

UNITED WISDOM

Intuition: experience, a quick judgment, or a guess

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I39 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Intuition: experience, a quick judgment, or a guess

Epigraph

> *particular facts*

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, VI.11. W. D. Ross, Internet Classics Archive, displayed line 116. This fragment belongs to a philosophical discussion of practical deliberation; it does not assert that an inner feeling is infallible.

What this article is about

An editor quickly reads a short news item and feels that something is wrong. A check reveals different dates in the headline and the main text. That evening, the same person sees a terse message from an acquaintance and immediately decides that the acquaintance is offended. Yet the message gives no explanation for its brevity. Both judgments arose quickly and sounded convincing, but their grounds and the opportunities to check them differed. This imagined scene raises a question: what are we calling intuition in a particular case, and how much trust is appropriate now?

We do not have to choose in advance between worshipping an inner feeling and distrusting every quick answer. We can notice the signal, identify the task, and consider the information available. We will compare a selected philosophical text with a limited reading of a scientific paper, preserving the differences between their concepts. The contemporary practice is editorial: turn an impression into a precise question and a proportionate check. It promises neither consistently correct decisions nor knowledge of another person's hidden intentions. It does not measure personal development through the speed or confidence of an answer.

I. Describe the signal before declaring an ability

The word intuition can name very different events. Someone noticed a discrepancy, chose an option without lengthy calculation, experienced an unpleasant feeling, or invented an explanation. A useful starting point is to describe today's particular event. What was seen, heard, or proposed? What conclusion arose? If the editor writes that two dates appear incompatible, there is something available to check. If the editor writes only about having powerful intuition, the subject disappears behind an assessment of an ability. The name can remain, but a concrete question makes it possible to continue and discover exactly what was confirmed.

It helps to distinguish an observation from an added conclusion. The message contains one short sentence: that is an observation about its form. The acquaintance is offended: that is a version of the person's state. I do not want to continue messaging now: that is a personal preference. These can arise together without becoming one fact. A person may consider a wish when choosing an action. However, wanting to end the conversation does not establish someone else's offence, and brevity does not establish its cause. This distinction preserves attention to the signal without immediately granting it every possible authority in today's situation and relationship.

Sometimes it is more useful to formulate a quick answer as a provisional choice. The first option suits me better now, rather than I know the first option is objectively best. This does not require weakening every position. If there is a precise ground, it can be named. If the ground is unknown, provisional choice remains an honest status. What matters is what the answer is required to do. A preference may be enough when choosing the colour of a personal notebook. An assertion about an event or a change to a shared agreement will require different information. One word does not make those tasks identical or prescribe a common way to resolve them.

Describing a signal does not require immediately explaining its origin. The editor might have noticed a date without articulating it on the first reading, or might have reacted to a different feature. One successful result does not establish the internal mechanism. What we do know is that the check found a discrepancy. That limited result is meaningful in itself. We can recognise the usefulness of a quick observation without concluding that its author is universally infallible. The evening interpretation of the acquaintance might also prove correct, but it has not yet been established. The difference between the cases remains even when the first impressions feel equally strong.

II. The same word does not make concepts identical

In selected passages of Book VI, Aristotle distinguishes apprehension of principles from practical consideration of particular circumstances. Ross's translation uses the expression intuitive reason; it cannot automatically be read as today's everyday hunch. The reading covers limited sections, not the entire Ethics. It is philosophical discussion, not a contemporary experiment on fast decisions. Book VI.

For a reader today, this distance between concepts can be useful. We might encounter a familiar word in an old text and want it to validate our practice. A matching translation does not yet establish a matching subject. We need to ask what the author distinguishes, what the selected passage discusses, and what work the term performs. In this article, the ancient text opens a question about attention to a particular situation. It does not certify the editor's ability

to read someone else's mood. Our limited comparison preserves the source within its scope without turning it into a ready-made seal of authority for every inner feeling.

There is also a risk in translating our own guess into the language of a tradition. A person might call it immediate knowledge and decide that checking is no longer necessary. A new name adds no information. If the original subject is the reason for a short message, it remains a question about a real interlocutor. Philosophical reading may change how the question is posed, but it cannot answer for that person. Respect for a text includes the possibility of not applying it where it provides no relevant ground. The tradition can then participate in reflection without having to confirm an already attractive decision.

