

UNITED WISDOM

Intellectualisation: When Explanation Displaces an Encounter with Experience

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-12-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Intellectualisation: When Explanation Displaces an Encounter with Experience

Epigraph

> *“No impression without expression”*

William James, Talks to Teachers on Psychology, V, The Necessity of Reactions. A short fragment from the Henry Holt 1925 edition in Project Gutenberg; the Russian text uses an editorial translation. A pedagogical proposition, not a requirement to express every emotion immediately.

What this article is about

In an illustrative scene, someone describes a friendship ending. They can explain mismatched expectations, different communication styles, and stages of growing up. The account is coherent, almost a lecture. But a simple question about what they miss now receives another general theory of relationships. The theory may be correct. Difficulty arises when it occupies another answer's place: what actually happened, what became significant, and which choice is available to this person today.

Here, intellectualisation names a working way of keeping experience at a distance through abstract explanation. This is neither a diagnosis nor an accusation of excessive intelligence. Thinking is useful; distance sometimes helps preserve possibilities for action. The article examines the boundary beyond which explanation stops returning us to particular experience. James's historical pedagogical arguments, Dewey's philosophy of inquiry, and limited evidence from research on defence mechanisms have different grounds. We will examine reasoning's function through events and consequences while preserving a person's right to their own pace and language.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Thought Can Bring Us Closer or Farther Away

The same explanation can serve different purposes. After a difficult event, someone seeks an understandable sequence to decide what to do next. At another moment, the same scheme allows them never to return to the event at all. Complexity of terminology does not locate the difference. A simple account can also shield someone from a question, while detailed theory can reveal something previously missed. Ask which access to the situation appears after explanation and which disappears.

In an illustrative episode, someone's important proposal is rejected. They explain this through market competition. That may be a reasonable first approximation. They then examine requirements, clarify a weakness, and decide whether another attempt is wanted. The general scheme helps particular work here. But if every question about the proposal ends in a speech about market cruelty, explanation closes different possibilities with one answer. Its truth and its function need separate consideration: a true thought can also be used to stop inquiry.

Distance has a useful place. An urgent event sometimes requires concentration on the order of actions and postponement of detailed inner consideration. Not every calm response means avoidance. Not every general phrase communicates an inner defence. A chosen way of coping can be respected and later examined for whether returning to specifics remains possible. The problem is not the pause itself but its potential to become indefinite, unnoticed as either a decision or a limit.

Intelligence and lived experience should not be opposed as if one must harm the other. Experience includes thoughts, memories, expectations, and ways of describing. Concepts are needed to compare situations and learn. But a concept should withstand an encounter with the particular: an unexpected response, a new detail, or our own disagreement. When every detail is declared an example of a ready scheme beforehand, recognising where the scheme stopped fitting becomes difficult. Thought then loses its capacity for clarification.

The first question is therefore modest: what exactly did explanation allow us to see? A particular answer can be examined. If only a sense that everything is definitively understood appeared, ask which uncertainty was actually resolved. Enough may have been resolved, making further discussion unnecessary. Sometimes only the account ended while the decision remained unchanged. The difference emerges through available work, rather than another person's right to declare us detached from feeling.

II. A Psychological Term Does Not Replace Observation

In Change in Coping and Defense Mechanisms across Adulthood, published in 2014, Manfred Diehl and colleagues examine changes in defence mechanisms, including intellectualisation. The abstract reports an association between increases in measured ego development and intellectualisation. This does not universally establish its harm or benefit. Available limitations include a predominantly European American sample and self-report measures. The article's narrow conclusion is that the term needs research context and does not constitute an ordinary verdict on every abstract argument.

Our conversation's working definition is narrower than the scientific construct. We discuss situations in which general explanatory speech may displace particular consideration of experience. We neither establish an unconscious mechanism nor transfer a measured pattern to a reader. The boundary matters: “intellectualisation” sometimes conveniently devalues someone who disagrees. They explain their position and are told they are defending themselves. The substance of their argument is then no longer considered. The term makes conversation unexaminable while claiming psychological depth.

