

Cuatro reflexiones sobre moral, odio y perdón

Four reflections on morality, hatred and forgiveness

Alfonso Felipe Díaz Cárdenas

Universidad Autónoma de Puebla

diazcard@yahoo.com

María del Rayo Sankey García

Universidad Autónoma de Puebla

ryathome@hotmail.com

Resumen

En el capítulo se analizan cuatro perspectivas psicológicas que estudian las acciones humanas que son consideradas como buenas o malas desde una perspectiva moral así como algunos estudios afines a estos puntos de vista. Hemos tomado la perspectiva de Beck al considerar que el pensamiento humano está organizado en esquemas y modos cognitivos. Además consideramos que los procesos cognitivos en el ámbito moral toman como base esos conjuntos organizados de creencias que son, esencialmente, construcciones sociales que nos llevan al camino de la hostilidad o del perdón. Por consiguiente, es la interpretación de la situación, así como de las intenciones que motivan la conducta de los demás y la propia, la que determina la evaluación moral del comportamiento humano.

Palabras clave: cognición, moral, perdón, esquema, construcción social, modo cognitivo.

Abstract

The chapter discusses four psychological perspectives that study human actions that are considered good or bad from a moral perspective as well as studies related to these points of view. We have taken the prospect of Beck to consider that human thought is organized into schemas and cognitive modes. We also believe that cognitive processes in the moral

field are those organized sets of beliefs that are, essentially, social constructions that lead us to the path of hostility or forgiveness. Therefore it is the interpretation of the situation, as well as the intentions that motivate the behavior of others and itself, that determines the moral evaluation of human behavior.

Key Words: cognition, morality, forgiveness, scheme, social construction, cognitive mode.

Fecha recepción: Marzo 2012

Fecha aceptación: Mayo 2012

Introduction

Moral systems provide a concrete way of integrating the values and standards that society expects to defend much -as beliefs, at least-; to serve as a basis and guide for their behavior and, mainly, to be allowed to assess the behavior of others in their interaction with him. Thus, humans are both producers and products of social systems in which they live (Bandura, 2001). Certainly our conceptions are not only the product of the values that we build, they derive from social roles we play (Perkins, 2009). In this order of ideas, in this chapter we will stop to analyze four psychological perspectives that study human actions which are considered good or bad perspective moral and, eventually, we review studies related to these points of view. The selection of these perspectives puts emphasis on the three major issues that intitulan this section: morality, hatred and forgiveness as essentially cognitive processes.

The development of moral reasoning according to Piaget

Jean Piaget (1985) offers us a serious and largely complete study on the development of the reasoning on moral issues. With the same clinical method that investigated the development of logical-mathematical structures deals with the analysis of the development of the moral criterion in children and adolescents: ask your child to think and express their views on problems that have any moral implications or obligation related to the social mode of the "ought to be".

Based on a series of interviews held with children, Piaget suggests that all child verbal thinking consists of progressive awareness of the schemes built through action and proposes an evolutionary sequence, from a pre-moral stage, through two clearly distinguishable stages.. In the first of those two periods, it called heteronomous morality of the child based their judgments on a total, non-reciprocal, unilateral rules and regulations established by adults respect. It is a morality of obedience whose source is totally alien to the child. While in a second phase, called autonomous morality, the child tries to base their moral decisions on mutual respect, cooperation, equality, reciprocity and justice.

At orientation heterónoma the author warns in the responses of children with a tendency to consider the duties and values that relate to them as subsisting in themselves, independent of consciousness and mandatory taxes, whatever the circumstances in which they are present the individual. This trend of moral realism involves three characteristics: i) the duty is essentially heteronomous; ii) any act which responds to obedience to a rule, that is, an act of obedience to adults, is good; iii) any act contrary to the rules, it's bad.

Thus the rule is not actually produced by the conscience and the good is rigorously defined through obedience. Since adult pressure produces a kind of realistic detail, the rule must be observed to the letter and not in spirit. Based on this objective conception of responsibility, the child will begin to evaluate acts not according to the intention that triggered, but in terms of its material under the rules proposed.

