

UNITED WISDOM

What We Call Truth: Correspondence, Coherence, and Usefulness

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

What We Call Truth: Correspondence, Coherence, and Usefulness

Epigraph

> *truth and falsehood are properties of beliefs and statements*

Bertrand Russell, The Problems of Philosophy XII, second condition. Exact English clause; his subsequent argument makes truth depend on facts beyond belief.

What this article is about

People arranging a meeting disagree. One trusts their timetable because it matches the organizer's message. Another finds that the time conflicts with other arrangements. A third proposes a workable option and calls it correct. Correspondence with circumstances, coherence among beliefs, and practical usefulness meet here, but they raise different questions. What makes a statement true? How do we establish its truth? What lets us act usefully? This article distinguishes these questions through Russell, Bradley, and James while preserving disagreement among their approaches. It does not choose a final theory for the reader or declare every convenient story true. The everyday examples are invented for analysis, and the exercise examines one claim without turning conversation into an examination. Attention to truth begins with understanding what, exactly, we are asserting, and what kind of grounds could support that assertion.

I. Truth and how we know it are different questions

"Truth" can refer to a correct statement, a person's honesty, or a discovery about life. "They told the truth" sometimes means that a report matches an event, sometimes that feelings were not concealed. A dictionary cannot settle these uses permanently, but a particular conversation can clarify them. Sincere error does not correct a meeting time; naming the right time does not establish honesty in every explanation. The message's content, how it was obtained, and the speaker's intention concern related but different questions. Each needs evidence appropriate to what we actually want to establish.

Russell opens Chapter XII of The Problems of Philosophy by separating truth's nature from how we discover which beliefs are true. We use that distinction without automatically adopting his whole account of knowledge. A guess can be correct; a conscientious check can still produce an incorrect conclusion. Evaluating a method and evaluating content therefore differ. A good procedure addresses particular opportunities for error, but "checked" needs to specify

what was examined, against which grounds, and with what result. It does not make the procedure's participant an infallible witness to every circumstance.

Imagine that a meeting record proves correct but was accidentally copied from an older message. This time its date matches the new agreement. That does not establish that old messages reliably show new decisions. Conversely, a typo in a fresh record does not require abandoning every written arrangement. We need to identify the particular failure and improve how the record is handled. Attention to truth then moves beyond blanket judgments of "trustworthy" or "untrustworthy." It examines a specific claim and the route through which we reached it, preserving both a correct result and the limits of its method.

The distinction also matters in personal disagreement. Someone may deeply believe an account of their past without confirming every detail. Another may accurately correct a date without understanding the event's significance. Neither confidence nor precision gives either person the whole subject. Facts can be checked, experienced meaning heard, and a future decision discussed separately. This is an original proposal for conversation, rather than an established reconciliation method. It cannot guarantee agreement. It helps prevent one accurate correction from being treated as the complete answer to everything a person wanted to say about their life.

II. Correspondence: a statement meets its subject

A correspondence approach asks how a statement relates to what it concerns. Saying a meeting is arranged for Wednesday refers to a particular agreement, rather than elegant wording. In Russell's account, truth depends on belief's relation to a fact, rather than conviction's internal intensity. This remains his philosophical answer, not the final settlement of every problem of truth. In our everyday illustration, wanting to meet on Wednesday does not establish that participants actually agreed on that day and communicated the arrangement. The claim needs contact with its subject, even when the wish behind it is entirely understandable.

This question does not require imagining a viewpoint outside human experience. Observation, memory, records, and participants' accounts mediate access. Each has limits, though those limits differ. A saved message may establish the written date more precisely than memory; memory may indicate that the date was subsequently discussed differently. Compare materials against the question instead of selecting a favourite method in advance. Mediated access does not require abandoning correspondence. We can continue asking which situation is being established and how far the available route actually permits us to check it, without claiming an impossible view of everything at once.

