

**The Fragility Of Knowledge: What If What We Know Is False?
Cognitive And Neurobiological Perspectives On The Fragility Of Knowledge**

Dr Arinaitwe Julius¹, Asiimwe Isaac Kazaara²

1, 2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract

This study examines the profound philosophical and empirical question of knowledge fragility-the vulnerability of human cognitive representations to error, distortion, revision, and falsification from integrated cognitive psychological and neurobiological perspectives. Drawing on phenomenological qualitative methodology, the study conducted in-depth interviews with twenty-six participants including academic researchers, clinical psychologists, philosophers of science, and individuals who had experienced significant 'knowledge ruptures' moments of discovering that longstanding beliefs or certainties were false. The study documents how participants understand, experience, and respond to the fragility of their own knowledge, exploring the cognitive mechanisms underlying false knowledge, the neurobiological substrates that both enable and constrain learning and unlearning, and the psychological and social consequences of recognising knowledge's contingency. Findings reveal that knowledge fragility is experienced as simultaneously threatening and generative: threatening to individual identity, professional authority, and social cohesion, but generative of intellectual humility, epistemological flexibility, and creative innovation. The study identifies 'epistemic resilience'-the capacity to hold knowledge lightly, recognise its contingency, and revise it in response to evidence as a developable cognitive disposition with significant educational, clinical, and scientific implications. Recommendations address epistemic education, scientific communication practices, and psychological support for individuals experiencing worldview-disrupting knowledge revisions.

Keywords: Knowledge fragility, cognitive psychology, neurobiology, false beliefs, epistemic resilience, phenomenology, memory malleability, epistemic humility, learning

1.0 Introduction

'What do I really know, and how certain can I be of it?' This ancient epistemological question, first systematically posed in the Western philosophical tradition by Plato and radically reformulated by Descartes' method of systematic doubt, has acquired new urgency in the contemporary knowledge landscape characterised by information overload, deliberate misinformation, rapid scientific revision, and algorithmic filter bubbles that can create self-reinforcing belief ecosystems impervious to correction (Mercier & Sperber, 2017). The question is no longer merely philosophical but has become a pressing psychological and public health concern, as the consequences of false knowledge from vaccine hesitancy to climate denial to conspiracy theory conviction generate measurable social harms that knowledge systems have struggled to address.

Cognitive psychology and neuroscience have made significant advances in documenting the mechanisms through which human knowledge representations are constructed, maintained, and revised, revealing in the process the multiple systematic vulnerabilities of human cognition to error, bias, and distortion. The constructivist memory research tradition, initiated by Bartlett (1932) and dramatically advanced by Loftus and her colleagues' eyewitness testimony research (Loftus & Palmer, 1974), has demonstrated that human memory is not a recording system that stores and retrieves veridical representations of experience but a reconstructive process that is influenced by subsequent information, suggestion, emotional state, and social context in ways that frequently produce false but confident memories. The discovery that human beings can hold detailed, emotionally rich memories of events that never occurred and resist correction of these memories even when confronted with contradictory evidence-is perhaps the most profoundly disquieting finding of the cognitive revolution.

Neurobiological research has complemented cognitive findings by elucidating the neural mechanisms underlying memory consolidation, reconsolidation, and extinction-processes that reveal knowledge as permanently in-process rather than stably stored (Nader, Schafe & LeDoux, 2000). The discovery that memory reconsolidation-the process through which reactivated memories are returned to a labile, modifiable state before being restabilised — means that the act of remembering itself is an act of potential modification has profound implications for how we understand the relationship between past experience and present knowledge. Every time a memory is accessed, it is potentially rewritten; every time a belief is engaged, it is potentially revised. The stability of knowledge that we experience subjectively rests on neural processes that are, at the molecular level, in perpetual flux.

