

UDC 371.011: 373.5.015.31: 130.2 (47.7)  
doi: 10.15330/jpnu.4.1.133-139

## EDUCATING TO FORGIVE AS AN EXPRESSION OF CONCERN FOR ORDER IN A PERSON'S NATURAL ENVIRONMENT. PART. 1: EVIL AND HARM IN THE LIFE OF A HUMAN PERSON AS THE SOURCE OF THE NEED TO FORGIVE

MICHAŁ WYROSTKIEWICZ

**Abstract.** The paper defines philosophical categories of good and evil in the process of upbringing and development of the personality. People are good by nature. That is why they tend towards the good, they desire what is good, they feel bad and do not function well when they are touched by evil. Goodness is part of the natural environment of the human being; goodness is the natural climate of the human person. At the same time, however, people perform bad deeds. They create evil. They often harm others. This is the cause of disorder in a person's environment. It turns out that the only effective and reasonable means of restoring such order is forgiveness. It is the only thing that has a chance to realistically stop the potential avalanche of evil that appears to be the obvious result of wrongdoing and "nurturing" harm or planning revenge. The evil that "insidiously" enters the world creates the need for forgiveness as the only way to respond to harm; as a way that leads to real order in a person's environment.

**Keywords:** harm, forgiveness, upbringing, integral development of the human person, human ecology, educational space.

### 1. INTRODUCTION – CONTEXT: ABOUT FORGIVENESS IN PEDAGOGY

The fact is that an integrally understood education cannot be simply limited to the transfer of knowledge, but it must also include upbringing. Those of us who are involved in education and raising children are well aware of this fact. Education, as seems obvious to us, does not mean teaching someone to be polite (though, undoubtedly, this is an important issue if we rightly agree that we consider being rude to be an injustice). Instead, we must show students what values are and convince them that they are worth pursuing. We must incorporate values into their lives, and educators are to give them ideas on how to do it. The authentic integral development of the human person, which in fact means the development of an integral human being, will not occur without reference to true values [1; 2].

Education experience of XX-XXI century and pedagogical innovations serves as a means of forming abilities of students to find social contact in the environment, critically assess the negative trends in society, treats the members of other social sectors and cultures with respect [20, p. 244-245].

In modern conditions of European integration the hierarchy of values of the modern student is changing. In the world educational expense some attempts of search for innovational ways of pedagogical activity, which is based on postmodern foundation are well visible. At the same time the values system, which the process of education is directed toward, has cultural-historic character. Globalization and intergovernmental integration into modern world community are to be realized taking into consideration educational traditions as formation and development of a person are inseparable from social medium of the people (O. Budnyk) [19, p. 13].

True values are those that result from a person's true nature. If we rightly consider that being ecological means conformity with nature [3], then it can be said with all conviction that striving for these values is an expression of concern for the maintenance and ecological governance of the world within the integrally integrated environment of an integrally human person [4].

## 2. METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Although the obvious effect of ecological reflection (including from the perspective of human ecology) is to develop normative postulates whose fulfillment contributes to maintaining the greatest natural order in the world, nevertheless, because of the variety of ecological approaches, these suggestions will not be the same in every case [5]. Yet, we will always be concerned about values. According to the thesis, the most appropriate ecological concept is human ecology in relation to an integrally understood human person and their environment [6]. Human ecology will be the ordering tool for further analyzes and discussions.

According to the assumptions of human ecology, the matter of priority (meaning the reality in which realizing the natural purpose and sense of existence is expressed) is the above mentioned integral development of the undertaken human person. Striving to find them is therefore recognized as the basic ecological imperative. The potential of the person, the resulting rights and the need for continuous development belong to human nature. Following the path to integral development is a most natural activity, like green ecology. Relinquishing or obstructing it appears to disturb the ecological balance in the world [3].

According to the above ecological key, the situation of people who find themselves in misunderstandings or conflicts due to evil, which is the result of the evil or suffering they have experienced, will be analyzed. The starting point will be anthropological knowledge. The causes and effects of a conflict will be determined based on these. The latter will be in reference to the development of an integral human person, which was already pointed out and is obvious in our reflections on human ecology. After making an in-depth assessment according to the key assumptions of the research undertaken on the concept, I want to refer to the widest possible knowledge in order to obtain a truly integral vision of the human person. Thus, I will refer to various sciences, from empiricism, through mathematics, the humanities and theology, in order to develop synthetic conclusions on the nature of ethical directives.

