

WHEN THEIR EXPLANATION STILL DOESN'T EXPLAIN IT

*A 20-minute record check for changed stories, denial,
and the part that still doesn't add up.*

ONE EVENT. ONE RECORD. ONE CONCLUSION YOU CAN EXPLAIN.

THIS TOOL HAS ONE JOB

Take one specific event, message, timeline, promise, denial, or changed explanation and compare what happened with what was later said about it. The goal is not the harshest conclusion. The goal is the conclusion the record actually supports.

The moment can be recent or years behind you.

If the explanation still does not account for what happened, you can use this process on the record you already have.

Torch & Soul | Ignite Your Purpose. Fuel Your Soul.

Start With the One Moment

You do not need to solve the whole relationship here.

Pick one moment that still bothers you because what happened and what was later said about it do not seem to sit cleanly together.

Maybe the story changed.

Maybe something was denied.

Maybe you had a message, timestamp, promise, receipt, or conversation you could point to, and somehow you still ended up questioning yourself.

The moment may be happening now, may have happened recently, or may be years behind you. You do not need new contact with the other person to use this tool. Work from the record you already have.

THE BOUNDARY

We are not going to decide what kind of person they are. We are not going to decide what you should do about the relationship. We are going to look at one record. That is enough for this exercise.

SAFETY FIRST

You do not need to confront anyone, disclose your notes, access private devices, track a location, test someone, or place yourself in a risky situation to complete this tool. If recording or keeping this worksheet could create a safety problem for you, use the safest method available to you, or do not keep a written copy. Your safety outranks finishing the exercise.

STEP 1

Freeze the Scene

Before the explaining started, what actually happened?

Write only what a camera, screenshot, timestamp, message, or person standing in the room could have captured.

- What was said?
- What was done?
- What happened first?
- What happened next?
- What date or time matters?
- What physical or digital evidence exists, if any?

Leave motive out for now.

What I directly observed:

Exact words or messages I remember or have:

Timeline details that matter:

Evidence I can actually point to:

What I do NOT know from this scene:

STEP 2

Record Your First Read

Your first interpretation is information. It is not automatically a fact.

Before the explanation changed how you felt about the moment, what did you think it meant?

This is your first interpretation, not something you have to defend.

My first read was:

I thought that because:

Which parts of that read came from something observable?

Which parts were interpretation, assumption, or fear?

STEP 3

Record What Came Next

Now capture the response as accurately as you can.

- What did they say?
- What did they deny?
- What explanation did they give?
- Did the explanation stay the same?
- Did they introduce anything you could independently verify?

Their response:

What they said happened:

New verifiable information they gave me:

Things that were explanation but not independently verifiable:

Anything in the account that changed later:

STEP 4

Separate What Actually Changed

A conversation can change your confidence without changing the underlying facts. New evidence can also legitimately change your understanding.

Put each part of the record in the column where it belongs.

What stayed the same	What genuinely changed	Explanation only	Emotional pressure / atmosphere	Still unknown
Facts that remain supported after the conversation.	New facts or verifiable information that changed the record.	Claims or interpretations offered but not independently established.	Tone, anger, warmth, guilt, urgency, silence, affection, or pressure that changed how the moment felt.	Questions the available record cannot answer yet.

KEEP THIS DISTINCTION

A longer explanation is not automatically new evidence. A calmer tone is not automatically new evidence. Your discomfort fading is not automatically new evidence. But a timestamp, message, document, independently verifiable fact, or other information that actually changes the record may be.

STEP 5

Compare the Record

Now put the original event beside what came later.

1. Does the later explanation account for the original facts?
2. Does it require any known fact to be ignored or changed?
3. Did genuinely new information appear?
4. Is there a direct contradiction between versions?
5. Is there something material that still has no explanation?
6. If this has happened before, can you name the separate events, or are you calling one event a pattern?
7. After the issue was raised, was there accountability or repair that addressed the actual issue?

Write the cleanest version:

What the later explanation DOES account for:

What it DOES NOT account for:

Direct contradiction, if any:

What is still unknown:

What repair or accountability occurred, if any:

STEP 6

What the Record Supports

Do not choose the strongest answer. Choose the most accurate one.

☐ EXPLAINED ENOUGH TO REVISE

New information reasonably accounts for the material facts. I have a reason to revise my first read.

☐ MATERIALLY UNRESOLVED

Some information fits, but a meaningful contradiction or unexplained fact remains. I do not need to pretend it is resolved.

☐ NOT ENOUGH YET

The record is too incomplete to support a stronger conclusion in either direction. “I don't know yet” is an honest result.

My current conclusion, in my own words:

The facts supporting that conclusion:

The unknowns I am leaving open:

STEP 7

Set the Revision Standard

A conclusion should be allowed to change when the evidence changes.

You do not need future contact with the other person for information to count. New information may come from an existing message, timeline detail, document, receipt, remembered detail that becomes clearer, or other verifiable information already available to you.

What information would make me MORE confident in my current conclusion?

What information would make me LESS confident?

What would genuinely resolve the contradiction?

What would NOT count as new evidence by itself?

Examples: a calmer tone, a longer explanation, pressure to drop it, warmth returning, or my discomfort fading.

My revision standard:

What the Record Supports

KEEP THIS PAGE. This is the one-page summary of the event you checked.

EVENT I CHECKED:

WHAT I DIRECTLY OBSERVED:

WHAT WAS LATER REPORTED OR EXPLAINED:

NEW VERIFIABLE INFORMATION:

MATERIAL CONTRADICTION / UNRESOLVED FACT:

WHAT IS STILL UNKNOWN:

MY CURRENT RESULT:

- ☐ Explained enough to revise
- ☐ Materially unresolved
- ☐ Not enough yet

MY CURRENT CONCLUSION:

WHAT WOULD CHANGE MY VIEW:

What This Tool Deliberately Does Not Do

- Decide whether someone is a narcissist.
- Prove cheating or deception.
- Read motive or tell you why someone did something.
- Teach you to monitor someone, access devices, set traps, or collect evidence covertly.
- Track a pattern for 7, 30, or 90 days.
- Evaluate whether an apology or behavioral change is sustained over time.
- Tell you whether to stay, leave, reconnect, confront, or make another relationship decision.
- Preserve clarity across repeated emotional-pressure cycles or teach a long-term communication system.

Those are different jobs. This tool is intentionally narrower: one event, one record, one proportionate conclusion.

Before You Close This

You may still not know why they did what they did.

You may still wish the explanation had been cleaner, the contradiction had never happened, or someone had simply told the truth.

But this exercise does not require you to borrow somebody else's certainty, including mine.

Your job was to decide what this record supports today, what remains unknown, and what information would honestly change your view.

That is enough.

With truth and fire,

Melissa

Torch & Soul

[Ignite Your Purpose. Fuel Your Soul.](#)