

UNITED WISDOM

Memory as reconstruction, rather than a video recording

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-05-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Memory as reconstruction, rather than a video recording

Epigraph

> *“Remoter dates are conceived, not perceived”.*

William James, *The Principles of Psychology*, 1890, Chapter XVI, “Memory”, p. 650. Quoted from the original English text. This concerns how the distant past is represented, rather than a denial of accurate recollection.

What this article is about

Imagine a hypothetical reunion of old friends. One remembers an important conversation taking place in a kitchen, another remembers going outside. A third confidently reproduces a sentence the others do not recognise. Nobody intended to deceive. But after several questions, a simple explanation becomes tempting: either one person holds the correct recording, or memory has no value at all.

Between those extremes is a meaningful possibility: treat recollection as a present representation of the past that may combine experience, knowledge, later accounts, and today's understanding. Its value remains, while particular details require attention to their foundations. We distinguish personal recollection, narrative, external records, and causal explanations, drawing on a limited experiment by Loftus and Palmer, James's historical analysis, and Augustine's Christian reflection. Their questions and grounds remain distinct. The practical aim is to handle memories with greater care, examine consequential information more precisely, and avoid turning confidence into conclusive proof.

I. A past event and a present recollection

An event has already happened; remembering happens now. The distinction seems obvious until an account becomes particularly vivid. In a hypothetical situation, someone smells the room, hears an intonation, and almost sees a movement of hands. That experience deserves attention as their actual experience in the present. Yet its strength does not make the room directly observable again. Time, other conversations, and ways of understanding events remain between what happened and today's account. We need not presume every detail mistaken, but we should distinguish its source from its sense of persuasiveness.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A video also requires interpretation: it has a viewpoint, sound quality, beginning, and end. Nevertheless, its frames can be reviewed as an external record of a particular observation. A memory does not become such a record simply because it feels like a scene. Comparison with video is therefore useful precisely for identifying the metaphor's limit. It does not establish that memory is always inaccurate or that a camera always provides complete truth. Both sources should be considered according to what they allow us to know, and how.

If a hypothetical participant remembers being afraid, that report concerns their experience. If they remember a conversation's exact time, dating becomes a question. If they explain someone else's intention, they are interpreting. All three assertions can occupy one sentence but have different foundations. Separating them preserves the first's value without requiring it to prove the second and third. Acknowledging a feeling does not require unconditional acceptance of every conclusion about an event's sequence or another person's inner life.

In practice, we can begin by asking what is being asserted now. Instead of “Is my memory generally correct?”, ask “Do I remember the place?”, “Do I know the date from correspondence?”, or “Am I assuming a cause?” That clarity enables discussion of one discrepancy without judging an entire experience. Sometimes a fact will be confirmed; sometimes it will become less definite; sometimes participants' accounts will remain different. In every case, the person gains a more precise map of foundations, rather than a demand to abandon their own life if a detail needs correction.

II. Vividness and confidence raise separate questions

A confident account can easily be accepted as accurate, especially when detailed. But logically, confidence concerns a person's present attitude to their report, while accuracy concerns correspondence with events. The questions interact in actual assessment, yet they do not coincide by definition. Strength of conviction alone cannot establish correspondence. Nor can a report be declared false merely because its speaker is cautious. In either case, we need grounds for the particular detail rather than judging a person through their manner of speaking.

Imagine a hypothetical scene: someone names another person's jacket colour and immediately adds that they may have confused two days. Another participant answers without hesitation. The first person's caution does not prove error, and the second person's confidence does not exclude it. Perhaps one retained a photograph while the other draws on a familiar image of an acquaintance. Those are possibilities to clarify, rather than an established explanation of the discrepancy. If the colour matters, look for information relating to that day. If it changes nothing, the disagreement may not merit further effort.

The same care applies to detail. Several expressive details produce a coherent image, but narrative coherence does not confirm all its elements together. A correctly remembered place does not prove an exact sentence; naming a participant correctly does not establish the cause of their action. We can examine the assertion on which a decision depends. This matters especially when a vivid story starts determining an attitude towards someone. Narrative persuasiveness then gains excessive power if no step from scene to conclusion has been examined separately.