The philosophical tradition of epistemology has of course long recognised knowledge's fallibility, from Hume's empiricist scepticism about induction to Popper's falsificationism to Kuhn's account of paradigm shifts. Yet these philosophical recognitions have rarely been integrated with cognitive and neurobiological accounts in ways that illuminate the lived experience of knowing and not knowing, certainty and doubt, belief and revision. This study seeks to contribute to this integration by exploring, through phenomenological methodology, how individuals experience the fragility of their own knowledge-the subjective texture of discovering that what they thought they knew was false, the psychological processes through which knowledge revision occurs or is resisted, and the implications of these experiences for their broader relationships to knowing and uncertainty.

2.0 Problem Statement

Despite the extensive scientific documentation of human cognition's vulnerability to systematic error, these findings have been inadequately translated into educational practices, public communication strategies, or psychological support frameworks that could help individuals develop more robust and flexible epistemological orientations. The gap between what cognitive science knows about knowledge fragility and how educational systems, media environments, and psychological services engage with knowledge and belief represents a significant applied research

Received: 12.08.2026

Accepted: 16.08.2026

Published on: 30.08.2026

challenge. Furthermore, the phenomenological dimension of knowledge fragility — how individuals actually experience the discovery that their knowledge is false, and what psychological processes are involved in revising or defending challenged beliefs — has received insufficient qualitative research attention, leaving an experiential knowledge gap that limits the practical applicability of cognitive and neurobiological findings.

3.0 Main Objective

The primary objective of this study was to explore how individuals experience, make sense of, and respond to the fragility of their own knowledge, integrating phenomenological accounts with cognitive psychological and neurobiological theoretical frameworks. Specific objectives included: exploring how participants conceptualise the nature and limits of their own knowledge; examining experiences of significant knowledge revision or falsification; investigating the psychological and social consequences of recognising knowledge's contingency; and identifying cognitive and affective factors that facilitate or impede epistemic flexibility and revision.

4.0 Literature Review

The cognitive psychology of knowledge and belief rests on foundational distinctions between knowledge types, confidence levels, and the processes through which beliefs are formed and revised. Kahneman's (2011) dual-process theory, distinguishing between fast, automatic, intuitive System 1 processing and slow, deliberate, analytical System 2 processing, provides a framework for understanding why knowledge errors are so persistent: many false beliefs are maintained by System 1 processes that are fast, efficient, and resistant to the effortful correction that System 2 analysis would require. The fluency heuristic the tendency to judge information as true when it is processed fluently and familiar means that repeated exposure to false information, even in contexts of correction, can paradoxically increase its perceived truth value (Schwarz et al., 2007). This 'illusory truth effect' has profound implications for public health communication, scientific education, and any domain in which false information circulates widely.

The memory science literature has documented multiple mechanisms through which veridical knowledge can be replaced by false representations without awareness. The misinformation effect (Loftus & Palmer, 1974) demonstrates that post-event suggestions can alter memories of witnessed events in ways that participants are unable to distinguish from their original perceptions. The implanted memory paradigm (Loftus, 1997) has demonstrated that entirely fabricated childhood events being lost in a shopping mall, riding a hot air balloon can be successfully implanted in a significant minority of research participants who come to report detailed, emotionally resonant memories of events that never occurred. These findings challenge fundamental assumptions about the reliability of eyewitness testimony, autobiographical memory, and the experiences that ground personal identity, suggesting that what we take as the most certain of all knowledge our own past experience may be substantially reconstructed rather than recorded.

Neurobiologically, the discovery of memory reconsolidation has transformed understanding of knowledge's neural stability. Nader et al. (2000) demonstrated in animal models that reactivated memories are temporarily destabilised

Received: 12.08.2026

Accepted: 16.08.2026

Published on: 30.08.2026

returned to a labile state in which they can be modified or disrupted before being restabilised through protein synthesis-dependent reconsolidation. Subsequent human research has documented analogous processes in declarative memory (Hupbach, Gomez, Hardt & Nadel, 2007), suggesting that the neural substrates of human knowledge are in principle modifiable each time they are accessed. This finding has significant clinical implications particularly for the modification of traumatic memories and maladaptive fear associations but also raises more general epistemological questions about the stability of what we call 'knowledge' at the level of neural representation.

