

UNITED WISDOM

Why a Convincing Story Outlives Its Refutation

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-03-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Why a Convincing Story Outlives Its Refutation

Epigraph

> *what has happened is manifestly possible*

Aristotle, Poetics, IX; a clause in the discussion of what is possible and what has happened. S. H. Butcher's English translation.

What this article is about

We can remember a correction while continuing to explain events through the earlier story. An organiser says a meeting was cancelled before the supposed quarrel, yet in the next conversation the cancellation becomes a consequence of that conflict again. Knowing a corrected detail and revising the connections are different tasks. This article examines that gap through a fictional amateur ensemble. We distinguish an event from its explanation, plausibility from confirmation, and correcting one connection from vindicating everyone involved. Bounded experimental findings help sharpen the question; literary and religious sources offer different perspectives. Together they do not constitute a proven persuasion technique. The aim is to revise our own account without inventing a convenient replacement for an unknown cause or demanding private information. A story may survive because a correction was missed, misunderstood, disputed or not incorporated into reasoning. One repeated sentence does not establish which circumstance applies to a particular person.

I. How a Cancelled Rehearsal Acquired a Cause

Imagine an amateur ensemble that uses a shared room for its Tuesday rehearsals. On Wednesday, a member tells us that the pianist quarrelled with the organiser and left, so Tuesday's meeting was cancelled. Her story has characters, tension, a decision and a consequence. It answers several questions together: why the room was empty, why the pianist was absent, and why the organiser sounded abrupt. The events form a comprehensible sequence for a listener. This is a fictional learning example, however, not an account of an actual ensemble. So far, we know only what the member's message says. A cause appearing in that message does not mean it has been established independently, or that every event mentioned actually occurred.

An accessible notice then appears: the cancellation was announced on Monday morning. According to someone who took part in the conversation described as a quarrel, that

conversation happened on Monday evening. For this example, suppose the order of those two events is reliably confirmed. That particular evening conversation cannot have caused a cancellation already announced in the morning. The correction matters, but its scope is limited. It does not establish the actual cause, prove that relations were excellent, or show that the pianist never left early on another occasion. An unknown motive remains unknown. Participants need not disclose private correspondence to preserve the precise conclusion about this sequence of events.

A week later, a listener says, “I know about Monday, but after their quarrel the ensemble stopped meeting anyway.” It is worth clarifying which meeting and which quarrel are being discussed. Perhaps the person now means a different event; perhaps the earlier cancellation has quietly returned to the old chain. We cannot check the correction simply by asking whether they heard the new date. We need to consider the explanation they now use for this cancellation. That distinction involves no accusation of stubbornness. Someone can accept the date without yet noticing that a later sentence of their own still depends on the order of events that the correction ruled out.

II. A Story Connects Claims That Need Different Grounds

The brief account contains several kinds of claim. A meeting did not take place; the pianist was absent; two people had a difficult conversation; their conversation caused the cancellation; and leaving expressed hurt feelings. A schedule may confirm the first, people present may attest to the second, and participants may report the third. The causal connection and the inward motive require further grounds. Speaking them in one breath can conceal these differences. Our analysis restores them without requiring an investigation of the ensemble's entire life. First determine what we are being asked to accept: an observation, somebody's testimony, a conclusion about sequence, a causal explanation, or a supposition about another person's experience.

The account may feel convincing because its connections seem to need no explanation. A quarrel fits a departure; a departure fits a cancellation. We can readily imagine what comes next. That mental transition is not a missing document or witness, however. Even if each event is separately confirmed, the connection between them still needs examination. Someone might have been absent for another reason, while the room's availability might have affected the meeting. These possibilities merely illustrate the logical space. We are not saying either was the ensemble's actual situation. A possible explanation helps reveal that a single explanation is unproven; imagining the alternative does not establish that alternative as fact.

The question “Why did the story survive?” can itself become an account that is too smooth. We notice the old version being repeated and immediately conclude that the person enjoys blaming the organiser. We do not know their motive, though the explanation fits our irritation.

