

UNITED WISDOM

Dehumanisation: How a Person Becomes a Category

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-29-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Dehumanisation: How a Person Becomes a Category

Epigraph

> *color line*

W. E. B. Du Bois, The Souls of Black Folk, Forethought, 1903. A brief historical designation of racial division. The author's American context remains specific; this is not a universal description of every difference between people.

What this article is about

Volunteers discuss a late delivery. They know who should have brought the boxes, but not what happened on the way. One participant recalls the person's origins; another agrees with a general description of people from that background. The individual almost disappears from discussion. Belonging explains their action, and every detail is accepted beforehand as confirmation of what such people are like.

This is an authored example, not an observed group. The delivery may indeed have failed through the person's fault. Establishing that requires information about the task, action, and consequences. A category cannot perform this examination. It may name an important part of life without revealing every decision or determining respectful treatment. An explanation closed to specifics changes both the event's description and the person's place among others.

The article examines that movement without diagnosing people or communities, guessing intentions, or requiring acquaintance with someone dangerous. It distinguishes categories, actions, and entire human lives. How can specificity return when belonging has become a ready answer? How can actions remain criticisable without making someone a being of different worth? These questions matter for conversation and accurate decisions about future collaboration.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. A category can support description or close it

Categories serve many tasks: discussing professions, languages, age-related experiences, duties, and historical conditions. Naming a group is not itself dehumanisation. Ask what the name does within an explanation. Does it identify a checkable circumstance or replace information about someone? Does it help formulate a question or settle the answer beforehand? This examines categories' use without prohibiting all shared language or automatically declaring meaningful forms of belonging harmful.

The delivery person's origins can be known while the cause of delay is not. Using the former as the complete answer to the latter removes an unknown without checking. Someone seems already understood. The explanation remains unestablished, however confident or familiar it sounds. Return to the subject: a delivery task, conditions, and delay. Origins do not establish the sequence of actions; obtain that sequence separately where the team's decision needs it.

Closing categories can be noticed where no exception is possible. Every fact receives a predetermined meaning. A good action becomes chance or a trick; a mistake confirms the type; declining discussion of origins proves something again. This hides a person’s specific circumstances behind a fixed description. The observation concerns an account's organisation rather than its author's hidden mental cause. We need not infer internal hatred to identify where an explanation stopped allowing actual clarification.

One careless phrase does not establish the entire pattern. Someone may express a thought poorly, have another task, or correct themselves after clarification. Ask what is known about the action and why belonging matters. The answer may reveal an unsupported transfer or restore a specific circumstance. This is more accurate than immediately labelling the speaker. Otherwise dehumanisation itself becomes another category closing information about someone and their subsequent response.

II. An action does not reveal all human worth

Criticism has a subject: boxes arrived late, information was incorrect, or an important agreement was broken. Such statements can be true and consequential for cooperation. They do not establish lost human worth or uniform conduct across everyone's shared background. Conclusions need grounds proportionate to scale. Identify a breach and change participation without expanding an event into an account of someone's essence, relatives, or everyone routinely grouped alongside them.

Specificity does not require gentleness towards harm. A dangerous action may need stopping, distance, and suitable assistance. Recognising humanity does not require continued contact or cancel protection for affected people. Our distinction concerns what is known and how

decisions are explained. Distance can rest on threat and behaviour without claims of inferior nature. Professional or legal procedures require separate consideration; this article does not replace them with general moral reasoning.

A comprehensive verdict may seem stronger than particular criticism. It avoids returning to circumstances or distinguishing future actions. Forceful wording does not improve accuracy. Describe even repeated breaches: what recurred, under which conditions, and what decision follows? This may support strict limits. Strictness does not require making someone a category explaining everything beforehand. Specific grounds make it clearer why a boundary is needed now and what it concerns.

Nor should flawlessness be humanity's condition. If respectful treatment lasts only until an inconvenient action, it remains a conditional gift from the observer. Actions need not receive identical responses. Consequences differ without making dignity a reward for their absence. Dispute, limit cooperation, and require correction while distinguishing action from overall worth. This matters particularly where a breach is real: necessary responsibility need not become an excessive verdict on an entire life.

