

UNITED WISDOM

Noise, order, and different ideas of what is normal

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-18-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Noise, order, and different ideas of what is normal

Epigraph

> *Only the sound reached me…*

George Gissing, By the Ionian Sea, Chapter X, web426, opening of the second sentence. The traveller hears a conversation whose content he does not understand.

What this article is about

Imagine an evening in a building with a shared staircase. Someone returns from a late shift and talks on the phone on the landing. Behind the neighbouring door, someone else is trying to finish work. By morning, shoes by the entrance and a box beside the railing have joined the dispute. One person sees ordinary life; the other sees disorder. Each assumes that calling their own expectations normal should settle the matter. Yet the phone, shoes, and box have different effects. Perhaps one item is merely unwelcome, another obstructs passage, and the source of the sound has been misidentified.

A conversation about neighbours begins where these distinctions matter. This article asks how to separate the effects of particular noise or clutter from a demand that someone follow another person's way of life. We consider the event, the activity affected, an available change, and the other person's response. Every domestic scene is fictional. Historical philosophy and one university's housing rules offer different comparisons; they do not establish local standards. The suggested practice is voluntary, does not guarantee agreement, and is not a required conversation when there is a threat.

I. Audible, unpleasant, and obstructive describe different things

A sound can be audible without preventing an activity. Someone else's music can irritate you even while you continue working. Or you can feel little irritation but miss another person's words during an important call. These experiences need no ranking of which is most real. They do, however, communicate different things when you request a change. The first concerns perception, the second a feeling, and the third a particular intersection of activities. Greater precision reduces the need to prove either your own good upbringing or your neighbour's general inadequacy. In Chapter X of By the Ionian Sea, Gissing describes an audible but incomprehensible conversation, then later reassesses irritation with music. A literary episode does not establish that every interference is invented.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

In our fictional building, Anna hears Nikita's phone conversation through her door. She does not know whether he is deliberately speaking loudly or whether he understands how his voice travels along the stairs. She can say that his conversation is audible in her room without explaining his character. If it interferes with a call, naming that activity and its time helps. If what troubles her is simply another person's presence behind the wall, that too is Anna's experience, but it does not automatically determine how Nikita may live. Clarifying the subject does not dismiss the feeling; it helps her make a request consistent with what is known.

Nikita can also describe what he knows. He has returned late and has not yet entered his flat. He could move the conversation inside, end it sooner, or resume it later. Perhaps his voice is audible indoors as well. In that case the first adjustment would be insufficient and another check would be needed. Neither Anna nor Nikita has to guarantee silence throughout the building in advance. They need to learn what action is available and what changes where the difficulty arose. Any result remains limited to this episode until a broader arrangement has been discussed.

Precision must not become an examination imposed on the person being disturbed. Anna need not keep an impeccable record of every second or first prove that her irritation is always justified. She can begin with a sufficiently specific case and acknowledge uncertainty. Nikita can ask for clarification when it helps him act; that does not entitle him to postpone responding indefinitely. If discussion is possible, both can approach the subject more closely. If it is not, an imperfect description does not erase the difficulty or the need to find another suitable way of addressing it.

II. A familiar norm is not yet a shared agreement

Normal often means that things were arranged this way wherever I lived before. In one home, shoes stayed by the door; in another, they went into a cupboard. In one, people talked in the kitchen after a late shift; in another, evening voices belonged in a separate room. Such habits may have a history and practical advantages. But an old arrangement does not automatically transfer to a new landing. People arrive with different expectations, and a mismatch does not yet tell us who has violated a genuinely shared agreement.

Anna is accustomed to an empty entrance. Nikita usually leaves shoes outside to avoid bringing them into his room. As long as passage is available, the dispute might concern how the landing looks. That is not a meaningless subject: appearance can matter. It should, however, be described as a preference and a proposed shared arrangement. If the box blocks a needed area, the subject changes to access. One general argument about disorder should not silently cover both cases as though the consequences of every object were established and identical.

In the first chapter of On Liberty, John Stuart Mill examines the pressure of social customs on individual life. The selected context has been read, rather than the entire book. His philosophical argument helps us question a preference turned into a demand; it is not a current rule of neighbourhood law.

A useful conversation need not abolish habits. Anna can remain fond of an empty landing and Nikita can prefer another way of storing things. They may agree on a place that does not interfere with its agreed use, or acknowledge that they have not found one. Equally, a longstanding rule is not necessarily arbitrary merely because it is familiar. It may have a particular reason that a newcomer does not know. The task is to discover the reason and scope, rather than choose between compulsory deference to the past and compulsory rejection of it on principle.