Piaget noted that some parents, their disciplinary strategies and tactics do not promote moral development of children. He said then that "most parents impose your child a large number of duties which reason, for a long time, it is incomprehensible to him" (1985, p. 160). Thus, the child puts all these rules in the same plane physical phenomena themselves.

In analyzing the arguments that children do to reach the stage of autonomous morality, Piaget (1985), with a great capacity for research and an outstanding view of cognitive processes, put in the center of the discussion reciprocity as a factor of autonomy. He

noted that up to a moral autonomy when consciousness necessary an independent ideal of all outward expression. That is, the child discovers that unrelated to the other no moral necessity. Thus, autonomy appears simultaneously associated with reciprocity when mutual respect is strong enough for the individual to experience from within the need to treat others as he would want to be treated.

Thus, if on the one hand from the perspective heterónoma the idea of unilateral sanctions is integral respect and moral authority, any progress on cooperation and mutual respect naturally eliminate, gradually, the idea of atonement the notion of punishment and it reduced to the proportions of a simple repair or a simple measure of reciprocity.

Piaget proposed that children's development an emerging concept at first, on the basis of which occurs every time you think fairer defend himself and return the beatings. This becomes a simple matter of compensation, it is also about reciprocity: if, say, someone the right to punch me is awarded, also gives me that right.

But due in part to the pursuit of a progressive equilibration, charity and forgiveness of injuries outweigh mere equality. And this development, according to Piaget, the child conflicts arise between justice and love, "because sometimes justice prescribes what love fails and vice versa" (Piaget, 1985, p. 270), the reciprocity concern leads him to overcome this a bit short mathematically justice back many punches as received.

The child begins to put forgiveness over revenge, not out of weakness, but because of revenge "never end up" as Piaget expressed a ten years (1985, p. 271). The precept "Do unto others as you would have them do not" happen to gross equality. So, without leaving reciprocity, generosity allies with simple justice and the child discovers that among the most advanced forms of justice and love no real opposition (Piaget, 1985).

But the moral of obedience is not peculiar to the age, in order to understand that an adult can harm and even kill, to another just to fulfill an order received from someone with authority over her, Stanley Milgram devised a series of experiments in which a subject makes a series of questions about a task learned by someone without knowing him,

agreed with Milgram to make mistakes. Before committing a mistake, this guy had to administer electric shocks that increased in intensity with each failed response. Milgram proposed from his observations on this experimental situation where the person evaluated actually received no download, that most people have learned to obey almost automatically and without hesitation to anyone who adopts a role authority to it, although, in fact, have no.

Among the key findings of its studies Milgram notes that even "that person, that inner conviction, repudiates steal, kill or assault can discover himself performing these actions with relative ease when ordered by any authority. In other words, behaviors that are unimaginable for an individual acting on his own will can be executed without any hesitation if they are made in order to carry out orders "(Milgram, 2009, p. 19).

Parents and managers of social institutions such as schools or church discipline often focus on the establishment of obedience as a value in itself. To Milgram, the essence of obedience lies in the process that leads a person to see herself as the instrument to run events that other person wants, and that, therefore, no longer considered more responsible for their own Actions. As shown in the Milgram experiment, obedience becomes an automatic process for the child and is likely to remain in adulthood.

Clearly disobeying authority is a process that requires breaking automation and make a deliberate decision. In such cases, Milgram noted, there is a real person who must obey or disobey authority, a specific instance in which an episode of challenge can occur. Forcefully this researcher points out that "all acts of disobedience are characterized by that moment of decisive action" (Milgram, 2009, p. 20). The act of disobedience is, then, a cognitive decision even more aware and often more difficult than if we decide to behave obediently. A soldier who is ordered to shoot and kill a woman in a battlefield could decide not obey many cognitive complications and murder. The decision not to obey that order requires, however, a more complex cognitive process including the calculation of the serious consequences that would entail the act of disobedience in this context, also

discounted the fact that their disobedience will not save life likely the woman and another soldier responsible for killing and enforce the order that he has refused to consummate.

