they want to revisit the event, or refuse others' questions. These possibilities matter especially when protest becomes a test of courage. A person need not speak continually for disagreement to retain significance. Job's speech shows a particular voice that does not close its complaint; it does not require everyone to reproduce that voice. The Stoic text offers a different path of assent. Our contemporary comparison lets a reader refrain from choosing between them immediately, or from demonstrating exactly how they presently relate to the irreversible. Neither disclosure nor silence measures authenticity universally.

Continually repeating a position is not the only way to preserve it. Mila can stop arguing with a neighbour over dinner without changing her assessment of the cutting. A break in conversation concerns conversation, not automatically conviction. Treating every pause as surrender would require endless confirmation of what was already said. The article does not claim that a pause inevitably brings relief or that argument is always useless. It distinguishes times: the conversation can stop now while the question remains open. An ordinary day can include work, food, meeting someone, and memory together, without every activity becoming a symbol of protest or evidence of final reconciliation. Disagreement can have a place in life without occupying the entirety of that life.

VIII. Another person’s calm does not determine your response

Mila's neighbour sincerely thinks it is better not to think about the trees again. That may be his chosen relation. The problem begins when he makes it compulsory for everyone and declares a different response mistaken. Mila need not prove that he hides feelings or understands less than she does. She need only refrain from making his decision her own. The difference need not become another judgment of someone else's calm. One person continues a question, another declines discussion; both remain particular people with boundaries. Shared life may require agreements about particular actions, but not identical inward reactions. Universal agreement cannot be obtained merely because everyone can observe the same fact. A common observation leaves room for different evaluations and choices.

Even a source suitable for one person can be presented inappropriately to another. If the neighbour tells Mila that wisdom requires wishing for everything that occurs, he may quietly demand a particular understanding of gods, good, and loss. If Mila requires him to complain like Job in return, she assigns him another person's voice too. Our reading makes neither tradition an instrument of compulsion. A source can be offered as an interlocutor, with its particular ground explained and refusal permitted. That promises no harmonious conversation. It preserves the distinction between discussing an idea and directing another person's life. Historical formulas especially should not be used to deny an actual loss or the responsibility of someone who could influence the event.

Someone's disagreement cannot become their permanent duty either. If Mila later stops pursuing a petition, that need not make her earlier words insincere. Time, knowledge, and willingness may change. An evaluation can remain while participation changes; an evaluation can also change when new information appears. No option should be deduced beforehand from a supposedly correct philosophical role. Personal continuation need not depend on remaining the most steadfast or the calmest person in the courtyard. It concerns choosing a particular activity under present conditions. The article does not approve every act labelled protest. It protects a narrower freedom: acknowledgment of a fact need not mean automatically abandoning one's question, nor does retaining a question bind a person to permanent public activity.

IX. Disagreement can remain unfinished

Life may offer no final state in which someone either accepts everything without remainder or never yields anything at all. Mila acknowledges the lindens' absence, disputes the decision's evaluation, does not know the courtyard's future, and nevertheless meets a friend. These are several relations rather than one definitive answer. They need not be judged an inward failure because they do not merge into a formula. In the selected chapter of Job, question, fidelity, and fear stand together. Epictetus's Manual gives assent another, more comprehensive ground. The difference makes it possible to see contemporary incompleteness without concealing it behind a confident label of shared ancient wisdom or a compulsory path to calm. A partial answer can remain explicitly partial.

Retained protest need not require hatred of every subsequent day. If Mila notices a new flower beside the path, she need not look away to confirm her relation to the old trees. The new object does not cancel the earlier one. A meeting can be enjoyed while a loss is remembered; future planting can be considered while refusing to call the cutting a useful lesson. This guarantees no easy coexistence of different feelings. It distinguishes objects and permits a good moment not to become betrayal of a loss. Someone need not prove the whole story has acquired the right meaning before taking part in an ordinary task. Participation is neither a receipt approving the past nor a technique required to reduce its weight.