In an illustrative discussion, one participant wants to discuss experience and the other a contract's conditions. This difference does not prove the second avoids intimacy. The contract may have been breached and need particular work. They can be asked whether both are willing to discuss their inner response separately, but consideration of responsibility cannot be replaced with a demand to feel correctly. Events have their own grounds. Someone can experience complexity while still pointing to an actual fact the listener dislikes acknowledging.

Content and the form of speech should also be distinguished. A professional uses terms because they are more precise in their field. A reader uses a general scheme because details are not yet known. A third person speaks abstractly among people they do not trust with a personal account. All are possible without established avoidance. Observe the transition: what happens when permissible specifics appear? Are they considered, postponed for an understandable reason, or repeatedly lost in a new general explanation?

If using the term, translate it back into observation. Instead of “you're intellectualising,” say: “When I asked about yesterday's conversation, you returned to a general scheme three times; could we consider that episode separately?” This proposal allows refusal and correction. The person can explain why they presently choose that level. We gain a subject for discussion without claiming a right to know their inner motive. This makes conversation stricter about words and more cautious about identity.

III. Knowing about Action and Being Able to Act

In Talks to Teachers, chapter V, James relates learning to expression and subsequent perception of an action's result. This is a historical pedagogical argument, not contemporary confirmation of our exercise's effectiveness. Its limited comparison concerns the difference between correct words and a particular capability. Someone may know how attentive listening is described while failing to notice they interrupt. Theory receives a different examination when it meets the actual sequence of conversation.

In an illustrative example, someone reads about boundaries and explains them convincingly to friends. Yet when inconvenient help is requested, they automatically agree. The knowledge need not be useless: it may help them notice the transition later. But acquired language does not yet equal an available skill. The next step can be reduced to one situation: avoid answering immediately, clarify the request, and check time. Theory becomes a way of noticing and changing action rather than evidence that work is already complete.

Action should not become an obligatory public performance, however. Someone can learn without spectators, select a manageable scale, and avoid explaining the process to everyone. Not every thought needs immediate expression. Correspondence with the aim matters: understanding an agreement benefits from an examinable document; learning to refuse requires an opportunity to try speech; living quietly through loss cannot be replaced with an examination in productivity. The comparison with learning retains these boundaries.

Feedback can also be ambiguous. A listener irritated by our refusal does not prove the refusal wrong. Their satisfaction does not prove our boundary was preserved. The result needs assessment on several grounds: are the words clear, does action correspond to the agreement, does it consider actual authority, and does it preserve dignity? Another's reaction adds information without gaining sole authority to evaluate our inner work. Otherwise theory will simply be replaced by dependence on approval.

Which part of knowledge remains transferable can be examined. After one experience, someone clarifies that a rule suits a voluntary request but not an obligatory workplace procedure. Experience does not destroy the concept; it defines its application. More precise knowledge generally contains boundaries and exceptions that can be explained. If theory remains entirely unchanged after every outcome, examine whether the outcome participated in reasoning at all or was merely declared another confirmation.

IV. A Scheme Should Allow the Unexpected

In How We Think, chapter I, Dewey relates reflective thought to consideration of a belief's grounds and consequences. This is a philosophy of inquiry and education, not a laboratory result about defences. A narrow comparison helps formulate a question: which observation could change the explanation? If none could, thought may serve to guard an account. This does not yet establish why it is guarded or make every stable belief mistaken.

In an illustrative example, someone explains every conflict through “different levels of awareness.” Disagreement confirms the other's low level; agreement confirms growth. Even a direct question about a broken promise becomes a sign of failing to understand the big picture. This scheme need not refute everything its author says. It shows that some particular answers can no longer enter discussion. The question can return to the promise: what was agreed, what was done, and what correction is now possible? The big picture should not destroy these distinctions.

A useful concept allows its own boundaries to be clarified. Different communication styles can explain part of a misunderstanding without establishing the fairness of any words spoken, for example. Different expectations may be real while an agreement still exists. A general cause does not automatically cancel a particular consequence. When explanation retains this scale, it helps see a situation whole. When it uses the whole to dissolve every inconvenient part, reasoning stops being open to correction.