III. A historical voice should not dissolve into a general metaphor

In The Souls of Black Folk, Du Bois addresses American racial division and Black experience. Chapter IX connects prejudice with evaluating belonging instead of actions. This is historical political and autobiographical writing. Du Bois, chapters I and IX. We preserve that particular subject rather than presenting a selected passage as an experimental model of every contemporary conflict.

Historical reading raises a question for our authored example: what does a category's name reveal about an action, and what do we merely assume? The answer needs its own checking. A delivery delay cannot be declared equivalent to years of racial oppression. Nor should historical experience be devalued into an attractive comparison for small inconvenience. Scale and circumstances differ. Useful comparison preserves them rather than lending an example historical weight its own facts do not support.

Historical racial terms and generalisations appear in the text. We do not import them as scientific categories or accepted norms for describing someone today. The brotherhood fragment concerns the author's particular aspiration in chapter I. It does not require erasing differences and chosen belonging for abstract unity. Respect must not become conditional on first abandoning an important history. That would turn unity itself into a method of overlooking someone in their actual circumstances.

Genre distinctions preserve a source's value too. A historical author can pose a meaningful question without every position becoming contemporary scientific truth. We use selected

contexts and two short fragments, not a claim to reading the whole book. Respect requires accuracy about the experience described, its history, and the grounds for moving a question elsewhere. The last answer belongs to our analysis rather than being automatically validated by a work's renown.

IV. Not knowing another's meaning does not prove it absent

In On a Certain Blindness in Human Beings, William James considers limits to understanding what matters to others. This is philosophical reasoning, not a contemporary diagnosis of a reader. James, Talks to Teachers, Talks to Students, II. The selected framework distinguishes an unfamiliar experience from a claim that another has no meaning of their own.

We do not know how the person understood the delivery task or what happened on the way. That authorises no invented exonerating story. Nor can a category fill the gap. Ignorance has a specific subject: information is unavailable. Preserve it, obtain a needed answer, or make a limited decision without it, explaining that decision through available facts. Someone becomes no less human because we lack a complete internal picture or are unwilling to investigate it.

Attention to meaning does not require accepting every explanation as true. An account may be incomplete, mistaken, or inconsistent with a known sequence. Check its subject. Recognising someone's experience does not give their story unlimited authority over everyone else's facts. Preserve both sides: someone may remain distinguishable, and shared tasks have actual conditions. Neither categories nor subjective stories should alone cancel necessary examination of actions, agreements, and consequences.

A full biography is unnecessary for rejecting excessive judgement. Often, limiting a conclusion to known facts suffices. This matters where distance is needed: avoid contact with someone dangerous without assigning an imaginary essence. Describe unsafe contact without claims about everyone in their group. Limited information must not become compulsory risky closeness. Philosophical attention gains a practical boundary when accuracy and protection coexist rather than requiring complete understanding at any cost.

V. Language can keep an action visible

Compare accounts of the delivery. One identifies a deadline, duty, and delay. Another identifies people supposedly characterised by that attitude. The first permits clarification; the second contains an overall answer already. This is an authored distinction, not a rule that a grammatical form automatically causes particular harm. Context matters. Check whether wording permits facts differing from a ready judgement and whether it reveals the subject of the team's next action.

Specific language need not be colourless. Name dissatisfaction, a serious breach, and required change. Respectful treatment does not require hiding an effect. Clear consequences can make discussion stricter: delay postponed assembly, so another deadline is needed. That connection can be checked. Describing unsuitable people generally sounds stronger but says less about what happened or how work continues. Respect and substantive criticism can exist within one formulation.

Distinguish name, role, and category. A delivery role carries a duty; a person has further roles; origins may matter historically. Not all information is equally needed now. Delivery duties usually concern timing directly, while origins may be irrelevant. Check rather than adopting a universal rule of cultural context's complete insignificance. Instruction language or differing expectations can sometimes matter. Name those specifically without making a category the final answer about an entire person.

Changed language needs changed conclusions. Removing a harsh label while treating future actions as predetermined leaves someone closed to facts. Examination concerns more than politeness. What could change our judgement of an action? What information will we consider? What grounds support limiting collaboration? These reveal whether specificity has returned substantively. An attractive category name cannot restore distinguishability where procedure still substitutes it for examining the actual situation.