III. A complaint about noise does not establish the complainant's superiority

A person being disturbed can be right about the effect and wrong about its cause. They can hear a sound accurately while unfairly judging its source's intelligence or culture. These outcomes can coexist. We need not dismiss the entire complaint because its wording is unpleasant. But acknowledging a difficulty does not require accepting a ranking of people attached to it. The other person remains someone whose action can be discussed, rather than a representative of an inferior way of life who must first earn a hearing.

In Schopenhauer's essay on noise, his account of interrupted thought appears alongside contempt for people he regards as less intellectual. The specific passage in Saunders's translation has been read. We retain the evidence of the author's irritation and reject his hierarchy; it is neither an explanation of the brain nor a standard for treating neighbours.

In our scene, Anna can ask Nikita to move his conversation without saying that his way of life is primitive. Nikita can hear the request without agreeing with a humiliating judgement. If that judgement has already been made, two questions can be separated: what action caused a difficulty, and what treatment was unacceptable? An apology for harshness does not itself remove the noise. Moving a conversation does not itself repair the humiliation. One correction cannot be tasked with doing both jobs, nor should it mean that the other person must immediately recover their former ease.

The substitution can work in reverse. Nikita could call Anna someone who knows nothing about lively human interaction, thereby evading the question of audibility. His defence of freedom would then become another ranking of people. A dispute about whose temperament is more complete leaves the late conversation on the same staircase. You can dislike strict silence while considering another person's activity. You can need quiet without treating every

voice as a moral defect. This does not guarantee friendship, but it avoids requiring a victory over human worth before considering one intersection of actions.

IV. Describe clutter through the use of the space

An object has an appearance, a position, a duration of presence, and consequences for particular activities. A box might look untidy, occupy the only area available for a shared object, or make passage difficult. These properties do not always coincide. If a conversation begins with a general accusation of disorder, someone may remove what looked irritating while leaving what obstructs use. They might also remove everything without understanding what will be expected next time. A general word conveys emotional meaning without necessarily identifying an available change.

Nikita's fictional box stands beside the railing. Anna wants to pass with a large bag and has to walk around it. That describes one accessible case. There is no need to claim in advance that any storage on a landing is unlawful, or judge the box's danger by its appearance. Local requirements, technical access, and safety call for their own verified information. An everyday request can remain specific for now: move this object from the needed area, if Nikita can do so. A legal conclusion should not be introduced to strengthen an insufficiently precise conversation.

In another case, a magazine lies on a shared surface. Anna considers it untidy; Nikita wants to finish reading after dinner. If nobody intends to use that surface and there is no previous agreement, the subject is the desired appearance of the shared space. It can be discussed. But it should not acquire the weight of an actual obstruction merely because the word bothers fits both experiences. Anna can request another arrangement and Nikita can offer to put the magazine away later. Their differing expectations do not yet determine a single correct outcome.

Sometimes the subject is uncertain. Anna thinks an object belongs to Nikita, who has never seen it. A confident tone does not make the accusation more accurate. They can investigate its origin or approach whoever is available to organise the space, without assigning blame. If nobody knows who is responsible, that is a separate difficulty. It does not require leaving an obstruction untouched for the sake of proof, but neither does it authorise disposing of an unfamiliar object regardless of circumstances. This article establishes no such procedure. It distinguishes an observed consequence, an unknown owner, and an available action still to be determined.

V. Time changes the scope of a request

The same sound may be unobtrusive during the day and interrupt something in the evening. Saying so is not inconsistent. A shared space has different uses at different times, and people have different schedules. Yet your schedule is not a universal calendar for every neighbour. The question is what condition genuinely applies here and what particular arrangement can be agreed. Naming a period limits a request. Without it, quiet could mean a few evening minutes, the entire night, or the absence of other people's presence around the clock.

Anna is not asking Nikita to stop talking altogether. She wants to finish one call and will then leave. He could accept this limited adjustment without accepting a permanent prohibition. On another day, Anna sleeps earlier; the previous episode does not automatically establish a new routine. A recurring condition can be discussed separately. A one-off favour has value at its own scale. It should not become hidden confirmation of a rule the other person has never heard, nor must every conversation begin from scratch when an intelligible agreement already exists.

In the read historical Community Living at Michigan PDF, section E, the university relates sound requirements to residential and shared areas. The former address is now unavailable; the official policies page leads to separate current documents not read in full. The historical section establishes no present rules. It illustrates one institutional arrangement rather than a timetable for every home.