There is no duty to preserve protest forever in its earlier form either. A question may change, become quieter, lose a practical addressee, or remain memory. An answer may give it new precision. These possibilities cannot be allocated beforehand to stages of proper acceptance. No psychological stages or deadline are described here. Personal continuation means something else: a known fact remains known, an evaluation may persist or be reconsidered, and action is chosen separately. Irreversibility limits the return of a particular past, without granting others authority to declare every remaining question closed. This distinction promises no final harmony. It leaves honest room for what remains unsettled and requires no announcement of a completion the person does not experience.

X. Acknowledging a limit while leaving a question

Our scene ends with Mila keeping the photograph and choosing one question about the other trees. Her friend does not participate. The old lindens do not return. None of these facts proves Mila found the right consolation or that her friend approved the cutting. The imagined scene ends with a limited action rather than a grand victory over the past. It shows a possibility of naming absence, retaining an evaluation, and choosing present participation together. Real choices may differ: silence, a note, conversation, or declining conversation. No option is supplied in advance for every reader. Distinctions are offered for considering a particular choice without promised restoration, others' agreement, or final relief. This ending remains an example, not a forecast.

Acknowledging the irreversible can be precise: this particular past can no longer be changed. Precision diminishes if unspoken additions follow: therefore it was just; therefore gratitude is required; therefore questions are forbidden. Each addition needs its own ground. Epictetus connects such a ground with world order and piety; Job retains complaint in relation to God; Aristotle considers available means with an assumed end. These are different textual tasks. Our contemporary conclusion attributes no unanimity to them: a limit to changing the fact can be acknowledged without giving it authority over every evaluation and subsequent action. Readers may consider that conclusion, accept it partly, or postpone it without performing inward agreement for someone else's expectations.

Within this frame, permission to protest is neither an order to protest nor a guarantee of success. It permits retaining a judgment, question, or testimony after honestly acknowledging what happened. Permission to pause is neither an order to forget nor proof of approval. Between them remains room for particular decisions that need not become lifelong roles. An irreversible event retains its limit, but need not automatically become the sole author of a future life. Continuation requires neither gratitude for loss, a promised lesson, nor identical reactions from loved ones. It does not return the old lindens or repair every consequence. It preserves a present choice to act or refrain, without substituting agreement for fact or denial of fact for disagreement.

What this means in practice

If reflection fits now, you might choose one event and write three separate statements. The first concerns what is known and cannot return in its earlier form. The second concerns your evaluation, if you want to name it. The third concerns an action, or absence of action, chosen for today. There is no need to select the hardest event, prove yourself to others, or disclose a personal history. Unknown facts can remain unknown in the first statement rather than being filled with assumptions.

You might then look for an unnoticed “therefore” connecting the statements. A fact does not automatically entail approval; an evaluation does not oblige every available step; the absence of guarantee does not make every step pointless. These distinctions require no change of feeling. They help name objects more precisely. Where harm is continuing, it should not be described beforehand as entirely completed past.

You can stop with a note, choose one limited question, or take no action now. Another person need not be recruited without agreement, and refusal need not become a test of friendship. The practice is optional and promises neither calm, restoration, nor a successful request. It does not replace specialist help or supply a legal procedure. It can be postponed without explanation and without first forgiving, giving thanks, or finding useful meaning.

Key quotation

> *We deliberate about things that are in our power and can be done;*

— Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics III.3, opening clause; W. D. Ross

Connections between traditions

Question

First textual ground

Second textual ground

Comparison mechanism

What does not follow

Fact and assent of desire

Epictetus, VIII, carrier 891: occurrences are to be wished as they are, rather than merely reported.

Job 23:2–7, 51–60: bitter complaint and desire to present a case before God remain while suffering exists.

Knowing an event is separated from relating to it: Stoic direction of desire differs from religious complaint. Contemporary factual acknowledgment remains narrower.

No single doctrine of calm, compulsory approval, or guaranteed answer to any present protest follows.

Loss and religious ground

Epictetus, XI, 901: loss, including loved ones and property, is called returning what was given; a giver is named.