Social cognitive theory Bandura

We can introduce the analysis of the theory of Bandura with the example of Jewish extermination and ask how it was possible for Germans educated in the Christian faith could obey orders that made them violate the respect for human life Why then behaved contrary to what he preaches religion and Christian faith? Bandura (1991) studied extensively the development of human behavior and emphasizes the role of observational learning, as an example, refers to the fact that even when parents and teachers tell us what to do and what you should not do, it is their actual behavior that guide the behavior of children and youth. They can listen to their parents the importance of charity and equal to other respect, but learn more from its discriminatory and aggressive behavior against people belonging to different to theirs groups, either in economic terms, religious , politicians or even with regard to our passions for sports equipment.

As part of the social cognitive theory of Bandura (2002, 1991), moral reasoning is linked to moral action through self-regulatory mechanisms. This wording suggests that the moral self is turned on or off in different contexts and circumstances by a number of mechanisms dictated disconnect between standard and inconsistent, contradictory and opposed to all moral norms actions. Something like if the parents declared their children, "this is the norm, but do not worry because you learn different ways to violate without the cognitive, behavioral or emotional consequence for you."

Insofar as the child grows and develops cognitive ability, adults spend of corrective social or physical sanctions to ensure compliance with the rules of children threats. These social consequences combined with explanations and arguments nourish self-restraint and self-regulation, which are more effective than punishment mechanisms from external sources. Supplementally, inducing feelings of empathy for the victims of our immoral or violate the rights of others actions, strengthens the conviction of the need to respect the rights of others and regulate our behavior.

Bandura (2002, 1991) proposes at least three instances where we can turn our moral self-regulation: a) the conduct itself, which can be regarded as completely incompatible with the conception and definition of who we are as people; b) the consequences of their own behavior that may endanger the safety of the person, their relationships with others or some prized possessions at risk; c) the victim, whose evocation can activate thoughts and emotions of empathy, consideration, sympathy or pity.

According to Bandura (1991) our parents and teachers have taught us by word or by modeling mechanisms acting precisely in these three instances and allow us to clear the moral self and behave in a way that violated principles and rules theoretically accepted, no matter the consequences, for ourselves or others without worrying about what you can feel, suffer or the other person suffer.

In cognitive terms, these mechanisms are nothing more than basic cognitive processes by which people make sense of their own actions, their relationships with others, their intentions, the world in general, and the future.

At the level of behavior, Bandura (1991) proposes three different mechanisms so that the person can make behavior contrary to moral norms accepted: justification, which is to consider our moral actions have a purpose that gives it a value above for which it is allowed to violate other principles. The most dramatic case is that of killing another person in favor of the fight against evil, for the salvation of the world, for the defense of religious truth, the supreme cause of the revolution or something similar.

Palliative comparison is a second cognitive process that leads to attribute meaning to immoral behavior that allows the person to break the rules that say they believe in and not feel guilty, or activate mechanisms of self-punishment or generate a self-regulating inhibitory of that action. As can be seen from the example in Note II, the Israelites decide to assassinate Palestinians who have committed crimes against the Jewish people believe that their actions are not as bad as their enemies and thus generate an interpretation that functions as a palliative soothing any discomfort that may evoke his conscience.

A third cognitive mechanism is the euphemistic labeling. As noted by several authors describe not only the words but constructed realities. Human actions can have a different appearance depending on the words we use to describe them. Using an aseptic language immoral actions lose their disgust (Bandura, 2002).

Examples of the use of language in which it was hidden, disguised or attenuates it "immoral" an act we can find them in what Klemperer (2001) called the language of the Third Reich. Not only among the Germans, but even in the case of the Jews the use of words that "cruel acts and serious consequences are hidden behind colorless, everyday names" (Klemperer, 2001, p. 269) was extended. So it could be said that they were "looking for someone" to express or communicate that person had been taken discreetly, either to jail or to the barracks, and that with a high probability would be a victim of unjustified aggression. But also those "events have become so banal everyday that are designated as ordinary facts, instead of highlighting its grim seriousness" (Klemperer, 2001, pp 269 -270.); in the television industry and film including the category of action-adventure films that tell the most brutal forms of human cruelty Bandura (1991); in the large industries, to report the results of analysis of environmental impacts of their emissions, they indicated that residues were found anthropogenically acid derivatives, instead of using the words pollutants or hazardous waste; in military practice of using aseptic terms to reduce the reluctance to cause the consciousness of the soldiers assigned actions. So the bombing of a city are called surgical operations and civilian deaths become collateral damage. The major military operations are given names like Desert Storm. The terrorists call themselves freedom fighters. As further shown, Bandura (2002) quotes a senator of the United States of American who claimed that "the death penalty is the recognition of our society to the supremacy of human life".