To avoid repeating the same mistake at a different level, keep several questions apart. Was the correction delivered? Was its time frame understood? Is the source disputed? Which subsequent inference depends on the old connection? An answer about a particular person needs particular information. General observations about storytelling do not give us access to that person's intentions or memory, even when the old account remains troublesome.

III. A Plausible Work and an Actual Event

In Part IX of Poetics, Aristotle distinguishes relating what has happened from portraying what may happen according to probability or necessity. Butcher's translation includes the epigraph's thought in a discussion of familiar names: what has happened is evidently possible. The direction matters. An event that actually occurred was not impossible. An event being possible and convincingly portrayed does not mean it occurred. We can bring that logical distinction to the ensemble story. Doing so does not turn a literary work into a defective transcript, or turn ancient poetics into a modern experiment about memory or rumours. The source addresses the work of a poet, rather than the factual assessment of our fictional rehearsal.

Aristotle considers how a work is constructed, including connected actions and the impression created by their sequence. For our question, the useful point is that an account can be evaluated on different grounds. It may be expressive, internally coherent and recognisably human while describing invented events. A historical claim has a further obligation: give grounds for regarding its events as actual. Artistic merit does not automatically fulfil that obligation. Conversely, an accurate cancellation notice may be dry, brief and lacking a hero or climax. Its modest presentation does not diminish the date's relevance to the proposed causal connection. The two kinds of assessment can coexist without one substituting for the other.

An expressive story therefore need not be answered with an even more expressive one. We can acknowledge why it held our attention and investigate its factual content separately. Listeners need not give up their enjoyment of stories to notice a missing foundation. A writer need not make every sentence bureaucratic to preserve the distinction between fiction and reporting. In the ensemble case, the substantive question is straightforward: what grounds make an evening conversation the cause of a morning decision? The question may remain unanswered. Pausing there does not destroy our ability to understand human situations. It limits this particular story's claim to present its successful construction as the recovered course of events.

IV. Remembering a Correction and Reasoning With It

The publisher abstract of Ecker, Lewandowsky and Tang's 2010 study describes corrected information continuing to influence memory and reasoning, including when the retraction itself is remembered. In the reported experiments, a specific warning reduced but did not eliminate the influence. Combining a warning with a plausible alternative explanation reduced it further, again without eliminating it. Here we use only the abstract actually consulted, rather than the unavailable full article. It distinguishes remembering a correction from continuing to use the earlier content. It supplies no diagnosis of an ensemble member, universal conversational rate, or single explanation for every mistaken story's persistence. Those broader conclusions would exceed this limited source reading.

In our example, we can examine the distinction through content without measuring another person's memory. Ask which conclusions we draw from the cancellation. Do we regard it as evidence of a rupture between the musicians? Predict from it that the organiser will not invite the pianist again? Retell the missing rehearsal as an outcome of their conversation? If those conclusions depended on the sequence “conversation first, cancellation second,” the new date requires revising that foundation. Adding a note at the end of the story leaves its earlier causal construction intact. A conclusion might have other, independent grounds, of course. We then need to identify them rather than retain the cancellation as an unsuitable reference.

This differs from demanding an immediate change of feeling. Disappointment or concern can remain after a fact has been clarified. A corrected account need not wait until we feel warmly towards everyone involved. We need only stop presenting this cancellation as an established consequence of that quarrel. Revising an explanation does not require adopting the opposite assessment: “There was never any difficulty between them.” We can say less while preserving what matters: the meeting was cancelled, the proposed connection to this conversation fails, and the rest needs its own grounds. That is an authorial orientation for our speech, not a promise that one act of will removes the earlier message's influence.

V. A Correction Need Not Become a New Drama

In a 2020 registered report, Ecker, Butler and Hamby compared narrative and non-narrative corrections. Across three experiments, they found no general narrative advantage when corrective content was comparable. The first used fictitious event reports, with testing immediately or after two days. The authors note limits involving online samples and experimentally incentivised attention. Their findings do not show that format never matters: attracting attention outside an experiment remains a separate issue. But they do not support a promise that a mistaken story must be defeated by a better story. We cannot judge a correction's usefulness solely by its dramatic quality, or generalise these tested comparisons to every audience and setting.