The opposite caution also matters: different concepts do not make an old text useless. It may help us see how a general formula is insufficient for a present action. Editorial attention and communication with an acquaintance require different information. This is a contemporary question for our practice, not a reconstruction of Aristotle's entire teaching. The reader has access to a limited reading with its boundary identified. There is no need either to declare all teachings one psychology or to abandon comparison. We can simply name what is being compared and retain the right to stop before making an assertion the source does not support.

III. Consider experience together with its conditions

In their 2009 paper, Kahneman and Klein connect assessment of intuitive judgment with environmental predictability and opportunities to learn its patterns. Subjective experience alone is not presented as a reliable measure of accuracy. Here the abstract and selected parts of the authors' paper were read, rather than all the studies they discuss. It compares approaches and evidence; it does not experimentally test our note-taking practice. Bibliography and abstract.

For our present consideration, we can ask several editorial questions. Which particular task has this person encountered before? What made it possible to learn whether an answer succeeded? How similar are today's conditions to the previous ones? In editorial work, a date can be checked against a source or a calendar, and the text can be corrected. For presumed offence, checking involves another person's answer and cannot be reduced to a sentence's appearance. We have not statistically measured the editor's reliability. We have only identified different opportunities to obtain information. That is more precise than trusting all of one person's judgments equally out of respect for general experience.

Years of service alone do not describe the material available for learning. Someone can do the same work for years and rarely obtain information about distant outcomes. Someone else can frequently encounter a recurring task and have a clear way of checking that particular task. For our note, this is a question about a specific assertion, rather than a ready-made ranking of

professions or people. Which cases do I remember, and what was known about their outcomes? If information was not retained, the limitation can be recorded. We should not fill the gap with a confident story as though time spent participating had already established the accuracy of every answer today.

It helps to separate familiarity with a field from familiarity with a task inside it. An editor may be good at spotting inconsistent information without sufficient grounds to judge the personal reaction of a news item's author. The questions arise nearby but require different checks. One needs a source for a date; the other needs a real conversation and the context of a relationship. A person keeps the benefit of experience while recognising this boundary. It does not erase professional competence. It clarifies which ground is being used today and where earlier successful work has not yet answered a new question.

IV. A familiar scene may contain a new condition

A familiar text contains an unusual date format. The editor notices a discrepancy and initially suspects an error. Checking shows that one date refers to publication and the other to the event. The first observation was useful for consideration, but the initial explanation changed. This outcome does not require declaring intuition good or bad forever. Two results can remain: the signal attracted attention; clarification established a different relationship. What matters is the movement from the first impression to available information, rather than a need to prove that every part of the original judgment must have been correct.

If the task changes, the previous way of checking may also need refinement. A time zone appears in a news item, the editorial office adopts a different format, or a date represents several stages. We are not claiming that every change inevitably destroys a skill. We ask which condition matters to this particular conclusion. We can read an explanation, compare the source, or request clarification. Such action is compatible with experience. It does not make a specialist a novice in everything or require learning to begin again merely because today's scene differs from the familiar one at a single point.

In personal communication, similarity also does not necessarily mean a previous event is repeating. The acquaintance once wrote tersely when angry. Today that person might be busy, agree with a proposal, or simply choose a short reply. These possibilities are not equally established, but the previous case does not automatically assign today's cause. We can notice a resemblance and formulate a question if the reason actually matters. We do not need to demand proof for every ordinary message. We need to avoid turning a familiar form into final knowledge about a person, especially when an accusation or a decision on that person's behalf rests upon it.

A boundary can be recognised before the result arrives. These conditions are not entirely familiar to me; I will treat the answer as provisional. That is not a ceremony of compulsory doubt. The person identifies a status where a substantial difference has been found. If there is no difference and the usual check is simple, it can be performed without an elaborate inner process. Proportion preserves experience as a resource and does not turn attention into an endless audit of every movement. In our scene, reading the date's explanation is sufficient. In messaging, an ordinary reply may suffice, while the question of mood remains open until an appropriate conversation.