We should not, however, demand that an ordinary recollection meet the standards of an official record. In a friendly conversation, people can share impressions as impressions. The more consequential the matter, the greater the need for precise wording and independent material. Care means neither believing every detail nor suspecting every detail. It means proportionately distinguishing what someone experiences now, reports about the past, feels confident about, and can substantiate. Doubting one element does not require rejecting the rest, but acknowledging one does not confirm the whole account either.

III. What Loftus and Palmer showed

In Loftus and Palmer's original 1974 paper, participants watched films of car accidents. In the first experiment, different verbs in questions accompanied different speed estimates. In the second, a week later, groups responded differently about broken glass absent from the filmed accident. The authors discussed reconstructive memory and an alternative involving response changes. These were limited student laboratory experiments, rather than tests of every form of memory or proof of what causes each disagreement between people.

Substantive caution is necessary in both directions. The result warrants taking seriously the way questions are asked after an event. It does not license declaring every inconvenient memory suggested. A particular case needs its own information: what was observed, which accounts appeared later, and which assertion is being examined. A laboratory scene cannot substitute for a biography. It is particularly unjustified to turn a research finding about possible wording effects into a universal explanation of distressing experiences or a way to dismiss reports of harm.

In a hypothetical everyday conversation, the distinction appears between “What do you remember about the meeting?” and “Why was he shouting then?” The second already contains the assertion that shouting occurred. If that detail is disputed, the question requires an answer within a proposed version. We are not claiming that this wording necessarily changes a particular person's memory. Its logical premise, however, can be noticed immediately. A more open question allows someone to describe their own representation, name uncertainty, and disagree with the starting structure of another person's account.

The authors' practical inference is limited: in a consequential discussion, it helps not to insert a disputed detail into a question before its basis becomes clear. This is a conversational rule rather than an independent memory-recovery procedure. It promises no elimination of error. It simply reduces confusion between what someone reported themselves and what a question introduced. Scientific research helps identify a real problem here; the subsequent everyday recommendation remains our proportionate interpretation and is not presented as a tested clinical method.

IV. Distinguishing personal experience from later knowledge

Someone can know more about an event than they directly remember. In a hypothetical example, they remember waiting at a station but learn the exact date from a ticket. These sources can complement each other. A problem begins when the date's source disappears from the account and the whole scene seems to have survived in the same way. It helps to distinguish “I remember”, “I learned later”, “I see in a record”, and “I assume”. That distinction does not establish each source's quality in advance; it enables an appropriate question.

Later knowledge does not necessarily distort memory. Sometimes it corrects a date, explains a circumstance, or makes sense of an action that previously seemed random. The important thing is not to confuse a useful clarification with access to an earlier experience. If a hypothetical reader learns from a letter why a meeting was delayed, their present understanding may change. That does not mean they already knew the reason then. Both layers matter in a biographical account if their boundary remains visible and the earlier state is not rewritten as all-knowing.

The distinction also helps in discussing childhood episodes. A family narrative can preserve important information about a period when a child could not yet understand it. But belonging to one's life does not make a retelling a direct recollection. Someone can say “The family tells us this happened” and retain the story's meaning. They need not create an inner scene to be entitled to regard it as part of a biography. Asking about a report's origin supports honesty; it does not devalue relatives or establish their error.

When a detail's origin is unknown, it can remain unknown. Memory need not supply an accompanying index card for every image. Forcing a gap to be filled can turn an assumption into an overconfident assertion. Instead, a boundary can be named: “I don't know whether I remember it myself or heard about it later.” That can suffice for an ordinary conversation. If a serious decision depends on the detail, additional material and suitable procedures are needed. An honest limitation on a source is more useful than confidence obtained merely to complete one's story.

V. William James: memory includes a relation to the past

In Chapter XVI of *The Principles of Psychology*, 1890, James distinguishes an image's recurrence from recollection. Remembering involves a relation to the past and a sense of its belonging to personal experience. An image alone does not tell us when or by whom it was experienced. This is historical psychological analysis, rather than a contemporary experimental model of the brain. Its role here is to sharpen a question: what makes a present representation a recollection rather than merely a familiar scene?