VI. Belonging can be chosen and meaningful

Not every category is imposed. Someone may name a language, community, profession, or historical connection important to them. Rejecting dehumanisation does not require treating belonging as a superficial shell. It can support meaning, conversation, and common action. The issue arises where one attribute forcibly replaces all experience or determines permissible decisions beforehand. Distinguish chosen identification from assigned totality. Respect lets someone describe and clarify connections without becoming everyone's sole representative within an observer's category.

Chosen belonging does not establish identical opinions. One speaks personally, another holds a particular representative mandate, and another describes a familiar circle. These roles differ. Ask which experience is discussed without requiring answers for everyone. Declining cultural explanation makes neither the culture empty nor suspect. Recognise ignorance and select suitable information for separate inquiry without making a listener supply a compulsory overall map of an unfamiliar tradition.

Belonging can have actual institutional or relational consequences. Our local example does not describe that entire history. Accurate discussion of one delay does not establish wider inequality's disappearance. Knowledge of inequality does not automatically establish a

particular action either. Both scales can matter if each has sufficient grounds and its own question. Preserve historical conditions without using them as every individual's complete biography in contemporary collaborative work.

Some discussions need categories, such as considering instructions in different languages. State the purpose and generalisation's limits: understanding material rather than language users' inner nature. The subject permits checking formats and considering different answers. A generalisation remains workable where clarification is possible and a whole personality is not substituted. It becomes closing when a language requirement establishes someone's work attitude, morality, or capacity for every other task without examination.

VII. A boundary does not need humiliation

Suppose checking confirms repeated missed deadlines. Reassign work or stop assigning delivery. Grounds concern the task and its risks, not an assertion that someone is unworthy of contact generally. A firm boundary can leave further questions open. Cooperation need not be preserved for an attractive image of unity. Identify the restricted action, evidence, and scope without extending the decision to an entire life or community.

Explaining a boundary can itself be unsafe or impossible. Recognising humanity does not compel detailed dialogue. Choose distance and available assistance according to conditions. This article offers no universal threat-response procedure. Its subject is the lack of necessity to humiliate a whole category in recognising a particular danger. Urgency does not require complete understanding, but urgent action does not turn every assumption about someone's nature into established knowledge for later accounts.

Helpers need boundaries too. Someone asked to explain another's behaviour may lack information or permission to share it. Their category need not be accused of insufficient openness. Accept a limited answer and return to available facts. Privacy protection does not prove a general motive of secrecy; it concerns a role and circumstance. Specificity serves examination and respect for those nearby, whose supposed closeness or shared origins do not make them responsible for an action.

A boundary without humiliation does not guarantee agreement. Someone may dispute facts or decline further discussion. Where revision procedures exist, name their actual availability; where absent, do not promise them for politeness. Accuracy remains possible amid conflict: a decision, grounds, and unknown parts. This differs from a total judgement closing every response beforehand. Respect appears in knowledge's and action's scope rather than compulsory pleasant feelings on both sides.

VIII. Examine exceptions to your own account

Ask what information does not fit your categorical story. Was it considered or dismissed beforehand? This need not construct a positive image; it checks openness to differences. If good conduct is disguise and error reveals truth, no clarification can challenge the account. That protection is not evidence; it reveals an explanatory limitation. Name it before accusing someone of a wrong feeling or demanding an immediate complete change of attitude.

Return to the task rather than collecting exceptions to exonerate. One good action does not cancel a confirmed delay. It may limit the conclusion that someone is always irresponsible. Different facts answer different questions. A delivery needs its explanation; repeated collaboration involves several known episodes. No list establishes an entire human essence. Examination can be strict enough for a decision without claiming a final moral portrait.

Clarification may change your role: repeating an unsupported characterisation, adding origins to timing, or sharing a total verdict. These are correctable actions. Do not make yourself a new representative of bad people, or demand that someone confirm your goodness. Correct information, limit conclusions, and state further opportunities to discuss. The response belongs to the other person. Correction does not guarantee an emotional outcome, but can reduce your contribution to spreading an inaccurate description.

IX. Restoring a person does not require complete closeness

Seeing someone more specifically requires neither detailed acquaintance nor continued relationships. Sometimes stop deriving unknowns from a category. Withhold a particular task without claims about everyone sharing their origins. Acknowledge harm without an entire group's immutable nature. Reject excuses inconsistent with facts. These decisions preserve distinctions. Closeness, trust, cooperation, and recognition of human worth concern different questions and need not arrive together.