The claim needs a sufficiently clear subject. “Everything went well” might mean that a meeting occurred, the plan was completed, someone felt pleased, or nobody was harmed. These parts do not confirm each other automatically. A completion report should distinguish results from impressions; an account of experience cannot be replaced by an accurate checklist. Correspondence begins by clarifying what would need to happen for the sentence to be true, and what happened. Yet every life evaluation cannot be reduced to one observable event. Any remaining judgment should be discussed openly rather than concealed inside a broad phrase.

Truth should also be distinguished from approval. Establishing an unpleasant conversation does not make it morally acceptable. Accurately describing a refusal does not show it was fair. Circumstances can be clarified before discussing evaluation and action, even when the discussions develop together. We can acknowledge an uncomfortable fact without endorsing what happened, and criticize conduct without inventing a more convenient event. Fidelity to the subject sometimes means correcting precisely the detail that strengthened our argument. The evaluation then rests on what is established instead of requiring an advantageous distortion to make the criticism persuasive.

III. Coherence: beliefs must withstand consideration together

We rarely hold just one belief about a situation. The meeting is Wednesday; the room is available after lunch; one participant can attend only in the morning; travel takes time. Each report needs grounds, and together they may reveal a conflict in the plan. Coherence asks whether the claims can hold together under the stated conditions. It is more than a pleasing sense of unity. We need to establish whether words concern the same time, person, and meaning. Apparently incompatible statements may describe an earlier agreement and a later one. Establish the contradiction before deciding what needs correction.

In Chapter XXIV of Appearance and Reality, Bradley connects degrees of truth with internal harmony and the whole’s inclusiveness. His argument belongs to the metaphysics of the Absolute. It is neither a timetable check nor a claim that friends’ agreement suffices for truth. The comparative question concerns what a convenient system leaves out. A plan accommodating only its organizer may look coherent while concealing others’ circumstances. This is our original application of a question about inclusion, rather than a transfer of Bradley’s entire metaphysics into household instructions or proof that every coherent decision is fair.

Russell objects to defining truth by coherence alone, partly because several coherent systems may be possible. His criticism does not make every coherence check useless; it identifies a limit. Internal connections do not alone select the actual circumstances. A consistent story can describe a meeting that never happened. Its details may sustain the plot without becoming evidence. Everyday analysis needs checks of the initial statements alongside checks of their

relationships. When every report derives from one invented record, matching retellings do not create independent contact with the event or answer the original question.

Coherence can prompt a further question. Conflicting dates may involve an error, rescheduling, or different events. The more confident participant should not automatically prevail. Ask which explanation accounts for the grounds without extra assumptions introduced only to rescue an earlier version. Agreement among reports need not produce final certainty either; it can strengthen a working account within limits. “These reports fit together” is more accurate than “everything is proved” while an external source remains unchecked. Such wording keeps the account open to circumstances it does not yet include, without discarding the useful consistency already found.

IV. Usefulness: which experience supports action

Practical usefulness also needs a precise question. A plan can help people meet without describing their original agreement. Choosing Thursday instead of Wednesday may work if everyone attends. It does not retrospectively make “We had already agreed on Thursday” true. Action’s usefulness and a report about the past differ here. This does not diminish the practical decision: it solved its problem. Success does not authorize rewriting the arrangement’s history. We can say the earlier record differed, the arrangement was revised, and the new option enabled the meeting. The new agreement needs its own clear confirmation.

In Lecture VI of Pragmatism, James connects truth with ideas’ verification in experience and where they lead. His approach cannot be reduced to “It pleases me, therefore it is true.” The passage read stresses the constraints that circumstances impose on arbitrary beliefs. Our question concerns what supports an idea’s expected operation. A map that helps locate a place undergoes a particular check. One successful route does not verify every label or opening time on it. Practical verification matters, but its scope needs to be stated without assigning it more than the experience actually established.