Imagine a hypothetical reader who has repeatedly seen a photograph of a celebration. They know the image and can describe people's positions. A separate question is whether they remember participating in the celebration. Both possibilities may coexist: remembering part of the event and knowing other details from the photograph. One answer need not cover the entire scene. Familiarity with an image and personal experience of the past rest on different foundations. A coherent picture can contain those layers together, while a conversation can distinguish them in words.

James's analysis also helps distinguish recognition of content from establishing its source. A hypothetical person may remember hearing a story without observing the event described. Their memory of the conversation is real, although it does not make them a witness to the story itself. This is an ordinary distinction between two episodes: a report's transmission and what was reported. Retaining it avoids setting a speaker's honesty against the need for examination. Someone can sincerely pass on an account while lacking direct information about the original event.

A historical text cannot license independent explanations of every contemporary memory difficulty. Its concepts arose in a particular scientific setting. Yet a limited distinction remains useful for our reasoning: a present image, its association with a date, and a feeling of personal belonging should not be merged into one proof. Examination can clarify one layer and leave another open. The question of accuracy thereby stops sounding like an accusation that someone has no life of their own. It becomes a question about a particular relation between a person, a representation, and an event they are trying to understand.

VI. Augustine: inner space is not an external record

In Book X of Augustine's *Confessions*, memory is pictured as a space where images, acquired knowledge, and the person meet. He distinguishes images' presence from the presence of external things. His reflection unfolds within a Christian address to God and a search for self-understanding. It is not a laboratory theory or an early confirmation of Loftus and Palmer's experiment. Similar questions do not erase different purposes: an experiment examines a particular influence, while a confessional text considers human life before God.

The metaphor of inner space suggests memory's richness without promising a literal storehouse of unchanged objects. In a hypothetical situation, a reader recalls the sea while sitting in a room. Their experience contains an image, but the sea has not moved into the room. This simple distinction does not establish how accurately they remember the water's colour. It shows another limit: representing a thing and its external existence are different events. Inner persuasiveness need not provide complete verification of external details, although the experience itself remains actual.

Comparison with a contemporary conversation helps when someone wants to retain a recollection's significance after a detail is corrected. A hypothetical participant learns that a trip took place a year earlier than they thought. That changes the date but need not destroy gratitude for time spent together. They can correct a fact and retain a relationship without declaring the relationship proof of the fact. This is the authors' practical interpretation. It is not deduced as an obligatory Augustinian instruction and does not require readers to adopt his religious foundations to distinguish the two levels.

Nor should religious context be removed for the sake of convenient universality. For Augustine, the question about oneself is connected to the question about God, rather than solely to biographical accuracy. A reader with another worldview can understand that movement without sharing the faith. United Wisdom retains the distinction: careful comparison reveals a shared difficulty in addressing inner experience, while divergence explains why different texts consider it. Neither a scientific model nor spiritual reflection should absorb the neighbouring way of asking a question.

VII. Examination should match a detail's significance

Not every discrepancy warrants the same examination. In a hypothetical friendly account, participants can disagree about the weather without changing a meeting's meaning very much. If a dispute concerns a promised payment, conditions of consent, or harm, the consequences differ. Relevant messages, documents, and testimony with identifiable origins then become useful. This article does not establish a legal procedure; it proposes proportion between a conclusion's importance and the material supporting it. Memory remains a source, but need not be the only one.

Material's independence needs checking rather than presuming from its quantity. If hypothetical participants repeat one family story, several retellings do not become several separate observations. If a photograph received its caption much later, the image and caption date have different origins. That does not establish the story's or caption's inaccuracy. It identifies where clarification is needed. A documentary appearance does not remove questions about who made a record, what it records, and which additions came after the original event.

Examination should not promise unattainable completeness either. Correspondence can confirm an agreement without revealing every participant's feelings. A photograph can show someone's presence without establishing their intentions. One source may reliably clarify a detail and leave an adjacent question unanswered. Remembering this prevents verification from expanding silently into a final portrait of a relationship. We can state what is established and separately identify what remains interpretation. That wording allows progress without false completeness or devaluing information that has been found.