Avoid the opposite extreme of demanding one decisive test for every human thought. A friendship's meaning, religious conviction, and laboratory hypothesis have different grounds. We are discussing an explanation of an episode and the decision following it. Its connection with available information can be questioned without imposing a universal measure on all life. Rigour concerning a particular claim is compatible with respect for what does not fit one examination procedure.

An unexpected detail sometimes requires no new theory. It requires a more modest answer: “I did not account for that.” This correction retains the useful part of explanation and restores the missing part of an event. Worldviews need not be reconstructed every time. But the scale of knowledge can be distinguished from the scale of words. The grander an explanation, the easier it can unnoticed extend its authority. A particular correction often returns it to the task for which it was needed at all.

V. From a General Account to One Episode

Returning to experience can start with a sequence rather than a search for emotion. Where was the conversation, what was said, when did attention change, and which action followed? This is an editorial way to make the subject manageable. It requires neither reconstructing every second nor considering memory infallible. Unknown details should be marked. An event becomes more accessible when we stop filling gaps with what suits a ready scheme.

In an illustrative story of an ended friendship, someone first says relationships naturally change. They then recall one meeting: the friend twice cancelled an agreement, they remained silent, and later stopped replying. Several separate questions appear. Cancellation may have had a good reason; silence may have preserved calm or concealed disagreement; stopping replies may have been a boundary or an unannounced withdrawal. No single accusatory account needs choosing. Specifics expand the possible conversation instead of declaring the whole process natural beforehand.

The next question concerns significance: which part of the episode matters now? It may be lost contact, something unsaid, changed trust, or relief. The person can remain uncertain. An available request can be a beginning: do not cancel without a message, do not expect a quick reply, or clarify the fate of a shared undertaking. An encounter with experience thus does not reduce to feeling. It includes relationship conditions, forms of participation, and actions a general theory sometimes leaves outside attention.

A written note helps only in a suitable format. If it becomes a detailed accusatory chronicle, the question may grow heavier. A few lines can be enough, stopping when there is sufficient information for the current choice. Seriousness need not be proved through page count. Reliability does not automatically grow with detail either: someone can describe an interpretation at length as fact. Separating observation, memory, and supposition is more useful than a general demand for maximum openness.

An encounter with the particular sometimes shows the initial theory was useful and sufficiently precise. This is a permissible result. The article is not designed to declare every general statement a defence. If explanation helps see facts, acknowledge the unknown, and choose action, it can remain. Examination matters precisely because its outcome is not settled in advance. Otherwise fighting intellectualisation would become another intellectual scheme into which every conversation must fit.

Clarification sometimes requires new information rather than deeper inner effort. Someone tries to understand their response to dismissal but does not yet know the transition conditions or decision deadline. Their argument appears abstract because a substantial part of the event has not been established. They can obtain the document, ask the responsible person, and only

then discuss personal meaning. This is another limit to interpretation: missing specifics in an account are not always created by the speaker. Opportunities to encounter experience also depend on available information. Honest experience of a situation whose substance has not yet been communicated should not be demanded.

VI. Another Person Has Their Own Language

Our wish to hear something personal does not oblige another person to speak that way. Some express themselves more readily through an account, others through action, and others through a precise concept. The form's meaning should be clarified in the particular relationship. In an illustrative couple, one wants words of regret while the other offers to correct the matter. Correction may matter without answering the request for acknowledgement. Both needs can be discussed without declaring one cold and the other illogical.

A general theory of another's behaviour especially readily displaces an encounter with the person. We discuss attachment styles, generations, and cultures without asking what the speaker meant yesterday. Even an accurate theory does not know the answer for them. Our account can be offered as a hypothesis, allowing correction. If every answer is deemed defensive beforehand, the hypothesis has become a closed system. The person can then communicate nothing capable of changing our understanding.

Nor should the speaker have the final word on every consequence. They can describe their experience, while the agreement and action remain open to discussion. “It did not matter to me” does not cancel a promise that mattered to someone else. Respect for an inner world is compatible with examination of shared facts. This boundary protects conversation on both sides: against imposing a hidden cause, and against using private experience to forbid consideration of actual responsibility.