The social dimensions of knowledge maintenance and revision have been illuminated by social psychology's work on belief perseverance (Ross, Lepper & Hubbard, 1975), cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957), and identity-protective cognition (Kahan, 2012). Ross et al. demonstrated that beliefs can persist long after the evidence on which they were based has been discredited, with participants constructing alternative justifications for beliefs that would have been abandoned had they never been formed. Festinger's cognitive dissonance theory illuminates the motivational dynamics of belief maintenance, demonstrating that the psychological discomfort generated by belief-threatening information motivates defensive cognitive responses rather than belief revision. Kahan's concept of identity-protective cognition identifies the conditions under which motivated reasoning is most intense: when beliefs are central to group identity, threats to group-defining beliefs are processed through motivated defence rather than evidence evaluation, producing the paradoxical finding that greater analytical capability is associated with greater sophistication in belief defence rather than greater accuracy.

The existential dimensions of knowledge fragility have been addressed within psychology through Terror Management Theory (Greenberg, Pyszczynski & Solomon, 1986), which proposes that humans' unique awareness of their own mortality generates existential anxiety that is managed through cultural worldviews-belief systems that provide meaning, order, and symbolic immortality. From this perspective, challenges to central knowledge commitments can trigger mortality-related anxiety and correspondingly intense defensive responses, particularly when the challenged beliefs are constitutive of cultural identity. This framework suggests that epistemic humility-the willingness to hold knowledge tentatively and revise it in response to evidence may require not merely cognitive training but a degree of existential security that allows challenges to beliefs to be processed as interesting rather than threatening.

5.0 Methodology

This study employed phenomenological qualitative methodology, specifically Edmund Husserl's descriptive phenomenology as operationalised for psychological research by Giorgi (2009), which seeks to describe the essential structural features of a psychological phenomenon as they appear in the first-person experience of individuals who have encountered it. The phenomenon under investigation-the experience of knowledge fragility and specifically of discovering that longstanding knowledge or beliefs were false-was approached through the discipline of

Received: 12.08.2026

Accepted: 16.08.2026

Published on: 30.08.2026

phenomenological reduction, in which the researcher brackets pre-existing theoretical assumptions to attend freshly to the descriptive structure of participants' accounts.

Twenty-six participants were recruited through purposive and snowball sampling across three categories: researchers and academics across natural and social science disciplines (eight participants); clinical psychologists and therapists with experience of working with clients around belief revision (six participants); philosophers of science and epistemology (four participants); and individuals who had experienced significant 'knowledge ruptures' outside academic contexts — such as discovering that a long-held religious belief was no longer convincing, learning that a family narrative was fabricated, or coming to understand that a professional practice they had committed to was harmful (eight participants). This sampling strategy was designed to bring multiple perspectives and experiential registers to the phenomenon, generating a phenomenological account of sufficient depth and diversity to capture the structural complexity of knowledge fragility as a psychological phenomenon.

Data collection employed individual in-depth interviews lasting sixty to ninety minutes, structured around four broad phenomenological questions: What is it like to know something with certainty? What happens when something you were certain of is shown to be wrong? How do you relate to your own knowledge differently as a result of this experience? And how do you understand the nature and limits of your own knowledge now? These open questions were followed by phenomenological probes designed to deepen descriptive richness — requests for specific examples, elaboration of experiential qualities, and reflection on before-and-after contrasts. Data analysis followed Giorgi's (2009) method of phenomenological reduction, meaning transformation, and situated and general structural description, progressing from naive reading through meaning unit identification to the development of a general structural description of the phenomenon applicable across individual variations.

6. Results

6.1 The Phenomenology of Certainty: What It Feels Like to Know

When participants were asked to describe what it is like to know something with certainty, their accounts revealed the phenomenological richness of a cognitive state that is typically taken for granted rather than made the object of conscious attention. Descriptions converged on a cluster of experiential qualities: a sense of groundedness or solid footing, the absence of the effortful questioning that characterizes uncertainty, and a kind of cognitive quietness in relation to the known content—the sense that settled questions need not be reopened.