V. Confidence and preference perform different tasks

Sometimes a person says: I am so certain that explanation is unnecessary. Confidence describes the present relationship to an answer. For a shared assertion, an interlocutor still needs to know its grounds. This is not a requirement to reveal the entire internal process every time. A source, a checkable feature, or an informational limit can be named. If the ground has not yet been formulated, that can also be said. What matters is being able to distinguish the strength of an experience from something another participant can check and use. In the editorial scene, two different dates make that possible, while the feeling of offence does not yet do so.

A preference need not prove itself as a forecast. If someone dislikes a selected design, taste and project requirements can be discussed without explaining the feeling as secret knowledge of future failure. If a person does not want to attend a meeting, the conditions of participation can be considered. That does not necessarily mean the other participants are dangerous or unfriendly. A personal wish has a place in a decision without becoming a fact about someone else's qualities. This formulation preserves authorship: I choose or request a changed condition, rather than declaring that an inner feeling has already established the overall state of affairs.

Sometimes a feeling and a precise observation support each other. A person dislikes the tone of a letter, and the letter really does contain a direct demand to violate an established agreement. The demand and its consequences can then be discussed. There is no need to abandon the feeling to acknowledge the fact. Distinguishing the levels lets us retain both without adding an unsupported story about motives. A participant can refuse a proposed condition without claiming to have uncovered the author's entire personality. The inner signal helped attract attention; the ground for the response was formulated through the actual text and the shared agreement.

Weak confidence does not establish an error either. Someone can doubt a discrepancy that has been found and still establish it by checking. The goal therefore need not be a particular inner state: always feeling firm or always remaining suspicious. Our editorial task is to see the

status of today's answer more clearly. It may be a preference, a provisional explanation, a confirmed observation, or an open question. Knowing the status makes it easier to choose the next step and explain it to another participant without promising that the strength of confidence itself guarantees the outcome.

VI. A guess becomes checkable after clarification

The phrase something is wrong here can be a good beginning, but leaves many possible endings. If the editor examines dozens of features and finds any inaccuracy, it is easy to say the original feeling was proven. For more precise consideration, the suspected discrepancy can be recorded now. Do the dates conflict? Is the source unclear? Is part of what was promised missing? This specificity does not reconstruct the true cause of the first signal. It creates a present hypothesis with something to check. The result then concerns the named question, rather than confirming an ability to anticipate any possible problem.

A sufficient indicator should be selected for the check. If the question concerns an event's date, an appropriate primary source or clarification from the author is needed, rather than an attractive coincidence with another note. If it concerns an agreed time, the actual agreement is needed. When no suitable source is available, the result may be not established yet. That is neither a concealed error nor confirmation of the guess. It matters not to change the criterion after receiving an unwelcome answer. Otherwise, the note will preserve a favoured conclusion regardless of information intended to refine or refute it.

It helps to anticipate what would make us abandon a version. The dates might refer to different stages, with an explanation removing the suspected contradiction. The acquaintance might say they are busy, weakening the previous ground for presumed offence. Not every answer automatically reveals the entire situation, but new information deserves a place in the conclusion. If any refutation is declared concealment in advance, checking is no longer open. It is better to say directly that suspicion is being retained than to claim confirmation has been obtained. Another person is not obliged to prove a hidden state assigned by someone else's guess.

Recording before the outcome helps us see changes in our own version. We need not create an extensive accuracy diary or calculate a success percentage from a few convenient cases. One question, an expected indicator, and an outcome can be retained, including uncertainty. A small number of observations does not become a measurement of a universal ability. But it makes it possible not to confuse an initial answer with a later edited account of it. In our scene, it matters whether the editor noticed conflicting dates or merely a general feeling of strangeness. Both events are possible; claims about their accuracy will differ.

VII. Choose the check according to the decision's consequences

Not every quick decision requires the same consideration. Choosing a location for a personal note and publicly accusing an acquaintance are actions of different scales. In the first case, the person may easily correct an error. In the second, another participant and trust are affected. Proportion concerns consequences, available information, and time, rather than the prestige of the name intuition. We can act on preference where it really is a personal choice. For a shared factual assertion, it is appropriate to name a ground and check what matters, especially if the result is difficult to reverse or changes another person's conditions.