Two levels can be agreed: events and conditions first, then inner responses if both are willing. The order is not universal; someone sometimes needs support before speaking about the event at all. Agreement matters, rather than a correct sequence from a book. A listener can say they are currently ready only for the practical question. That adds clarity about a boundary. If no personal conversation will ever occur, the other can consider this when making their own decision about the relationship.

Support does not require analysing another's defence down to its supposed root. An attentive question, a particular offer, or calm presence sometimes suffices. A professional format, if needed, is selected separately. We need neither become a loved one's therapist nor accept their explanation without discussion. Between intrusion and indifference is room for joint

precision: hear what is available, seek permission to clarify, and preserve a person's right not to continue the conversation now.

VII. Do Not Make Immediacy a New Obligation

After criticising abstraction, it is easy to demand constant living contact from ourselves. Every thought now seems flight; every feeling must immediately be disclosed. This order can also distance someone from experience because they monitor whether their state is correct. An examination replaces the situation: am I sufficiently authentic? This article does not propose removing distance. It proposes noticing its purpose and when another way of approaching the same question becomes possible.

In an illustrative episode after a difficult day, someone prefers a quiet book to discussing conflict. This may be a reasonable choice of conditions. What matters is whether returning to the promised conversation remains possible. If the book repeatedly becomes a reason to postpone, the sequence can be examined without banning reading. The problem concerns an unfulfilled agreement rather than the moral value of intellectual activity. Correction may involve another time, a smaller conversation, or an honest withdrawal of the promise.

Inner attention also has a limit. If consideration intensifies prolonged severe distress, someone can stop and seek appropriate support. Continuing an unsuitable practice need not prove readiness for life. No cause of the state or treatment is established here. A right to choose conditions remains. External organisation sometimes suffices: sleep, a pause in messaging, clarification of a task, or return to an everyday routine. Their value should be assessed in the particular situation without promising a universal outcome.

Honesty cannot be measured through obligatory intensity of feeling. A calm account can be accurate and a vivid one selective. Restraint may be a preference, habit, or chosen boundary; its cause remains unknown. Examining substance matters more than stylistic expectation. What does the person acknowledge, leave open, and agree to correct? These questions allow different forms of response. Thought and experience need not compete for a right to be authenticity's sole evidence.

If several approaches become available, the one presently helping the task can be used. Conversation suits some, a note others, and a particular action followed by discussion others. The approach can change. Declining one exercise differs from declining self-understanding. This article establishes no maturity; availability of choice merely makes the process less coercive. Thought can remain a resource while experience returns as something thought continues to encounter.

VIII. A Good Explanation Returns to Life

A useful explanation leaves a more precise question, an understandable limit, or an available action. It can show what is still unknown and why haste is unwise. It need not bring immediate relief. What can now be considered matters more: a particular conversation, one's contribution, a decision's cost, or an actual obligation. Theory works when it helps organise this encounter and withstands the corrections the encounter brings. This is an editorial criterion of usefulness, not a scientific scale of defence.

In the friendship story, someone can retain the thought that relationships change and add an acknowledgement: a message about cancellation mattered to them. A clear request or considered ending of contact now becomes possible. Previous closeness need not return. Becoming specific does not prescribe reconciliation. It changes the decision's ground: a general law about people is replaced with understanding which conditions are acceptable here and what has already happened between these participants.

Explanation sometimes reveals a limit to possibilities. The friend is unwilling to discuss cancellations, and no work to restore the relationship is available now. This is unpleasant clarity but differs from an accusatory theory of the other's immaturity. A decision can follow an observable response without establishing the other's final identity. Both sides' dignity is preserved through precision of scale: not everything about someone, but this agreement, response, and available choice. The limit reduces a need for a grand account to justify leaving definitively.