A result may be useful for a reason the original explanation missed. A misunderstood message shaped a meeting plan, yet participants found one another because they also called. Crediting the message alone ignores the corrective action. Repeating success requires understanding what helped. This invented example shows why an account should include the route to the result and its revisions. “It worked” begins the inquiry instead of ending it. It invites questions about who benefited, which task was completed, and what remained unchecked, even when the overall experience was positive and everyone welcomes the practical outcome.

Usefulness has beneficiaries and a duration. A choice saves the organizer time but complicates someone else’s journey; it reduces today’s tension while leaving tomorrow’s agreement unclear. “Effective” should not conceal those differences. Choose an outcome and

notice participants' costs. Usefulness also does not absorb fairness: obtaining agreement through pressure can serve one person's goal while violating another's freedom. We distinguish the result, the means, and the right to refuse. Accurate knowledge of consequences matters, but it does not by itself determine which consequences we are entitled to demand from another person's life.

V. Three questions assist checking without merging theories

In a particular task, three questions can stand together: does the report match accessible circumstances, fit other checked information, and lead where expected when acted upon? Their proximity does not mean Russell, Bradley, and James offer one doctrine in different words. Their accounts of reality, thought, experience, and truth differ. We borrow directions of attention while retaining application limits. Checking a timetable does not settle the philosophical dispute. It can reveal that participants examine different aspects of a statement before prematurely presenting one result as the final answer to the whole question.

Return to the meeting. A saved message confirms the original date. Comparing room availability shows that the arrangement is difficult to fulfil. Choosing another day enables attendance. There is a reliable record, a conflicted plan, and a useful correction. Selecting one result should not erase the others. "We met successfully" hides the original organizing error; "The date was accurate" hides the need for revision; "The plan conflicted" hides the solution. A substantive account preserves these transitions so others know what they can rely on now and which earlier conclusion should no longer guide action.

These approaches sometimes support each other. A checked record fits other information, and action leads to the expected place. Confidence gains substance because several grounds can be named. Their independence still matters. If other reports copy the same record and a phone call corrected the action, the results are not three independent confirmations. No invented numerical calculation is needed. We need to recognize each ground's origin and avoid counting the same support repeatedly. Agreement among participants then conveys what they actually checked, instead of suggesting a larger shared knowledge that none of them possesses.

The result can remain open: a report confirmed, a conflict unresolved, and practical checking not performed. "Truth established" would conceal those differences. Name a limited next step: clarify room availability, ask the organizer, or confirm the revised agreement. Life need not wait for perfect inquiry. People can choose a reversible action under stated conditions. The need to act must not become invented proof. We acknowledge a decision made with particular uncertainty and remain prepared to change it when new information actually affects its grounds or consequences, rather than demanding either total certainty or unlimited postponement.

VI. Taste, values, and honesty require different consideration

“I enjoyed the meeting” and “The meeting happened on Wednesday” concern different subjects. One reports an evaluation; the other an event. Participants can evaluate the conversation differently while both sincerely and accurately reporting their experience. Naming different days for the same event raises a factual conflict. Taste’s language should not be transferred to dates, or date-checking to an experience’s entire meaning. Clarify the subject before saying “Everyone has their own truth.” That phrase sometimes recognizes differing experiences and sometimes prevents checking a claim about circumstances that people share.

Evaluations can also be discussed substantively. “It was fair” can be explained through a rule, consequences, responsibilities, and participation. People may agree about events yet differ in evaluation, or share a value while interpreting its application differently. Such disagreement need not be portrayed as merely missing facts. Facts still matter: evaluating conduct through a false description requires correcting the description. We can revise circumstances without abandoning fairness, or acknowledge a fact while criticizing the established conduct. Distinguishing grounds reveals these possibilities instead of demanding either acceptance or rejection of everything together.