In the ensemble case, a benevolent plot could readily replace the unknown cause of cancellation. Perhaps the organiser wanted tired musicians to rest; perhaps the pianist was looking after the group. Those versions may be more pleasant than an accusation, but we have no grounds to report either as the actual reason. A more precise correction explains the known distinction: the notice preceded the conversation, so that conversation did not cause the cancellation already announced. A confirmed cause can be added if one becomes available. Until then, the incomplete plot marks an honest boundary of knowledge. Preferring a generous interpretation does not transform invented content into verified testimony about somebody's action.

Presentation can still help a reader find the message's point. Name the meeting, date and connection being corrected, rather than send an opaque “That's untrue.” A brief story, diagram or two sentences may work, depending on the situation and available material. Each format must preserve the same factual core. Expressive writing that adds unverified motives changes the content. Concise writing that leaves the relevant cancellation unclear gives too little support for revision. These are observations about how our message is constructed. They are not a measured comparison of every way to communicate with different audiences, nor a guarantee that a well-specified correction will reach or convince the people who need it.

VI. Which Connections Need Rebuilding?

Think of the earlier story as several linked propositions. The evening conversation led to a departure; the departure caused cancellation; the cancellation showed the ensemble had broken up. Correcting the time affects the middle link if the cancellation means the meeting already announced as cancelled. The first and last links do not automatically become true or false. They can be examined separately if the question matters. We need not choose between retaining the whole account and destroying all of it. Reliable information may be mixed with one unsupported connection. Removing that connection preserves the events while changing the explanation of their relationship and the conclusions that relied on it.

For our own assessment, a useful question is: if I remove this cancellation from the evidence, what supports my conclusion that the ensemble broke up? There may be a direct announcement that meetings have ended, or a new schedule. There may be no remaining grounds. Those situations differ. In the first, rebuild the justification rather than conceal a mistaken link behind a correct result. In the second, weaken the conclusion too. A true conclusion does not make every argument used to support it sound. Even if the ensemble subsequently stops meeting, that does not change the cause of the earlier decision or retrospectively turn an incorrect sequence into a correct one.

The updated message can retain explicit gaps: “I was mistaken about that meeting. It was cancelled before the conversation. I don't know why it was cancelled, or whether later changes relate to the participants' relationship.” This version is less complete, but its separate questions are visible. It need not end our interest in the cause permanently. More information may arrive, and the account may change again. The pause concerns the current sufficiency of grounds, not humanity's general ability to understand causes. Uncertainty is useful here at a precise location. Extending it to the confirmed date, and treating both sequences as equally established again, would introduce another distortion rather than correct the first.

VII. People May Have Different Information

Repeating an old version does not always mean its continued influence after an accepted correction. Someone may have missed the notice, seen a cropped image without a date, or meant a different rehearsal. They may doubt whether the organiser's message concerns the relevant meeting. Check these distinctions before attributing their behaviour to a general feature of memory. Access to information differs even in a small group. Our fictional situation stipulates a reliable order of events for analysis; in an actual conversation, establishing that order is another task. Find out which materials are available to the speakers and which connection they are evaluating, without turning the inquiry into a demand for all their correspondence.

If the source is disputed, we cannot settle the dispute by saying that science shows people cling to old stories. An experimental result does not confirm the date of a particular notice. Show the accessible document, identify its provenance and explain the conclusion's scope. If confirmation cannot be disclosed, say so and reduce the public claim to what accessible evidence supports. Private information does not become public proof merely because we regard it as reliable. Protecting a personal conversation can still coexist with correcting our own inaccurate version. We can withdraw a connection we previously reported without exposing the conversation's contents or declaring its participants guilty of something else.

Disagreement also differs from intentional deception. Repeating a rejected connection can cause difficulties, but repetition alone does not establish intent. A practical response may require only stopping a particular inaccurate account or stating that it is unconfirmed. Investigating the inner reason for every repetition is not always necessary. The opposite extreme offers little help either: a sympathetic explanation does not require leaving an error uncorrected. Respect for a person and precision in a message can coexist. In the ensemble, we can address the use of an early cancellation as evidence of a later conflict while preserving participants' right not to explain all their relationships and decisions to an audience.