Their goal is to get us out of a crisis, a non-ecological situation of a difference between people. It is a natural thing for people to create a community [7]. Consequently, this will enable all people to develop, especially those who have suffered in any way due to inflicted evil resulting from an act of wrongdoing. This concerns both the victim and the criminal, and also the third person, who, although not directly involved in the process, nevertheless feels the effects, although we will clearly concentrate on the former.

For the sake of clarity, it should be stated (as may be inferred from the title) that this paper is the first part of a larger study. The above methods and assumptions apply to the entire research work. The contents that will be presented below are the anthropological basis for the undertaken research, which has become quite extensive. It must be stressed, however, that this foundation is not a simple introduction, but is fundamental, meaning necessary for understanding the problem and the effects in

the undertaken investigations. It comprises the basis for the conclusion, not for the research. In this way, it is part of the results.

The research problem that has been the subject of my investigations and whose results are the subject of this paper is quite extensive, and the research question was complex. Before I began to ask how to get out of a crisis situation that arises in a person's natural environment when he or she is suffering, I focused on whether or not a danger or threat can be avoided. In other words, the question concerns why pain, suffering, injury and harm enter into people's lives. Also, what are their effects on the development of an integral human being, which also means paying attention to the problem of the influence this has on a person's natural environment. These issues, which I consider to be necessary in my introduction, will be the subject of this study.

Speaking of methodological issues and assumptions in this paper, it should be clearly stated that, according to the above information, this paper has an almost exclusive one-sided view of the matter. This means that attention is deliberately focused primarily on a situation requiring forgiveness. It is the person who, as the subject of action, is the main subject of this study, the results of this elaboration.

### 3. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS: ANTHROPOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF THE NEED TO FORGIVE

People are good by nature. Goodness is a natural environment for them. They want what is good and strive for it. This scientifically proven thesis [8] is a key issue in this reflection. This means that not only do people want to do what is good and live surrounded by it, but also what is very importantly is that they feel bad when they are affected by evil. They not only feel dissatisfied, confused or uneasy, but even unfulfilled. A confrontation with evil does not make people feel safe either. This feeling is not the result of some misconception of one's situation but a reflection of the actual state of matters. Evil does not serve mankind. It moves people away from their natural purpose and makes it difficult for them to realize the meaning of their existence. Evil is not natural for a human person.

When experiencing evil, people feel a lack of well-being, which is most evident in mental discomfort. This is obvious because evil is something wrong, unnatural, or an unecological climate for man. Not only is performing evil but also experiencing it a thing that does not agree with man's nature, meaning one's most intrinsic motives and needs. By accepting evil, by doing or approving of it and remaining in such a situation or attempting to admit that it a normal state of being, to some extent people resign from naturally striving to develop, as well as the happiness that is its constituting element. Therefore, defending self against evil and rebelling against it is natural.

Looking at the theological-human relation of evil, we can say that it does not harmonize the will of the Creator with His vision of the world and man. On the contrary, these realities cannot be reconciled. Everything that He created, as *Genesis* states [1, p. 31], "was very good" [9]. That is how it should remain in order to maintain the status quo of a world which is the work of the good God. This also includes man who belongs to the world. Goodness, and especially the moral good, is at the top of the hierarchy of goods, so it therefore creates a state of ecological order in the world and is also the natural focus of human endeavors and the result of human action [10; 11]. In this sense, an evil act, recognized as sin in theology, is the first, meaning basic and primary source of environmental pollution [12; 13].

Despite the above-mentioned natural pursuit of what is good, people sometimes do bad things. Often they create and are the cause of evil. There is no need to conduct scientific research to be convinced of this, we simply refer to history or our personal experience. Such evil and its effects can be seen in many situations. According to previous theories concerning human nature, this means that people who do evil deeds are acting against their nature. This is one of the basic theses referred to in the research and resulting in my report. There are various reasons for this state of matters. Without going into the anthropological complexity of the topic, it is worth mentioning what appear to be the basic causes and the root of evil.

The first is limited human cognition, meaning the fact that man can be wrong because he sees the world, people and their behavior randomly. No human being is able to perceive and understand everything that is around him and what is happening completely. A person is not able to know everything. Forgetting about this and accepting as the ultimate and best solution the effects of their experiences and thoughts, people quite often find what is good and even best that which is actually not good at all. Ironically, they want to achieve it as well, often at any cost, like harming whoever obstructs their intentions. In wanting to be good, that is, acting in the most natural and logical way, they end up with evil. If we add impulsiveness in making decisions, and this is often present in human actions, then the likelihood of good judgment and making the right choice is even further reduced. The fundamental error that can be perceived in this case is an anthropological error, meaning an error in man's perception and understanding. It is looking at man in the wrong way, inappropriately identifying his nature, needs and possibilities. In detail, this error lies in recognizing human cognition as flawless and certain [8].