Sincerity matters: a person tries to say what they believe and avoid intentional concealment. A confident sentence alone cannot establish that intention. Every mistake is not a lie, and acknowledging one mistake does not prove complete honesty. We can more readily check a message, ask about grounds, and notice how a confirmed correction is handled. That observation does not reveal an entire personality. It can address how to continue this particular conversation or agreement. Respect does not require omniscience about another person, and responsibility for our own words need not await such omniscience either.

A personal discovery may be called a truth of life: someone realizes they no longer want to maintain an earlier image of success. This can express important clarity about choice without establishing how everyone must live. Advice based on that discovery needs its conditions restored: whom it helped, under which circumstances, with which remaining obligations. Someone else may choose differently. A precise scope need not weaken meaning. It permits sharing experience without turning one life story into a compulsory norm or conviction about our direction into authority over another person’s future.

VII. A convenient account must leave room for difficulty

An explanation can be valued for ending questions. Attributing every delay to others' irresponsibility leaves our plan flawless. The account may be coherent, emotionally convenient, and useful for quick decisions. Those qualities do not establish correspondence with events. Notice excluded material: a changed timetable, incomplete message, different travel conditions, our late reply. We need not excuse everyone in advance. Relevant circumstances should be allowed to change the account. Convenience becomes a limitation when every difficulty is explained in a way that prevents the original version from ever being wrong, however the available evidence develops.

Not every objection deserves equal weight. It may be irrelevant, repeat an error already checked, or lack accessible support. Establish that through content rather than whether its conclusion appeals to us. The examination may be brief: a document concerns another day, a quotation fails to support the alleged cause, or a participant's experience matters for assessing consequences. An objection can demand correction, clarification, or no changed conclusion. The reason should remain intelligible in each case. Otherwise rejected material disappears along with the possibility of examining how we responded to it and whether the dismissal itself was justified.

Correction need not destroy the whole account. One record's typo can leave other information reliable; a new meeting time can preserve the meeting's purpose. Sometimes, however, the correction affects a central ground and requires broader revision. Connections among details determine the scale, rather than preserving comfort at any cost. Ask which conclusions depended on the mistaken part and who received them. Correction then reaches where needed, becoming neither cosmetic wording nor total rejection of earlier work. This concerns responsible handling of claims, without promising that revision will be emotionally easy or that every initial commitment can remain unchanged.

Correcting knowledge differs from changing an event. Rescheduling changes circumstances; discovering that we misread a message changes our understanding of earlier circumstances. The old description may have been true at its time in the first case, and mistaken then in the second. "Information updated" should not conceal the difference. It determines whether someone needs to correct an earlier belief or simply learn a new decision. Responsible revision names time, grounds, and consequences clearly enough to understand what happened, particularly when a recipient already acted on our words and bore a real cost from the error.

VIII. Truth in shared conversation needs responsible language

A conversation becomes clearer when statements, questions, and proposals remain distinguishable. “Wednesday was agreed” describes an arrangement; “Can we reschedule?” opens a decision; “I suggest Thursday” offers an option. Calling a proposal established truth makes disagreement look like error before anyone has agreed. Replacing a question about the past with a convenient future solution leaves the past unclear. Ordinary wording can preserve participation: state the known, name the unknown, and offer an action separately. Philosophical terminology is unnecessary in every message, but attention matters to the different tasks we place inside a single sentence.

Explain checking without turning it into another person’s examination. “I read the organizer’s message but did not establish room availability” states a scope; “Everyone must accept the obvious” conceals it behind a demand. Another participant’s grounds may complement ours, conflict with them, or address a different question. Listening need not require agreement. Reciprocity matters too: requesting their source calls for willingness to provide ours, or admit reliance on memory. Such clarity can reduce empty disputes without promising goodwill from everyone. It also leaves a concrete claim open to examination instead of making the speaker’s confidence the only available evidence.