VIII. A Correction Needs a Destination

If the original story appeared in a group chat, a correction in a private conversation reaches a different audience. Questions about a story's power can obscure this simple delivery difference. Not everyone who heard the mistaken version necessarily received the clarification. A responsible correction can identify the earlier message it replaces, where the error occurred and what is now known. It cannot guarantee that everybody will read it or change their mind. It does give someone an intelligible opportunity to revise a specific connection. Choosing the form and location requires considering the audience's size, possible recirculation and personal boundaries, rather than focusing exclusively on the literary expressiveness of the new message.

For example: “I previously linked the cancellation of Tuesday's rehearsal to Monday evening's conversation. That was incorrect: the cancellation notice appeared in the morning. I have not established the reason for cancellation.” This need not retell every accusation. It identifies the mistaken connection sufficiently for readers to recognise it and gives grounds for revision. If a clarification can be attached to the original message, readers of the older discussion have more opportunity to notice the change. This is a suggestion for handling our own speech carefully. It describes no platform's existing obligations, universal legal procedure, or proven method for erasing the mistaken content from the minds of an entire audience.

A correction weakens when it tries to close every uncomfortable question at once. “There is no problem” extends far beyond the established date. “I was misunderstood” does not explain

what changed. “I always knew that” conceals the history of our own version. A more precise message can acknowledge a limited mistake without a ceremony of self-condemnation or a demand for immediate forgiveness. Readers remain free to assess other information. Our concern is that the new message should not retain the old causal connection in its subsequent conclusions. Publicly removing that connection from an explanation is substantive work; the formal word “corrected” at the end of the earlier story does not perform it for us.

IX. Hear the Matter Before Answering

Proverbs 18:13 connects a premature answer with not yet having heard the matter. The key fragment comes from the historical KJV translation; the verse continues by calling such an answer folly and shame. This is religious wisdom about speech and listening, rather than an experiment about remembering corrections. Here it poses an ethical question to the speaker: have I heard enough to pass on this version now? Applying it does not require calling somebody foolish or shaming them in public. We can direct the demand for attention towards our own readiness to finish an explanation before receiving available information. The source's genre remains part of its meaning.

Hearing the matter does not mean accepting every subsequent version. A participant in the conversation may also be mistaken, omit details or offer an interpretation of motive. Let them finish, then distinguish reported events from their interpretation. The right to ask a clarifying question remains, as does the right not to disclose personal information. Listening sometimes produces a narrower conclusion than we wanted: we know when cancellation was announced but not what caused it. That is still a change in understanding. It need not immediately yield a complete story. Incomplete knowledge can suffice to reject a specific error even when it cannot explain all the circumstances that remain unknown.

A shared question does not make answers from different genres interchangeable. Poetics helps distinguish the possible from the actual in its discussion of a work. An experiment tests bounded effects under specified conditions. A proverb addresses the responsibility of someone answering. We may compare these perspectives while identifying our move to the present example. We may not attribute one modern corrective method to every source or treat an ethical image as confirmation of a laboratory mechanism. Keeping the distinctions protects the source and the reader. It makes visible where a research result is reported, where a literary distinction is offered, and where this article proposes its own response to an invented conversation.

X. Leave Room for Further Knowledge

A convincing story may outlive the refutation of one element because its other sentences still sound unchanged. It may persist among another audience that missed the correction. The disputed element may turn out not to be what supports the conclusion at all. These situations differ; one formula cannot replace distinguishing them. In the ensemble, we checked a narrow connection between a later conversation and an earlier cancellation. The subsequent history of the participants' relationship stayed open. That limitation is not a failed inquiry. It shows that a correction answers a particular question and gives no authority to invent the entire unknown remainder of other people's circumstances on their behalf.

We can preserve three kinds of sentence in our own account. Some report what is confirmed: the cancellation was announced before that conversation. Others acknowledge revision: I no longer use this conversation as the cause of that cancellation. Others mark what is open: I do not know the actual cause. All three can coexist without competing to provide the most impressive ending. New grounds may change the open part later. The correction need not be withdrawn merely because more detail returns to the story. The history of clarification itself can help show which connections were considered sound at which time, and on what grounds those connections were subsequently revised.