A time on the clock does not itself explain someone's possibilities. Nikita might return late because of work, while Anna works at home during the day. Both circumstances matter without providing a complete solution. They could seek a less audible way to talk, another location, or a different way of giving notice. Sometimes the existing arrangement contains no suitable option. One person should not be assigned permanent endurance and the other disappearance from the building. Acknowledging a mismatch allows further inquiry into actual conditions. It does not establish bad intentions or remove the real cost of each proposed adjustment.

VI. A request should identify an action rather than conceal an examination

A request becomes easier to understand when the other person learns what is being proposed. You can ask them to move a conversation indoors, remove a box before you leave, or give notice of a recurring activity. There is no need to select a polite phrase from a prepared list. What matters is that the person need not guess the only acceptable answer. Asking them to become normal identifies no action. It creates an endless examination in which the complainant can change the criteria after each step without saying what would count as enough.

Anna can begin with one event and one request. If Nikita does not understand, she can explain the place and time. If he understands and declines, further explanation does not necessarily produce agreement. These situations differ. Otherwise discussion continues as though any refusal could only mean Anna was insufficiently precise. She may acknowledge that her proposal was not accepted. Nikita may name a real constraint. But a constrained response differs from a promise made merely to end an unpleasant conversation when he already knows he will not keep it.

Uncertainty should remain uncertainty within a request. Anna hears a voice without knowing whose it is; she can first clarify its source. She knows about the box but not where Nikita could move it; she can ask what is available. This is not an obligation to solve his entire problem in advance. Sometimes naming the difficulty and hearing his proposal is enough. If both suggest options, they can compare which consequence each would change. The most elaborate option is not always best: it might impose a substantial cost on one person without addressing the other's original need.

Precision also concerns your own reply. Agreeing to remove a box today is not accepting all of Anna's aesthetic rules for the landing. Avoiding a conversation during her call is not giving up your visitors. You can name the actual scope accepted. If the other person intended more, the mismatch becomes visible before the next accusation of a broken agreement. Yet this does not justify interpreting every word as narrowly as possible to evade its clear meaning. People are clarifying the real subject, not competing to preserve loopholes in a promise they understand.

VII. Not every sound or trace of life can be eliminated

In a shared building, other people do things: open doors, cook, return home, move objects. This simple observation does not excuse every noise. It reminds us that a request for comfort needs a feasible scope. If a condition effectively requires the complete absence of a neighbour's life, it cannot be presented as a small concession. Conversely, invoking life's inevitability does not answer whether a particular action can change. An unavoidable door sound and a chosen loud conversation may allow different adjustments, which should be considered separately.

In one fictional case, Nikita cannot enter without opening a door. Perhaps its sound comes from its condition rather than an intention to slam it. Asking him to return invisibly would then miss the subject. If possible, they can clarify who could inspect the mechanism without presenting their guess as a technical diagnosis. In another situation the door works properly but Nikita lets it go forcefully, allowing a different adjustment. Neither explanation is established by a single loud evening. The distinction matters because identical effects do not always require the same person to respond.

Cleaning need not erase every presence either. When people use a shared table, things will sometimes be on it. They can determine whether a needed area is available without requiring the permanent appearance of an empty photograph. Sometimes everyone chooses and enjoys a very strict arrangement. There is no need to call that immature. The issue is actual choice and access. If one person's preferred appearance requires continuous work from others, that cost should be named. Calling order natural does not make the cost negligible, or render the preference automatically unworthy of discussion. In Spring II of Gissing's book, the narrator values domestic tranquillity supported partly by a housekeeper's work. A literary preference does not require others to serve him silently.

There is no need to determine a perfect boundary for every future event. Today there may be only one disturbing sound and one temporary object to address. That portion can be resolved without creating a new system for everything else. Specifying every neighbour's movement can sometimes create more intrusion than the situation required. Repetition may, however, reveal that isolated requests are insufficient. A more stable condition then has a basis in actual life rather than a wish to control everything in advance. The scope of discussion follows the difficulty: a small case need not become a complete revision of someone else's household routine.

VIII. Giving notice helps only alongside a genuine response

Reporting forthcoming noise is not the same as receiving agreement. Someone can announce an activity and consider the matter closed while a neighbour first learns that a period they need has already been taken. Notice supplies information but should not act as permission on someone else's behalf. Its meaning depends on the subject: reporting an event, proposing another time, or asking about an acceptable arrangement. If these roles blur, people can read exactly the same message and understand entirely different things to have been accepted.

Imagine Nikita intends briefly to dismantle some furniture and posts a message in the shared conversation. Anna plans to work at home then. Her reply can influence the time if he has genuinely left that choice open. If it cannot change, he should not call the message a joint agreement. They can acknowledge an unpleasant overlap and seek an available way to reduce its consequences. This article establishes neither technical renovation rules nor permitted hours. The example concerns only the difference between a reported fact and a proposal to which the other person can still give a meaningful answer.