When time is limited, it helps to distinguish a temporary step from a final conclusion. The editor can pause the news item's release for a short check without declaring the author dishonest. Someone can postpone answering a message until a calmer moment without announcing that the acquaintance deliberately caused offence. These options are not always available; actual obligations and deadlines remain important. But when a temporary step is possible, it can keep the question open without presenting a limited decision as full knowledge of the cause. Provisional action has its own status and need not assert more than has been established.

Responsibility remains with the person who acts. Saying intuition made me do it might describe an impetus, but does not remove participation in a choice or its consequences for others. We can say: it seemed that way, I decided to act this way, and I now see new information. This position allows correction without a need to defend an inner source's infallibility. If an accusation was unsupported, correction concerns both the assertion and its audience. The matter cannot be considered resolved simply because a person found an attractive explanation for an inner state; the external result of the action also requires attention.

Sometimes a sufficient check yields no certainty. We can identify a risk, choose an available option, and retain the possibility of revision. The article promises no universal formula for complex decisions and assigns no compulsory level of caution. It asks about the cost of an error here and the information that can actually be obtained. Correcting a date is a relatively narrow question. A relationship includes another person's participation. Neither a quick feeling nor lengthy reflection itself gives anyone the right to decide what an interlocutor meant or how that person must respond.

VIII. In relationships, the other person remains the source of their answer

We may notice a tone, a pause, or a change in familiar behaviour. These can become reasons for an appropriate question, but do not amount to ready-made mind reading. In the evening scene, the person can reply to the message's content and later ask whether things are all right if the relationship actually needs that question. It need not begin with a declaration of offence. A more open formulation reports an observation and allows several answers. The interlocutor retains the possibility of explaining, declining to discuss mood, or correcting the assumption without first proving a right to differ from someone else's version.

The question itself also needs proportion. A person is not obliged to provide a detailed account of every short reply merely because someone else became anxious. We can acknowledge our experience and consider what participation has actually been agreed in the relationship. A specific agreement can be discussed literally. If there is no agreement, a request can be proposed and its answer heard. This is an editorial ethical boundary, not a universal instruction for every form of closeness. It helps prevent personal sensitivity from becoming authority to monitor another person continually and assign hidden motives through the form of messages.

If the interlocutor gives a reason, that answer deserves a place in consideration. It may be incomplete or raise another question, but cannot be excluded in advance as irrelevant because inner certainty is stronger. If necessary, specific contradictions between words and observable actions can be discussed. That differs from claiming that every reply already proves secret offence. In the first case, a shared subject for conversation is available. In the second, the explanation is protected against every answer. Our approach chooses the possibility of clarification while retaining the unknown where there is no shared ground for a final conclusion.

We need not demand complete insensitivity of ourselves. We can remain attentive, be surprised by a changed tone, and consider our experience of a relationship. The question is what status the observation receives. It seemed to me, I want to clarify, and I know from a direct answer are different formulations, each performing its own work. Sensitivity need not become infallible knowledge to have a place in life. In our scene, the evening impression may open a conversation or remain a personal note. It need not end in a diagnosis of the relationship, punishment of the acquaintance, or a story about an exceptional ability.

IX. A good outcome may change the first answer

The editor established the date difference and corrected the text. That particular result can be named. If it later turns out that the dates referred to different stages, the earlier conclusion can be corrected while the usefulness of the question is acknowledged. Our relationship to a quick guess need not depend on protecting every part of it. Sometimes a signal leads to a correct observation, sometimes to a new version, and sometimes to no answer. For editorial practice, what matters is what happened after consulting available information. The outcome need not make the initial inner answer the hero or culprit of the entire story.

We can also refine our own account of experience. I noticed this discrepancy well is a limited assertion. I always recognise an error at first glance is broader and requires other grounds. The first result does not oblige us to draw the second conclusion. Even several successful cases require careful description of selection and unknown outcomes if genuine measurement is intended. No such measurement occurs in this article. A person may enjoy a useful observation without turning it into a reliability percentage, an advertising promise, or authority to judge every question with equal confidence.

The evening conversation can also end modestly. The acquaintance said they were busy, and the person noticed how quickly a mood had been assigned from a short sentence. Or the reason remained unknown, with no practical question emerging for discussion. In both cases, the impression can be left without a final story. There is no need to seek complete transparency from another person to prove or disprove a guess. If a problem concerns an actual agreement, it remains available as a separate subject. The state of a relationship need not fit into the outcome of one message and one inner reaction.