Theological reflection draws attention to another cause of bad behavior. It includes Satan who influences the mind and will of man to push him to do evil deeds [8; 14; 15; 16].

A particular kind of evil that is being done is the above-mentioned wrongdoing by another human being. Its original causes are the same as bad deeds in general. This simply concerns obtaining material goods and problems related with rationally perceiving the world or a lack of understanding, meaning information and cognitive issues. The harm that we inflict on family relationships, neighbors, friends and society often do not flow out of ill will. Their source is often awkwardness in mutual communication and fear for oneself. However, we most often hurt each other because of pain. Sometimes it is suffering that "takes away our reason". In these difficult situations, we cause others pain, but we really do not know what we are doing [17].

Taking into account the above statements, as we have already mentioned, it is not difficult to conclude that whirling about in a bad situation is not compatible with natural human aspirations and our deep desires, and this is worth stressing once again in this context. A particular example of such a case is not properly being treated by someone else as highlighted in the above quote. An extreme case is conscious and voluntary evil performed to inflict suffering and harm. It is not surprising that the effects of such an experience are not only disappointment, a feeling a lack of order and security, but also anger, rebellion and a desire to defend oneself before such an attack and the person who is causing all this [18].

Although the issue seems obvious, however, for the record and the sake of completeness, it is worth noting that the injured party is not the only one who was "targeted" by the wrongdoer. Also, all people not directly involved in these procedures, colloquially speaking, those who do not stand in the line of fire, also suffer the effects of the damage caused to others. First of all, this concerns experiencing the disturbance of order and security and a crisis of confidence and trust in other people. In addition, it is not without significance that it is natural for a true community living in solidarity that such situations we recognize that harming someone in the community in some way hurts all of its members. Sometimes such thinking about the community extends and touches practically all of humanity.

As already noted, the obvious consequence of being hurt is different negative emotions. These can swell at times when we can identify the perpetrator of the experienced evil deed; when we cannot simply dump the blame on "bad luck", "adverse circumstances" or explain (usually incorrectly) that "it was meant to be so." An injured person, or someone treated unfairly, meaning inhumanly, a person who was denied a legitimate "right and, above all, lost their dignity, understandably rebels against a situation they recognize as unnatural, but they also rebel against the villain. A clear and justified aversion to all this does not always go away, and not always does "time heals all wounds", as the saying goes.

There are even cases in which this reluctance increases. This is the case when the time that has passed is spent on dwelling on the damage, which in such cases often eludes rational assessment and it grows, and sometimes also, unfortunately, it is spent on taking on different forms of planning some kind of revenge. It is worth noting that this is not always typical planning. Often this can simply mean

"nurturing" grief with the hope (and not always conscious) that the time will come when we will be able to compensate for the injuries suffered; it may be a kind of "nurturing" unwillingness towards others (and sometimes towards self), which under favorable circumstances will take on some form of aggression. What is most important is that this is not always about revenging the wrongdoer (although this situation seems to be the model case).

A victim has to react to what happened to him, he has something about it; he must somehow live through and refer to the experience. For him, it is important to undergo some kind of reaction, which may take on various forms: "O suffered harm [...] you cannot be easily forgotten." Simplified advice given to a hurting person such as "do not think about it any longer," "do not go back to what happened" and "forget about it" are very short-sighted, but may be an expression of kindness and desire to bring the person relief. Often, however, these are more of a hindrance than a help in striving to greater maturity. If the person who suffered an injury (especially deep and painful) will not be healed, being "overworked" or "overwhelmed" can easily make them into a source of harm to others. A hurt person who does not integrate the suffering she/he experienced is at risk that alone, in an almost involuntary and unconscious way, they will become wicked" [17].

The experience of inflicted evil undeniably includes reasons for social controversies, antagonisms, and even open conflicts. They arise almost automatically, because as noted above, they happen "in an almost involuntary and unconscious way." To put it into one phrase, we can say that we are dealing with a lack of unity among people. Such a situation appears to be natural, it is people's logical reaction to the unnatural reality of evil: if someone turns out to be the evildoer, we do not want to have anything to do with them. It is worth recalling once again that these conflicting situations of disagreement not only involve those who were direct participants but also other people who in different ways became their partners in crime. The community is broken up, but a community is necessary for integral development; without it, man cannot walk the path of life. The community is so important to a human person's development that in human ecology, it is called the ecological niche [21].