In a sufficiently safe everyday discussion, participants can decide beforehand which uncertainty is acceptable. Hypothetical friends need not agree on an exact sentence to acknowledge a meeting's importance. A serious dispute will have different requirements, and an informal conversation may be insufficient. Proportion does not mean always choosing less examination. It means choosing according to the actual question, consequences, and available options. Sometimes the next step is to check a letter; sometimes to end an unproductive argument; sometimes to seek an appropriate professional procedure.

VIII. An account can be corrected without humiliation

A person can change an account and retain good faith. In a hypothetical example, they are initially sure of a date, then see a record and correct it. Correction shows acceptance of a new basis. It does not prove that the original report was intentional deception. At the same time, correction does not automatically remove responsibility for an earlier assertion's consequences. If an error affected someone, the correction should reach the place where the earlier accusation or decision occurred. Care includes the speaker and everyone affected by the account.

Conversation becomes easier when a detail is clarified rather than a personality defect proclaimed. “According to the letter, the meeting was on Tuesday” leaves a clear subject for discussion. “You invent everything” demands a defence of an entire life at once. Even a serious discrepancy need not begin with a universal accusation. Material, question, and limit can be named. If reliable evidence disproves a detail, acknowledge that detail specifically. If it merely allows another version, do not turn possibility into conclusive refutation for an expressive victory.

Someone also needs room not to know. A hypothetical participant might say “I remember the general scene but cannot vouch for the words.” That boundary helps others understand how to use the account. It should not invite pressure for a more detailed version. Searching for a “real” hidden memory through persistent imagination is particularly undesirable here. Our practice concerns clarity in an already available report and external grounds. It does not propose retrieving lost events or turn an absence of detail into an indication of a particular cause.

When trust needs repair, precision and acknowledging consequences can work together. A hypothetical speaker corrects a fact, explains the correction's source, and acknowledges that earlier confidence complicated the conversation. This is a specific action, rather than a promise never to err again. The other participant retains the right to assess it according to the situation. Correcting memory does not demand instantly forgetting harm, but it creates a more honest basis for further conversation. Revision matters when it serves neither self-exoneration nor a person's humiliation.

IX. The meaning of the past can also change

Someone can understand an event differently without claiming that it happened differently. In a hypothetical story, a teenager experienced their parents' refusal as distrust, then as an adult learns about difficult family circumstances. Today's explanation may change. That does not erase how the refusal felt then or prove every parental action justified. A change in meaning, clarification of a fact, and assessment of responsibility are separate processes. Keeping them distinct means that a new perspective need not destroy an earlier part of one's biography.

It is particularly useful not to attribute today's knowledge to the past. A hypothetical adult can clearly see consequences of a choice that were unavailable then. This enriches present understanding without establishing an earlier intention. “Now I understand” is more honest than “I always knew” if the grounds emerged later. A consistent self-image need not be defended at any cost. Learning includes acknowledging that important things became understandable only after new experience, a conversation, or information received.

A change in meaning should not be imposed as a demand. If an event involved harm, someone else cannot require a participant to find gratitude or a spiritual lesson in it. A new fact can be considered without accepting a comforting explanation. This article proposes no therapeutic retelling and does not determine how distressing experience should be felt. Its boundary is distinguishing a present explanation from an assertion about the past. Support begins with respect for a person and their situation rather than an obligation to create an attractive story of growth.

In an ordinary, sufficiently safe situation, someone can ask what changed in their account: information, attitude, language, or the question for which it is recalled. The answer may combine several things and need not be made artificially simple. The past retains significance through different ways of approaching it: memory, archives, conversation, action. None has to contain the others completely. Meaning can develop while a person attends to facts, knowledge's origins, and other participants who cannot be reduced to characters in an internal story.

X. Living with a memory that does not know everything

Recognising memory's limits does not deprive someone of support. It changes that support's structure: a demand for a definitive recording becomes an opportunity to combine personal experience, available information, and honest qualifications. In a hypothetical situation, friends retain different details of a meeting but agree that the conversation helped them decide. If exact words are not established, they need not invent them. An account remains meaningful when its value does not depend on falsely promising to reproduce every second and everyone's experience.