Intuition may remain a convenient word for a quick impression, but more precise distinctions proved useful in our work. A signal, observation, experience, preference, hypothesis, and check do not perform identical tasks. The sources helped pose limited questions without giving universal permission to trust every feeling. A person keeps experience and the possibility of revising an answer. Another participant keeps the right to speak for themselves. A quick judgment can then begin proportionate consideration, after which action, clarification, and honest uncertainty are possible without a compulsory choice between mystical certainty and endless self-distrust.

What this means in practice

Choose one quick conclusion from today and write it specifically. Separate the noticed feature from its explanation, and personal preference from an assertion about an event or person. You need not first establish where the signal originated. It is enough to know which question is being checked now.

Ask whether this particular task is familiar and what information previously made its outcome knowable. Note a difference in today's conditions if it matters. Then name one available indicator that would support or change the version. If the relevant ground cannot be obtained, identify uncertainty; it does not count as confirmation.

Choose the extent of checking according to the action's consequences. For a personal reversible choice, preference may suffice. A shared factual assertion or a changed agreement requires appropriate information and participation by affected people. An imagined mood does not replace another person's answer. An observation and a question can be offered while preserving the interlocutor's right to differ from your version.

After checking, record the established result rather than only an attractive story about initial confidence. A changed answer is permissible. This editorial practice neither measures a universal ability nor promises to improve every decision. In the opening scene, correcting an actual inconsistency in the news and separately considering the acquaintance's real message is sufficient. Experience has not been devalued; its application has become more specific to the task, grounds, and consequences.

Key quotation

> *regularities of that environment*

Daniel Kahneman, Gary Klein, Conditions for Intuitive Expertise: A Failure to Disagree. Read PDF copy, p.515, abstract fragment; also in the selected conclusion on p.524. Attention to learning conditions, rather than a guarantee for any particular answer.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Question it opens	Boundary
Aristotle VI ↔ today's word intuition	Does a similar translation concern the same subject?	Intuitive reason is not equated with an everyday feeling.
Practical deliberation ↔ the editorial task	Which particular circumstances does the action require?	The philosophical text is not an experiment on our exercise.
Kahneman/Klein ↔ present experience	Where were there learning conditions and opportunities to learn the outcome?	Selected parts were read; the studies they discuss were not reproduced.
Confidence ↔ grounds	What can another participant check?	The strength of an experience does not replace information.
Hypothesis ↔ relationships	Who can give a real answer about today's situation?	A personal signal is neither mind reading nor diagnosis.

The map is editorial, not proof of one theory or historical influence. Everyday scenes are imagined; the practice is not presented as a validated intervention.

Primary sources

1. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, VI. W. D. Ross, Internet Classics Archive. The header/translator and selected passages in §5–8 and §11, displayed lines 55–94 and 115–119, were read, rather than the entire Ethics. Ancient examples about age or medicine are not used as present-day recommendations. Print pagination is not established by this copy.

2. Daniel Kahneman, Gary Klein. Conditions for intuitive expertise: A failure to disagree. American Psychologist 64(6), 515–526, 2009; DOI 10.1037/a0016755. The complete abstract and bibliography were read, along with the opening on p.515, selected discussion on p.522–523, and selected concluding points on p.524–525 in the university PDF copy. This was not the whole paper or the primary studies discussed by its authors. The author's publication list checks bibliography without replacing content.

Rights for international use of these particular copies are UNKNOWN. University hosting is not treated as a licence; complete source texts are not imported. Short direct fragments are counted by one ledger across all languages and files. Sujato/SuttaCentral and mirrors are excluded. The proposed questions are editorial; clinical or financial recommendations are not inferred from the authors' selected examples.

Tags

intuition, experience, quick judgment, guess, signal, observation, hypothesis, preference, confidence, checking, environment, learning, feedback, conditions, task, Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, W. D. Ross, Daniel Kahneman, Gary Klein, expertise, boundaries, consequences, responsibility, relationships, message, uncertainty, revision, source, UNKNOWN

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity across traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.