This matters for people harmed. An invitation to see the person must not become another demand: understand the offender, talk to them, and help them change. That choice may be possible but is not compulsory. Rejecting dehumanising descriptions can occur at a distance through accurate accounts. Known actions need no investigation of inner life. Universal unity especially cannot justify removing protection, privacy, or the right to end unchosen contact.

Volunteers can examine delivery, correct an ungrounded generalisation, and decide the next event. The person remains specific even where their role changes. The group need not declare flawlessness to correct its words. This limited result restores facts' significance rather than a category answering everything. Final reconciliation is not promised. Distinguishability matters

because criticism and protection become specific while human life remains wider than today's decision about boxes and arrival times.

X. Distinguishability preserves responsibility and dignity

Dehumanisation here names a movement closing someone within a category as an already understood type of different worth. This is a working moral distinction, not a diagnosis. Applying it needs context and checking. Not every generalisation performs that function. Limits need not humiliate, and disagreement need not deny humanity. Precision matters so the term identifies a movement rather than becoming a universal verdict on any uncomfortable discussion.

Historical reading and philosophy supply questions; a situation supplies information. What concerns a role? What is known about an action? Which experience is merely assumed? What is the decision's scale? These need no complete knowledge of someone, only avoidance of making incomplete information a closed portrait. An answer may be strict, distance necessary, and collaboration ended. Specific responsibility and dignity coexist instead of requiring complete exoneration or exclusion from the human world.

Return to the beginning: delivery was late, causes are checked, and origins stop replacing facts. Name a breached clear duty, clarify unclear conditions, or retain unknowns where information is insufficient. Each decision has a subject. An action remains, a category is not destiny, and respect requires neither closeness nor blindness to harm. A limited conversational step does not resolve historical injustice, but stops adding unsupported totality to it.

What this means in practice

Choose one description of an action using a category. Identify the task, action, and known consequences. Separately mark conclusions derived solely from belonging. Familiar wording is not confirmation. Check whether facts could alter your account's scale.

Reformulate a general verdict into an action and decision's grounds. Do not soften confirmed harm for politeness or add knowledge of a whole person you lack. Where a boundary is needed, explain through task, conduct, and actual risk when possible and safe. Humanity does not require renewing dangerous contact.

Correct an inaccurate generalisation you shared without requiring reassurance about goodness. If someone names meaningful belonging, do not demand abandonment for recognition. Clarify chosen meaning and accept limited answers. The aim is distinguishing actions and circumstances rather than compulsory intimacy, final portraits, or immediate universal reconciliation.

Key quotation

human brotherhood

W. E. B. Du Bois, The Souls of Black Folk, chapter I. A brief fragment of the author's aspiration, retaining historical belonging without requiring erased differences or unsafe relationships.

Connections between traditions

Du Bois's historical political voice and James's philosophical question concern different subjects. One preserves racial division's experience; the other attends to limited understanding of another's meaning. Comparison neither equates harm's scales nor turns selected contexts into a general experimental theory.

Our delivery example moves questions into another context within limits. Actions require facts, belonging may matter, and distance is compatible with dignity. This practical distinction establishes neither complete agreement between traditions nor a substitute for historical research.

Sources

• B17-R-29-N01-S1. W. E. B. Du Bois. The Souls of Black Folk. Forethought; chapters I and IX. Forethought and selected displayed contexts from I and IX read, not the whole book. Historical political and autobiographical voice; quotations are not from embedded poems by others.

• B17-R-29-N01-S2. William James. Talks to Teachers on Psychology and to Students on Some of Life’s Ideals. Talks to Students, II, On a Certain Blindness in Human Beings. Selected essay's opening and conclusion read, not the whole book. Philosophical framework without direct quotation or contemporary diagnosis.

Tags

dehumanisation, person, category, dignity, belonging, action, responsibility, circumstances, language, description, distinguishability, generalisation, facts, checking, boundaries, distance, safety, cooperation, origins, culture, history, meaning, respect, criticism, correction, traditions, philosophy, Du Bois, James, United Wisdom

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.