It helps to retain consequential information with identifiable origins: agreement dates, messages about changes, or conditions for a shared task. Such records do not make life suspicious. They assist memory where precision matters and leave it other roles: connecting experience, sustaining relationships, returning attention to what matters. But archives also have limits and require care with personal information. Not every conversation needs recording to deserve trust. The extent of recording follows an agreed task rather than fear of every uncertainty.

If a hypothetical person notices that an everyday argument supplies no new information, they can stop and name the remaining difference. That is not capitulation before truth. Sometimes further repetition increases the parties' confidence without adding grounds. A question can be postponed, suitable material sought, or a detail acknowledged as unresolved. This is compatible with responsibility provided uncertainty is not used to ignore significant harm or an obligation. Knowledge's boundary should clarify a decision, rather than conveniently remove the need for one.

Memory deserves both trust in its human role and attention to its foundations. It connects a life but need not be a camera. A recollection can matter while some details need checking; examination can be necessary without accusing an entire person. Our conclusion is not another absolute formula about memory, but a proportionate way to handle it. Name the source, distinguish fact from explanation, allow correction, and care for those affected by an account: the past can thereby participate in the present without demanding more knowledge than is actually available.

What this means in practice

Choose an ordinary recollection that can be discussed safely and voluntarily. Do not begin with distressing experience or a search for lost events. Write a short account and distinguish what you directly remember, know from a later report, see in a record, or assume. If a detail's origin is unclear, name that uncertainty without seeking an inner scene to fill the gap.

Identify one detail on which the task actually depends. If necessary, compare it with a relevant record or independent report. Clarify the material's origin and do not expand its significance: confirming a date does not reveal someone else's intention. A fact can be corrected, an experience retained, and an explanation revised separately.

When discussing recollection with another person, ask an open question and allow different levels of confidence. In a hypothetical example, “What do you remember about that meeting?” leaves more room for their account than a question containing a disputed detail. This practice assists conversational clarity; it does not recover memory, eliminate error, or replace professional procedures where consequences require them.

Key quotation

> *“...spacious palaces of my memory”.*

Augustine, *Confessions*, X.8.12: a short fragment of the image of ascending to memory's inner space, in Edward Bouverie Pusey's translation. The image belongs to a Christian search for God and is not a claim about a literal storehouse of unchanged recordings.

Connections between traditions

Approach	What is compared	Similarity	Limit of the comparison
Loftus and Palmer	Effects of a question after a viewed event	Present answers require attention to conditions	A laboratory experiment does not explain every recollection or distressing experience
William James	An image's relation to one's past	Recurrent representation and memory require distinction	Historical analysis is not a contemporary brain model
Augustine	Images in memory and external things	Inner representation is not external presence	Christian self-understanding has a religious purpose that does not replace experiment
Archival examination	A record's origin and an assertion's limit	A source is useful for a particular question	Recording a date does not reveal a whole inner life
The authors' position	Clarification without humiliation	Experience's significance can coexist with corrected details	Careful conversation does not replace clinical or legal procedures

Primary sources and research

• Elizabeth F. Loftus, John C. Palmer. Reconstruction of Automobile Destruction, 1974. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 13, 585–589. The complete original text of both experiments and discussion was read. The original paper is hosted by an archive rather than the publisher. No transfer to clinical cases is performed.

• William James. The Principles of Psychology, 1890, Chapter XVI: Memory. Electronic historical original in Classics in the History of Psychology, York University. The chapter's opening and analysis of recollection, pp. 643–652, were read. This is not James's 1892 abridged textbook.

• Augustine. The Confessions, Edward Bouverie Pusey translation. Project Gutenberg. Book X on memory, especially X.8.12–15; the relevant passage was read with its religious context. The short Russian quotation is the authors' translation from this version.

Tags

memory, reconstruction, recollection, past, present, self-report, testimony, source, confidence, vividness, accuracy, dating, interpretation, external record, archives, open question, Loftus, Palmer, William James, Augustine, Confessions, psychology, Christianity, self-understanding, responsibility, care, examination, limits of knowledge, personal experience, 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 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.