Silence is ambiguous too. Anna might not have seen the message, know her schedule, or understand that a reply was expected. Her silence should not become clear approval merely because that is convenient. But no reply need not keep every optional plan open forever. A deadline for clarification can be stated beforehand if that arrangement suits the participants, or they can follow an actually accepted rule of the space. The deadline cannot arise retrospectively. Nor should an established procedure be invented when all that is known is one person's habit of notifying others about an event already decided.

Giving notice can demand unnecessary personal information. To arrange an audible call, Nikita need not explain whom he will speak to or why. To identify a period of quiet, Anna need not reveal her work's contents. Often an activity's scope, location, and duration suffice. If other information is needed, its connection to the shared subject should be explained. Clarity between neighbours does not mean access to everyone's biography. You can consider another person's need while retaining a private area unrelated to the decision. Detailed disclosure should not become payment for the ability to request a sufficiently specific condition.

IX. Refusal opens another question without erasing the first

If a request is declined, the difficulty remains. It need not be declared resolved to preserve a pleasant conversation. Equally, refusal does not tell us everything about a person. Nikita might reject the proposed method, lack the ability to act, or have no wish to accommodate the request. An available explanation helps distinguish these possibilities; a motive should not be invented when none is known. Anna can acknowledge the limits of discussion and identify other ways this particular place handles such matters. Their existence and authority require facts; the article appoints no universal mediator or complaints procedure for every building.

Sometimes an alternative follows a refusal. Nikita will not stop talking in the evening but is willing to move to another room. Anna can check whether this meets her need instead of rejecting it because she did not propose it. His voice might remain audible. Then the actual result matters more than a competition over attractive promises. An alternative is not a solution in advance. It becomes meaningful when people learn what has changed and can report that the original difficulty persists.

In another outcome, Nikita responds with mockery or a threat. Discussion then ceases to be a voluntary way of clarifying a condition. Anna need not continue to prove her reasonableness, stay alone with him, or reveal more information. Available safety and appropriate assistance depend on circumstances. This text offers no protective protocol and does not know local services. Its boundary is simple: accurately describing noise does not make someone responsible for ending another person's dangerous treatment, nor is it a preliminary examination before seeking support.

A more ordinary lack of agreement can also be acknowledged without heroic persistence. Discussion can be postponed, limited to one action, or freed from expectations of friendly understanding. Neighbours need not become close. But distance does not itself resolve passage or recurring audibility. Such matters may require further consideration through the place's actual arrangements. A calm tone does not guarantee the desired response, and every unpleasant reply does not prove precision useless. Precision makes the problem's scope visible; consequences also depend on conditions, actions, and other people's choices.

X. Check the consequence rather than pass judgement on the neighbour

After a change, people can return to the original event. Nikita speaks inside his flat; Anna hears less and finishes her call. That is one possible result in our scene, not proof that moving a conversation solves every conflict. In another outcome the sound remains because its source or route was misidentified. A new question about the actual event is then needed. People need not defend their first explanation to save face. An incorrect guess can be revised without turning the original request into evidence of stupidity or bad intentions.

The box is gone but Anna still dislikes the shoes. Two questions are now easier to see: passage is available, while the landing's appearance still displeases her. She can discuss the second separately. Nikita can offer another location or decline the aesthetic arrangement. Meeting the first request does not require Anna to stop having preferences. Nor does it mean that he accepted every subsequent demand. Checking the result allows a real improvement to be named while retaining a remaining difference, instead of an endless feeling that nothing has been done.

The solution's cost deserves attention too. If Nikita moves an object to his private area and loses its use, the problem may have moved elsewhere. If Anna now constantly waits for announcements, the old dispute may have created new work. A cost does not necessarily make an arrangement unacceptable; people can choose it voluntarily. They should nevertheless see it, especially when the proposal recurs. An arrangement is not successful merely because one person feels calmer. Since the subject is intersecting activities, each person's convenience belongs alongside participation the other can genuinely accept.

A neighbourhood norm emerges from an intelligible subject, actual conditions, and the possibility of revision. It can remain small: one period for talking, one unobstructed area, one way of reporting a change. People continue to live differently without pledging similarity or closeness. Returning to the evening landing, we see a sound, an activity, an object, and available responses rather than a battle between normal and abnormal people. Some consequences can change; others remain open. This result is more modest than victory over another person's way of life, but more accurately shows what happened and what has not yet been agreed.