Job 23:13–17, 71–78: divine appointment and inability to turn God’s will coexist with the speaker’s fear.

Both passages contain a particular relation to a higher order, but no identical emotional form. Their grounds are not hidden beneath neutral acceptance.

Readers need not call their loss returning, agree with a purpose, or adopt someone else’s phrase as compulsory language for experience.

Assent to the whole and an open question

Epictetus, XXXI, 972–977: gods administer the whole wisely and justly; piety includes voluntary following and ritual context.

Job 23:8–12, 62–69: God cannot be found, but fidelity remains; testing and gold belong to Job’s speech.

The comprehensive Stoic ground differs from question, fidelity, and uncertainty in the selected chapter. Contemporary incompleteness is not named shared ancient assent.

No promise that every current loss produces growth, purification, or calm; religious premises remain explicit.

The irreversible and an available means

Aristotle, III.3, 65–75: available means are deliberated; searching stops at an impossible means, with the end assumed.

Epictetus, VIII and XXXI, 891/972–974: relation to occurrences concerns desire and assessment of things outside our power.

A limit to changing the event, a present means, and a wider ground of assent are distinguished. A new tree is not presented as returning the old one.

Aristotle does not supply our question of reconsidering the end here; Epictetus is no neutral author of a contemporary campaign or guarantee of its success.

A question and control of the answer

Job 23:3–9, 53–64: wishing to present a case does not remove the speaker's inability to find the addressee.

Aristotle, III.3, 68–71: available action is considered amid uncertain outcomes; others may assist deliberation.

Mila's present question can be definite while the answer remains unknown. An opportunity to ask does not mean control over results or others' agreement.

No legal procedure, probability of reply, or neighbours' duty to participate is established; present consent is a separate editorial boundary.

A personal limit rather than an imposed role

Epictetus, XXXI, 972: following occurrences is grounded in particular beliefs about gods and a just whole.

Job 23:2/15–17, 51/75–78: complaint and fear are explicit within a relation to God.

Different grounds do not command Mila or her friend to repeat one response. The article separately preserves voluntary speech, silence, and participation.

Neither calm nor complaint is a universal maturity test; historical V/XXX are not used for victim blame or enduring continuing violence.

Primary sources

1. **Epictetus, *Manual*, VIII, XI, XXXI.** George Long's named translation, Project Gutenberg 10661. Complete selected chapters were read: VIII, carrier 891; XI, 901; XXXI, 972–977, with displayed neighbouring context including severe V and XXX. The translator header was checked; no printed edition date is established here. Wishing occurrences, returning, and piety retain their particular grounds; neighbouring historical formulas are not used for victim blame. Primary text.

2. **Job 23, KJV.** All seventeen selected verses and edition label were actually read. Complaint, searching for God, fidelity, testing, and fear remain religious speech. Gold in 23:10 becomes no promise of compulsory growth after present loss; no whole-book or resolution reading is claimed. Primary text.

3. **Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, III.3.** W. D. Ross's translation, Internet Classics Archive. Exact actual reading of the complete selected chapter 65–80, already done in this same task

for P35, is reused; no new whole-work pass is claimed. Available means deliberation assumes an end; the contemporary question of wanting participation is added editorially and separately. Primary text.

Both short Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from the named English editions. The English epigraph was checked against KJV, the key clause against Ross, including continuations and selected context. No whole-work reading, Greek/Hebrew collation, therapeutic efficacy, or blanket international commercial rights is asserted. Ledger rights remain UNKNOWN; raw sources are not imported into a database or vector index. Contemporary voluntary protest, silence, and participation form a limited editorial frame, without claimed unanimity among traditions.

Tags

irreversibility, acceptance, protest, fact, evaluation, assent, disagreement, loss, memory, question, testimony, silence, pause, participation, boundaries, uncertainty, action, means, end, Epictetus, Job, Aristotle, piety, complaint, fidelity, fear, returning, present, continuation, freedom of choice

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.