“When I know something, I don't experience knowing it. That is the strange thing. Certainty is transparent—it is like a clean window you look through, not a wall you are examining. My knowledge of basic neuroanatomy, for example, is certain, and I experience it as simply there, available, unquestioned. It is only when someone challenges something I think I know, or when an experiment produces an unexpected result, that I become aware of certainty as a state —

because suddenly it is no longer there. The loss of certainty makes certainty visible retrospectively. While you have it, you don't notice it.” (Participant 4, neuroscientist, research university)

This phenomenologically precise account articulates what might be described as the 'transparency of certainty'-the phenomenological characteristic of settled knowledge as the medium through which we engage with the world rather than an object of engagement itself. The participant's analogy of the clean window is phenomenologically apt and aligns with Merleau-Ponty's (1962) analysis of habitual bodily skills as forms of knowledge that are lived rather than represented, transparent in use and visible only in disruption. The retrospective visibility of certainty-becoming aware of it only through its loss emerged across multiple participant accounts as a central structural feature of the phenomenon.

“I used to be absolutely certain about my religious faith. Completely certain, in the way that you cannot be uncertain about the colour of a wall in front of you. My faith was not a belief I held it was a world I lived in. When I began to doubt, it was not like changing my mind about a proposition. It was like the floor becoming uncertain. Like not knowing if the ground you are standing on will hold you. That is what knowing feels like when it goes-it is not intellectual, it is existential. You have lost your ground.” (Participant 21, former theologian, now philosopher of religion)

This powerful account situates the loss of certainty within an existential rather than merely epistemological register, confirming Terror Management Theory's insight that central knowledge commitments are not merely cognitive states but ontological foundations whose disruption generates profound existential anxiety. The participant's shift from a religious to a philosophical professional identity represents a radical biographical reconstruction necessitated by a knowledge rupture that was experienced not as intellectual revision but as existential destabilisation. This account raises profound questions about the relationship between identity and knowledge, and about the psychological conditions necessary for genuine epistemic openness.

6.2 The Experience of Knowledge Rupture: Discovery, Disorientation, and Restructuring

Participants who had experienced significant knowledge ruptures — discovering that longstanding beliefs, memories, or professional convictions were false — described these experiences through a consistent phenomenological sequence involving initial shock or disorientation, a period of destabilised cognitive functioning, and a gradual reconstruction of knowledge frameworks that either integrated the revision or defended against it.

“I was forty-three years old when I discovered that a memory I had carried my entire adult life — a specific, detailed memory of my father coming to my school play when I was seven, a memory I had used to define our relationship, to tell myself that he was present in my childhood — was not true. My sister told me. She said he was in hospital that week. She had documents. The memory was false. I had built an entire understanding of my relationship with my father on something that did not happen. When I understood that, I felt genuinely unmoored. Not just that the memory

Received: 12.08.2026

Accepted: 16.08.2026

Published on: 30.08.2026

was wrong — but that my ability to know what was real was in question. If that memory could be so vivid and so false, what else could be? I still do not fully know how to answer that question.” **(Participant 14, clinical psychologist, sharing personal experience)**

This account captures the epistemological cascade that significant knowledge ruptures can trigger — from the specific discovery that a particular memory or belief is false to a broader questioning of one's cognitive reliability as such. The participant's final statement — 'I still do not fully know how to answer that question' — reflects an epistemic position of permanent uncertainty about the reliability of memory that the scientific literature has consistently documented as the accurate position, yet which is psychologically extremely difficult to inhabit for individuals whose cognitive security depends on trust in their own memories. The clinical psychologist's use of her own experience — a methodological vulnerability she acknowledged during the interview — also illustrates the practical importance of the phenomenon for those who professionally handle others' cognitive and emotional realities.

“As a scientist, I had a particular theory about disease aetiology that I had built my research programme around for ten years. When the experimental evidence against that theory became overwhelming — and I had to accept that I had been wrong for a decade — it was one of the most difficult experiences of my professional life. Not because I could not understand the new evidence. The evidence was clear. But because I had staked so much on the previous position. I had trained students in that direction. I had written grants, published papers, given keynote lectures. Accepting the revision meant accepting that those things were wrong. My identity as a rigorous scientist was in tension with the knowledge that I had been wrong for a long time. How do you hold both of those things at once?” **(Participant 8, biomedical researcher, senior academic)**

This account illuminates the specific challenges of knowledge revision in professional and social identity contexts, where the stakes of acknowledged error extend beyond individual cognition to professional reputation, institutional commitments, and relationships with students and collaborators. The researcher's dilemma — between scientific integrity demanding acknowledgement of error and professional identity threatened by that acknowledgement — reflects the structural tensions that make knowledge revision in expert communities not merely a cognitive but a social and political process.