As already mentioned, evil brings up negative emotions. Often, however, a person's reaction to evil, especially if it takes on the form of harm, is not only in the sphere of the emotions, but also moves to the intellect (memory flashbacks, etc.), and consequently it even includes undertaking actions such as revenge in different ways and motives: compensation, equaling losses, or even so-called getting even with someone, meaning an action by which the villain can feel what it is like to be in the victim's situation, repeating the same situation as the person being harmed. It is worth noting that in the above mentioned possible situations, the result is always the same: retaliation, doing evil to those who have previously committed it in a more or less conscious way. The effect is evil. The damage is multiplied. A ruthless cycle of injury and evil is launched.

In our reflections on the threshold of psychology, spiritual theology and pastoral theology, we came up with one more thesis about the reactions to evil and especially to experiencing harm and injury. According to our observations, the effect of experiencing pain is quite often an action that, although it looks like retaliation, in fact is not. It is an attempt to get rid of the suffering which is the result of the pain experienced: "What is hurting others if not simply 'dumping' suffering onto our neighbor, something which we ourselves do not know how and do not want to carry?" – the author rhetorically asks, concluding these words with a reflection on the reasons for the abuse people do to each other. The author came to the following conclusion: "Most often, however, we hurt each other because of our own pain" [17].

Pain causes pain – harm causes harm. Based on the above anthropological reflections, we may rightly have the impression that this situation is very difficult. An injured person is introduced into an unnatural situation that she or he must react to. There is no way to "pass by" or "get over" it. They must face it. They can nurture it, which, as indicated above, is not a good way out of the situation, and this will not restore order into a person's natural environment. Thus, the only right way to go, as it seems, is to pursue forgiveness. This thesis will become the starting point for further research that will comprise the second part of our study.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

The above analyzes and discussions have led us to conclude that while living among people, one cannot avoid harm and will at least feel it. We also showed that people have to deal with each other. This is the basic idea of this part of the study. It shows that in such situations, it is necessary to develop standards that help people find themselves in unnatural and rather unfavorable situations, yet hopefully they do not often occur. The analyzes and discussions underlying this central issue in the next part of this study will seek to find a solution that can give us a chance to restore the disturbed sense of harm and order in man's environment.

Man is in an uneasy situation. On the one hand, since man's existence, we are inseparable from other interpersonal relationships and are not able to be freed from them, and what is more, we need these relationships to be fulfilled as human persons. It is worth mentioning that without relationships it would be impossible to experience love, which appears to be the fullness of humanity [7; 22]. On the other hand, due to various factors that cannot be avoided, people make many mistakes that make these relationships improper. This means that some relationships are not conducive to the development of an individual human person or society as a whole, which is part of the natural human environment. It turns out that not only entering into conflicts but also inflicting harm is unholy and even commonplace elements of human life.

Since it is almost impossible to avoid being hurt, we face the following choices: either to become angry, reject the abuser and nurture the hurt (or the feeling of being hurt), or to forgive. The choice of the first option, although it introduces a certain order into the relationships between people (because we know who is who, and this is already a way to organize relationships), yet it does not improve these relationships: it does not lead them to the original state of being when good people were united. This choice is always our approval for evil to continue to exist. It can even be the cause of evil structures. In such a situation, it is easy to conclude that the only right choice is forgiveness. It is righteous because it introduces order, or maybe it simply restores it in the natural environment of a human person.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Mazur P. Personalistic basis of education according to John Paul II. In: Dancák P., Hruška D., Rembierz M., Šoltés R. (Eds.) *Personalism and the present*. Prešovská univerzita v Prešove, Prešov, 2010. (in Polish)
- [2] Mazur P. Introduction. *Scientific Bulletin of Chełm – Section of Pedagogy*, 6 (1) (2015). (in Polish)
- [3] Wyrostkiewicz M. *Human Ecology. An Outline of the Concept and the Relationship between Man and Nature*. Wydawnictwo KUL, Lublin, 2013.
- [4] Wyrostkiewicz M. Ecological dimensions of the institutional education. *Scientific Bulletin of Chełm – Section of Pedagogy*, 7 (2) (2016). (in Polish)
- [5] Wyrostkiewicz M., From ecology to the human ecology. In: Nagórny J., Gocko J. (Eds.) *Ecology. The moral message of the Church*. Wydawnictwo KUL, Lublin, 2002. (in Polish)
- [6] Wyrostkiewicz M. The dispute about man in ecology. In: Nagórny J., Gocko J. (Eds.) *The dispute about man – the dispute about the future of the world. From Bl. John XXIII to John Paul II*. Poligrafia Inspektoratu Towarzystwa Salezjańskiego, Lublin, 2004. (in Polish)
- [7] Nagórny J. *The mission of the Christians in the world. Vol. 1: World and community*. RW KUL, Lublin, 1997. (in Polish).
- [8] Wyrostkiewicz M. Why do people sin? *Katecheta*, 57 (5) (2013). (in Polish)
- [9] *The Bible. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops*, Washington, 2002. Available at: [http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0839/\\_INDEX.HTM](http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0839/_INDEX.HTM).
- [10] Nowoad S., Wyrostkiewicz M. Moral good. In: Nagórny J., Jeżyna K. (Eds.) *John Paul II. Encyclopedia of moral teaching*. Polskie Wydawnictwo Encyklopedyczne "Polwen", Radom, 2005. (in Polish)
- [11] Wyrostkiewicz M. When the act is good and what does it matter? Why should you do something good? *Katecheta*, 56 (11) (2012). (in Polish)