Conversation need not continue indefinitely. People can state time limits, available checks, and responsibilities. Repeating material without a new question may justify preserving what is established and postponing the rest. “We have different truths” needs care, especially when a checkable claim affects someone else. Agreeing which document will guide the next action can suffice without settling every worldview difference. Sometimes there is no shared ground, which should also be acknowledged. Lack of agreement does not make our words proof or remove another person’s right to choose a different form of participation in the matter under discussion.

Truth does not become simple after three approaches are considered, but discussion can become more definite. Correspondence returns attention to the subject; coherence to connections and excluded circumstances; practical checking to action’s experience and limits. This is a limited editorial way of examining our words, rather than merging philosophical systems into a final doctrine. It leaves room for dispute, new material, and personal meaning. The outcome may be confirmation, correction, or an open question. We can state more precisely what is known, what remains unestablished, and why the next step is proposed. Responsible truthfulness then becomes part of ordinary participation.

What this means in practice

Choose one statement you intend to use in a modest shared undertaking. Checking should be available, respect privacy, and require no special authority. Write it precisely: “Wednesday was agreed” offers more to examine than “Everything is clear.”

Name what would make the statement true, then the available grounds: a message, participants’ memories, a record. Distinguish what you actually examined from assumptions. When original material is unavailable, retelling does not become independent confirmation.

Compare the claim with other relevant information. Where does it fit or conflict? Clarify time and wording before declaring contradiction. Do not revise an account simply to make it elegant; record the open question and a possible check.

Ask which action relies on the claim, what outcome can be observed, who benefits, who is affected, and whose consent is needed. Establishing room availability might precede confirming a new plan. Afterwards, assess action’s success separately from the original report’s accuracy.

State the result without a blanket label: confirmed, corrected, or still open. Give a substantive correction to anyone already sent mistaken information. If the decision changed, state the new arrangement and its conditions. This original clarity exercise is neither a demonstrated psychological intervention nor a settlement of every philosophical dispute. A sufficient outcome is a more precise claim and a manageable next step that participants can understand, check, and revise.

Key quotation

> *TRUE IDEAS ARE THOSE THAT WE CAN ASSIMILATE, VALIDATE, CORROBORATE AND VERIFY.*

William James, Pragmatism VI. Exact English original, including emphasis; concerns verification in experience and its constraints, rather than any pleasing belief.

Connections between traditions

Comparative question	Textual support	Difference and limit
Truth’s nature and how to know it	Russell, The Problems of Philosophy XII, opening	A true result is distinguished from a reliable route to it.
Correspondence with a subject	Russell XII, conclusion	Truth involves relation to fact; his account is not declared final.
Coherence and inclusiveness	Bradley, Appearance and Reality XXIV	Absolute metaphysics exceeds everyday consistency; group agreement is insufficient.
Verification in experience	James, Pragmatism VI	Experiential checking is not reduced to pleasant feeling or convenient justification.
Joint examination and evaluation	Original comparison in sectionsV–VIII	Limited checking retains philosophical differences; usefulness does not establish fairness.

Primary sources

1. Bertrand Russell. The Problems of Philosophy,1912. English original, Project Gutenberg5827. Read: ChapterXII opening, truth conditions, coherence criticism and concluding correspondence account. The intervening formal relational analysis is not represented as fully studied.

2. F. H. Bradley. Appearance and Reality, XXIV.1893; sixth corrected impression1916, English original, Wikisource. Selected passages read on expansion, internal harmony, degrees of truth and the Absolute. A metaphysical argument, rather than a contemporary timetable-checking method.

3. William James. Pragmatism,1907. English original, Project Gutenberg5116. Selected LectureVI passages read on verification, experiential leading and reality’s constraints, including the key quotation’s context; not the whole volume.

Tags

truth, correspondence, coherence, usefulness, pragmatism, fact, belief, statement, verification, experience, knowledge, uncertainty, error, revision, agreement, dialogue, responsibility, fairness, sincerity, personal meaning, criterion, grounds, Russell, Bradley, James, philosophy, reality, value, decision, participation

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.