What this means in practice

If you want to examine one safe domestic episode, describe the event before drawing a conclusion about the person. What was audible, or where was an object? Which activity of yours was affected? What is known about the cause, and what remains a guess? You need no continuous record of someone else's life. One sufficiently specific case may be enough to begin. If the subject is simply unwelcome, retain that honest description; do not add an unestablished danger, diagnosis, or legal violation to give the request greater weight.

Then choose one change you are willing to propose. Name the place, period, and sufficient result. You can ask the other person for an option if you do not know what is available to them. Distinguish a proposal, notice, and an accepted agreement. Do not automatically count silence as consent or turn a request into a concealed examination of upbringing. If they decline, ask once for an available explanation when appropriate. Further persuasion need not be a useful continuation.

After any attempt, check its actual consequence: is the needed activity or space available? What has the adjustment cost, and what remains open? A partial result is allowed. You can appreciate a specific change while retaining different habits. This practice is an editorial suggestion rather than a researched technique and does not guarantee agreement. It ends when there is a threat; safety does not wait for perfect wording. Technical or legal questions need separate local verification. The aim is limited: to see one intersection and an actual response more clearly, rather than prescribe a neighbour's proper life.

Key quotation

> *...my foolish irritation...*

George Gissing, By the Ionian Sea, Chapter X, web431, fragment of the second sentence. The traveller reassesses his own irritation; his self-assessment does not determine another person's experience.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Difference and limit
Schopenhauer ↔ editorial episode	What interrupts an activity?	Historical irritation proves neither intellectual superiority nor a medical effect.
Gissing ↔ conditions of domestic comfort	Who supports the chosen tranquillity?	The fictional narrator assigns neighbours no duties; others' work remains among comfort's conditions.
By the Ionian Sea ↔ audibility and assessment	What is known from one sound heard?	A literary reassessment of irritation neither makes every interference invented nor assigns others' motives.
Mill ↔ habitual order	When does a preference become a demand?	A philosophical argument establishes no local rights and does not erase consequences for others.
University rules ↔ shared home	How does a rule concern a place and activity?	One institution's arrangement cannot transfer to every building; the old PDF's current validity has not been established.
Personal experience ↔ shared request	How do we name unpleasantness and obstruction?	One word can describe different consequences; a need does not automatically secure another person's agreement.
Changed action ↔ checked result	What has actually become possible?	An attempt does not guarantee agreement and is not a tested conflict-resolution programme.

The map retains different foundations. It does not declare the sources one tradition or collective proof of the proposed practice.

Sources

1. Arthur Schopenhauer. Studies in Pessimism. T. Bailey Saunders translation, Gutenberg10732, updated 28 October 2024. Metadata, the translator's note, and the selected essay context, web695–713, have been read. The underlying work is Parerga und Paralipomena; the entire original has not been read. Historical hierarchy and punishment are rejected; rights beyond the host's stated context remain UNKNOWN.

2. John Stuart Mill. On Liberty. Gutenberg34901 electronic edition with W. L. Courtney's introduction; the basis edition's exact printing year has not been established. Selected context in chapter I, web186–198, and the beginning of IV, web657–664, have been read, rather than the whole book. Philosophical argument; no direct quotations or determination of local law; rights UNKNOWN.

3. University of Michigan. Community Living at Michigan; official policies access. Read historical indexed 55-page PDF, E5.1–5.3, PDF12–13/web443–468; not the entire document. Its former URL https://housing.umich.edu/wp-content/themes/housing/dist/pdf/CLAM.pdf now returns HTTP 404. This historical copy's effective year is not established. The official page above leads to separate 2026–2027 documents; their full text has not been read, and current hours or provisions have not been verified from the older copy. Limited institutional comparison only, without transfer of durations or authority; no direct quotations; rights UNKNOWN.

4. George Gissing. The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft. Transcription of the Archibald Constable & Co. edition, 1903, explicitly identified by the host; Gutenberg1463, updated 31 December 2020. Metadata, preface and Spring I–II, web0–46, have been read, rather than the whole book. Fictional narrator's speech, not the author's factual diary; rights UNKNOWN.

5. George Gissing. By the Ionian Sea: Notes of a Ramble in Southern Italy. Gutenberg4354, updated 27 December 2020; the print basis year has not been established. Metadata and the complete selected Chapter X, web396–433, were read, rather than the whole book. Literary travel, not acoustic research; historical class and racial judgements are not adopted. Rights UNKNOWN.

Tags

neighbours, noise, order, shared space, habit, norm, difference, audibility, irritation, activity, passage, time, request, consequence, availability, agreement, refusal, notice, silence, uncertainty, box, landing, privacy, cost of change, revision, respect, safety, Schopenhauer, Mill, institutional rules, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, connections between 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.