A new scheme can also replace experience. Someone learns to say “I'm intellectualising now” and repeats this instead of a particular answer. Naming oneself looks honest but leaves the same question. One can return to a small detail: what happened, what can be described, and which next step is needed? An ever subtler mechanism need not be found each time. Precision sometimes grows precisely by reducing explanation's scale and returning to an ordinary human question.

Intelligence need not disappear for someone to encounter life. It needs to retain a capacity to learn from what does not fit the first account. Thought can help hold experience, name a boundary, and make a decision. When it stops promising final transparency, room appears for the unknown and new. There, someone can be clear enough for today's step and open enough to acknowledge tomorrow that experience added what theory did not yet know.

What this means in practice

Choose one general thought you often use to explain a recent episode. Record its strongest version without making a caricature. Then separately describe one particular moment: available words, action, and result. Mark memory gaps and suppositions about others' motives. Demand no particular emotion from yourself.

Ask what the explanation does now. Does it help understand the event, choose action, preserve a pause, or end conversation? Several functions may coexist. Name at least one detail that would clarify the thought. If nothing can change it, examine rules for handling facts without declaring yourself insincere beforehand.

Separate knowledge from available capability. Which small part can be tried with agreed consequences? It might clarify a request, offer a brief refusal, change a deadline, or ask a listener a question. Do not make another's relationship an unagreed experiment. Assess results through events and agreements rather than relief or approval alone.

If conversation is needed, agree its format. Communicate whether you are ready to discuss the event, experience, or only a practical step. Allow another to correct their account and name their own limit. If needed, retain a pause with an understandable return. A right not to disclose the personal remains; actual obligations are considered separately.

The exercise is voluntary and editorial, without established effectiveness or a promise of treatment. You can stop if it does not suit and choose another support format. Retaining good theory with a clarified boundary is a permissible outcome. Another is abandoning an explanation that stopped helping. Either way, the task is to restore thought's capacity to encounter particular life.

Key quotation

> *“Active, persistent, and careful consideration”*

John Dewey, How We Think, 1910, chapter I, §1, the beginning of his definition of reflective thought. A short fragment from the verified edition; the Russian version uses an editorial translation. The full definition concerns a belief's grounds and consequences; the fragment is not an independent therapeutic instruction.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity	Substantial difference
James ↔ examining a skill	Correct words differ from particular capability	Historical pedagogy does not prove this practice effective
Dewey ↔ clarifying an account	Grounds and consequences enter consideration of thought	Philosophy of inquiry does not determine a hidden motive
Defence research ↔ an ordinary term	A way of approaching difficulty is named	A measured construct differs from a conversational accusation
Distance ↔ returning	A pause may preserve possibilities for action	Useful postponement differs from cancellation of an obligation
Explanation ↔ encounter	A concept helps organise experience	A ready scheme gains no right to cancel every new detail

This is an editorial map; similarities are limited, without claiming doctrinal unity or universal causation.

Sources

1. Manfred Diehl, Helena Chui, Elizabeth L. Hay, Mark A. Lumley, Daniel Grühn, Gisela Labouvie-Vief. Change in Coping and Defense Mechanisms across Adulthood: Longitudinal Findings in a European American Sample. Developmental Psychology, 50(2), 2014, 634–648; online 8 July 2013. DOI 10.1037/a0033619. The PubMed abstract and selected Method/Limitations passages returned by search from PMC were read. The full text was not read; direct PMC opening was blocked by a browser check.

2. William James. Talks to Teachers on Psychology; and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals, Henry Holt, 1925, original copyright 1899/1900; Gutenberg #16287, updated 2020. The preface and selected passages I and V were read; not the entire collection.

3. John Dewey. How We Think, 1910, Gutenberg #37423. Selected passages of chapter I, §1–2 and the beginning of §3, the definition, and an example of examination were read; not the entire book. The historical Columbus example is not used as a historical fact in this article.

Tags

intellectualisation, explanation, experience, thought, theory, practice, distance, defence, observation, specifics, Dewey, James, Diehl, reflection, skill, action, feedback, boundary, autonomy, dialogue, agreement, uncertainty, responsibility, clarification, support, self-understanding, concept, choice

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 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 operate in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.