After a refutation, the question concerns what we continue to infer as well as what we remember. We can hear a new date without noticing an old transition; we can remove the transition while still not knowing the cause. For precise speech, the second situation is often more honest than a completed explanation. It leaves conversation possible, promises no agreement and does not turn the other person into an object of correction. Showing the boundary of our own story gives readers an opportunity to distinguish its meaning from its grounds. That opportunity does not eliminate every error, but it can allow a rejected connection to stop determining our next account.

What this means in practice

Choose a small message you passed on and now think needs clarification. Use an accessible or invented case; do not disclose another person's correspondence. Write the events separately from the assumptions connecting them. Mark which new information changes which connection. If a new date rules out one cause, do not put another cause in its place without separate grounds. You can write “cause unknown” beside it. If the new material is itself uncertain, state its status rather than treat the existence of a correction as a completed check. This task concerns your own message, not measuring another person's memory or requiring them to demonstrate what they remember.

Now examine two conclusions you previously drew from the story. Do they retain independent grounds after the mistaken connection is removed? For each, identify the support or reduce the conclusion's strength. You need not deny a confirmed event, change your emotional response or declare every participant right. Instead, notice when a later sentence quietly restores the rejected cause. You could reread your proposed correction a day later, checking those sentences specifically. That timing is merely a convenience for independent work here. Neither the exercise's effectiveness nor an optimal interval has been established by the cited studies. The point is a concrete examination of what your next account actually says.

If you decide to share the clarification, briefly state the previous mistaken connection, the accessible grounds for revision and the remaining uncertainty. Consider whether the message will reach those who received your first version, and whether a visible clarification can be attached to the original. Do not demand immediate agreement or personal proof from others. In a private case, correcting your own next retelling may suffice. This is a voluntary practice of responsible explanation. It carries no promise to change another person's beliefs, restore relationships, or eliminate the continued influence of information among every listener who encountered the first story.

Key quotation

> *He that answereth a matter before he heareth it*

Proverbs 18:13, a fragment of the verse's opening clause. King James Version; the continuation concerning folly and shame was read in context.

Connections between traditions

Perspective	Connection to the question	Boundary of the comparison
Aristotle, Poetics, IX	Possibility can be convincingly portrayed without establishing an event	Literary argument, not memory research
Ecker, Lewandowsky, Tang, 2010	Remembered retraction differs from subsequent influence of initial content	Publisher abstract consulted, not complete methods
Ecker, Butler, Hamby, 2020	Narrative corrections had no general advantage in three experiments	Bounded comparisons, not a law for every audience
Proverbs 18:13, KJV	Responsibility to hear the matter before answering	Religious wisdom, not an experimental mechanism
The authorial ensemble example	Revising a connection can preserve events and an unknown cause	Invented case and voluntary exercise; effectiveness unmeasured

Primary sources

Aristotle, Poetics, IX, S. H. Butcher's English translation at MIT Classics. The entire selected Part IX on actual and possible events and plot connections was consulted; no Greek collation or complete-treatise reading.

U. K. H. Ecker, S. Lewandowsky, D. T. W. Tang, Explicit warnings reduce but do not eliminate the continued influence of misinformation, Memory & Cognition, 38(8), 2010, pp. 1087–1100. The complete publisher abstract was consulted; full text and detailed methods were not obtained.

U. K. H. Ecker, L. H. Butler, A. Hamby, You don’t have to tell a story!, Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 5, 64, 2020. Abstract, Experiment 1 methods and General Discussion with limitations consulted; not the complete article, appendices or raw data.

Proverbs 18, King James Version at Bible Gateway. The entire selected chapter was consulted; the opening of verse 13 is quoted. The Russian fragment is the authors' rendering through KJV, without Hebrew collation.

Tags

narrative, refutation, correction, memory, reasoning, stories, plausibility, testimony, causes, sequence, uncertainty, checking, primary sources, poetics, Aristotle, Proverbs, Ecker, Lewandowsky, Tang, Butler, Hamby, continued influence, listening, responsible speech, rumours, messages, clarification, limits of knowledge, interpretation, voluntary practice

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.