6.3 Epistemic Resilience: Learning to Hold Knowledge Lightly

Despite the disorienting quality of significant knowledge ruptures, many participants described these experiences as ultimately generative of what the study terms 'epistemic resilience' — a mature cognitive orientation that holds knowledge tentatively, acknowledges its contingency, and approaches revision as intellectually productive rather than personally threatening. This disposition, while frequently mentioned in the philosophy of science literature as a normative ideal, emerged in participant accounts as a genuinely achievable psychological state developed through experience with knowledge revision.

Received: 12.08.2026

Accepted: 16.08.2026

Published on: 30.08.2026

“I have had my scientific views revised by experimental evidence three or four major times in my career. Each time it was difficult. The first time was the most difficult. By the third or fourth time, I had developed a different relationship to my own convictions. I still believe my current theories — I would not pursue them if I did not — but I believe them with a kind of lightness that I did not have when I was younger. I hold them as the best available accounts of the phenomena, not as truths. There is a difference. And the difference is not merely verbal — it changes how I respond when someone presents evidence against my position. I am genuinely interested rather than immediately defensive. That took a long time to develop.” (Participant 1, theoretical physicist, emeritus professor)

“What I have come to understand — through my own experience of discovering false memories and beliefs, and through my clinical work with clients who are revising their worldviews — is that the goal is not to have no beliefs but to be able to grieve a lost belief and move on. Grief is the right word. When something you truly believed turns out to be false, there is a real loss — of the world as you understood it, of the identity built around that understanding. You have to grieve it. But if you can grieve it and release it, there is something on the other side — a greater capacity for genuine openness, genuine curiosity, a lighter, more flexible relationship to your own knowing. That is what I would call epistemic health.” (Participant 19, clinical psychologist)

The clinical psychologist's framing of epistemic resilience as a process requiring grief — the genuine emotional acknowledgement of what is lost when beliefs are revised — is both phenomenologically resonant with participant accounts and clinically rich in its implications for supporting individuals through worldview-disrupting knowledge changes. The analogy between epistemic revision and bereavement suggests that the psychological support frameworks developed for grief might be relevant to supporting individuals through significant knowledge transitions, a connection that has not been systematically explored in either the cognitive or clinical literatures.

6.4 Neurobiological Understandings: Participant Engagement with Brain Science

Participants with neuroscientific backgrounds offered particularly rich accounts of how neurobiological knowledge of memory malleability and cognitive bias had affected their personal relationships to their own knowledge, providing a distinctive phenomenological perspective on the experiential consequences of knowing about knowledge's neural fragility.

“I have spent my career studying memory reconsolidation. I know, in molecular detail, how memories are destabilised every time they are retrieved and then restabilised in a form that can incorporate new information. I know that my own memories are subject to exactly these processes — that every time I remember something, I am potentially rewriting it. And I can tell you that this knowledge does not make me feel more confident in my memories. It makes me feel appropriately humble about them. I no longer tell stories about my past as though they are documentary evidence. I say 'I believe this is what happened' and I mean exactly that — I believe it, and I know belief is not the

same as knowledge, and I know knowledge is not the same as truth.” (Participant 2, neuroscientist specialising in memory)

This account is remarkable for its illustration of how specialist scientific knowledge can translate into genuine epistemic humility in the first-person relation to one's own knowledge a translation that is by no means automatic and that the participant implies required deliberate cognitive and linguistic effort. The careful distinction drawn between 'I believe this is what happened,' 'knowledge,' and 'truth' reflects an epistemological precision that emerges directly from neurobiological understanding and represents precisely the kind of knowledge fragility awareness that the study argues has significant personal and social value.