- [12] Wyrostkiewicz M. When the act is wrong and what does it matter? *Katecheta*, **56** (12) (2012). (in Polish)
- [13] Wyrostkiewicz M. What is sin and why should we talk about it? *Katecheta*, **57** (1) (2013). (in Polish)
- [14] Gózdź K. The mystery of personal evil. In: Gózdź K. (Ed.) *Theology about Satan*. Standruk, Lublin, 2000. (in Polish)
- [15] Mroczkowski I. *Evil and sin. Philosophical-theological study*. Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, Lublin 2000. (in Polish)
- [16] Witaszek G. The Bible about Satan Biblia. In Gózdź K. (Ed.) *Theology about Satan*. Standruk, Lublin, 2000. (in Polish)
- [17] Augustyn J. Introduction. In: *Harm and forgiveness*. Ed. 2. Wydawnictwo M, Kraków, 2010. (in Polish)
- [18] Mellibruda J. The trap of non-forgotten harm in the psychological aspect. In: *Harm and forgiveness*. Ed. 2. Wydawnictwo M, Kraków, 2010. (in Polish)
- [19] Budnyk O. Educational Model of a Modern Student: European Scope. *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University*, **3** (2-3) (2016), 9-14. doi:10.15330/jpnu.3.2-3.9-14
- [20] Budnyk O. Ethnic socialization of personality: space of family educational traditions of the XXI-th century. In: *Education at the beginning of the XXI century*, Ks. prof. dr hab. Jan Zimny, Dr. Roman Król (Eds.), Stalowa Wola, Kiev, Ružomberok, 2012, 235-245.
- [21] Wyrostkiewicz M. *Human ecology. The Persons and their Environment from the Moral-Theological Perspective*. Wydawnictwo KUL, Lublin, 2007. (in Polish)
- [22] Wyrostkiewicz M. What are social relationships and why should you pay attention to them. *Katecheta*, **58** (11) (2014). (in Polish)

**Address:** Michał Wyrostkiewicz, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Aleje Racławickie 14, Lublin, 20-950, Poland.

**E-mail:** m.wyrostkiewicz@gmail.com.

**Received:** 20.01.2017; **revised:** 28.03.2017.

---

Виросткєвіч Міхель. Виховання здатності пробачати як вираження стурбованості щодо упорядкування природного середовища людини. Частина. 1: Зло в житті людини і джерело потреби пробачити. *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника*, **4** (1) (2017), 133–139.

У статті визначено філософські категорії добра і зла у вихованні та розвитку особистості. Люди за своєю природою добрі. Саме тому вони, як правило, прагнуть добра, бажують того, що є добрим; вони відчують себе погано і погано працюють, коли їх торкається зло. Досконалість є частиною природного середовища людської істоти; доброякісність – це природне середовище людської особистості. Але, у той же час, люди роблять погані вчинки – часто створюють зло довкола себе і прагнуть заподіяти шкоду іншим. Це є причиною безладу в навколишньому середовищі людини. Виявляється, що єдиним ефективним і розумним засобом відновлення такого порядку є прощення. Це єдине, що має шанс реально зупинити потенційну лавину зла, яка здається очевидним результатом проступку і “виховання” шкодити або планування помсти. Зло, яке “підступно” входить у світ, створює потребу в прощенні – єдиному способі реагування на шкоду; способі, який веде до реального порядку в середовищі людини.

**Ключові слова:** шкода, прощення, виховання, інтегральний розвиток людської особистості, екологія людини, освітній простір.