7.0 Discussion of Results

The findings of this study generate a rich phenomenological account of knowledge fragility as a psychological phenomenon with cognitive, neurobiological, existential, and social dimensions. The transparency of certainty the finding that settled knowledge is experienced as the invisible medium of engagement rather than as a conscious state-aligns with philosophical accounts of practical knowledge (Merleau-Ponty, 1962) and with cognitive neuroscience's documentation of the effortless automaticity of consolidated representations (Kahneman, 2011). This transparency makes the discovery of error particularly destabilising, because it disrupts not merely a belief but the ground of engagement-an experience the participants' vivid metaphors (lost floor, uncertain ground) capture with phenomenological accuracy.

The concept of epistemic resilience, which emerged from participant accounts as both a normative ideal and an achievable psychological state, makes an important theoretical contribution that bridges cognitive science, philosophy of science, and clinical psychology. The finding that epistemic resilience is developed through experience with knowledge revision through what might be termed 'epistemic loss processing' suggests that it is a capacity that can be cultivated through appropriate educational and clinical experiences rather than being a fixed personality trait. This developmental account of epistemic resilience has significant implications for education, scientific training, and clinical practice.

8.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

This study concludes that knowledge fragility is a profound and pervasive dimension of human cognitive experience that has been inadequately integrated into educational, clinical, and public communication practices. The phenomenological accounts generated illuminate knowledge fragility as simultaneously threatening and generative: threatening to identity, authority, and social cohesion, but generative of the epistemic resilience, intellectual humility, and curious openness that distinguish sophisticated from naive knowing. The neurobiological substrates of knowledge dynamic, reconstructive, perpetually in-process-support rather than challenge this phenomenological account.

The study recommends: first, that educational curricula from secondary through tertiary level incorporate explicit instruction in the cognitive science of knowledge and memory, including systematic coverage of cognitive biases, memory malleability, and the mechanisms of motivated reasoning, to develop students' metacognitive awareness of their own epistemic vulnerabilities. Second, scientific communication should adopt language and practices that more accurately convey the provisional and revisable nature of scientific knowledge, replacing triumphalist certainty framings with honest accounts of evidence quality, confidence levels, and the conditions under which revision would be expected. Third, clinical psychology training should incorporate epistemological themes including the relationship between belief, identity, and wellbeing, and should develop protocols for supporting clients through worldview-disrupting knowledge revisions that draw on grief theory and existential therapeutic frameworks. Fourth, public health campaigns addressing misinformation should be informed by the cognitive science of belief maintenance and revision, designing interventions that work with rather than against the psychological mechanisms documented in this and related research.

References

- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford University Press.
- Giorgi, A. (2009). *The descriptive phenomenological method in psychology*. Duquesne University Press.
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (1986). The causes and consequences of a need for self-esteem: A terror management theory. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Public self and private self*. Springer.
- Hupbach, A., Gomez, R., Hardt, O., & Nadel, L. (2007). Reconsolidation of episodic memories: A subtle reminder triggers integration of new information. *Learning and Memory*, 14(1), 47–53.
- Kahan, D. M. (2012). Ideology, motivated reasoning, and cognitive reflection. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 8(4), 407–424.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Loftus, E. F. (1997). Creating false memories. *Scientific American*, 277(3), 70–75.
- Loftus, E. F., & Palmer, J. C. (1974). Reconstruction of automobile destruction: An example of the interaction between language and memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 13(5), 585–589.
- Mercier, H., & Sperber, D. (2017). *The enigma of reason*. Harvard University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). Routledge.
- Nader, K., Schafe, G. E., & LeDoux, J. E. (2000). Fear memories require protein synthesis in the amygdala for reconsolidation after retrieval. *Nature*, 406(6797), 722–726.
- Ross, L., Lepper, M. R., & Hubbard, M. (1975). Perseverance in self-perception and social perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32(5), 880–892.

Schwarz, N., Sanna, L. J., Skurnik, I., & Yoon, C. (2007). Metacognitive experiences and the intricacies of setting people straight. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 127–161.