As for the consequences, actual or anticipated, children learn from adults cognitive processes that enable them to minimize, ignore or reconceptualizarlas so that, in moral terms, no longer seem bad or important. Thus, the death of tens of thousands of people in Hiroshima because of an atomic bomb dropped by the United States was minimized or even credible to many Americans. The consequences of war are often ignored or

redefined as necessary or inevitable and the person only evaluates the triumph of the army itself.

In relation to the victim, Bandura proposes two methods which inhibit any autosanción or moral self-regulation. One of them is to blame the victim. With various cognitive processes based on socially constructed beliefs, we believe that many of the victims of immoral actions of others have contributed to them or have earned or deserved such acts. Some women have learned that if her husband or partner commits an act of infidelity likely have caused them to not respond satisfactorily in sex, love, pet or some other plane.

The poor deserve their situation because, in general, believe they are drunk, lazy or inept in business. They envy the rich man's wealth and accept that their situation is inevitable for their innate deficiencies.

The woman is molested in the street that has been sought out dressed by such leading men, unable to control himself, to behave rudely and lustful. If not use provocative necklines or not anyone had a desirable body the mind, so that in any case will have to blame their genes. In cases of rape many women feel guilty because a set of patterns and beliefs that.

As another example, we can mention a number of beliefs that activate when on the street they have stolen money, car or any valuable asset. We automatically blame for leaving the car in the place we have stolen, or take money or jewelry that caused the temptation of our thieves.

The other mechanism is the dehumanization of the victim achieved through the social use of terms such as "pigs", "monkeys", "wild", "nacos" that cancels any possibility of considering the other as an equal.

In the same vein, institutional forms of bureaucracy and automation of killings and human rights violations contribute to the dehumanization of victims. Arendt (2000) has proposed that this process results in a trivialization of evil by which institutions responsible for acts violating acting in their official capacity, without any moral concern, fulfill their obligations

within the social system: the violence of the state is just one of the tasks that are required to exercise and therefore it requires no moral justification. Passing second, or rather not even on the agenda of the State, investigate the social causes of insecurity and criminality, much less, it is the task of government to create conditions that modify these origins.

The fundamental task of the state, derived from this concept is clearly expressed by Paul Werner, head of prevention Kripo headquarters; He appointed by Hitler in 1937, saying in 1941 that the German police mission was to exterminate crime and work to perpetual and total annihilation of the offender as enemy of the people. Which is regarded by the historian Martin Broszat as a sign that the Nazi regime, crime should be treated as an inherited disease and therefore neutralized and eliminated. So says Broszat, criminals were not perceived as human beings but as parasites who should be exterminated (Gellately, 2002 p. 70).

A recent example of combating criminal with such a view, is well summarized in the following statement:

We will have to fight the enemies of the nation in all the national territory and will have to overcome, and the perseverance of our efforts will be crowned with victory (Felipe Calderon, El Universal, February 20, 2007).

The president refuses to accept responsibility for the violent escalation, as described by Carlos Fuentes (2008) in his novel "The will and fortune"

The powerful do not want to know what is done in their name. The great secular criminal, Al Capone, knows and commands. But even the most fearsome tyrant opened the floodgates of violence that he can not control. (Carlos Fuentes, 2008, p. 347)

These cognitive processes including lost sense hate the aggressor, as Primo Levi wrote (2002) that "hatred is personal, goes to a person, a man, a face," but the Nazi system, for example, so prudent, "made direct contact between slaves and masters were reduced to a minimum" (Primo Levi, 2002, p. 302) and the persecutors and executioners and victims, had no face or even name.

Primo Levi's observation requires us to broaden the perspective of Bandura and consider a reformulation of the mechanism that has its main action levels offender's conduct and its consequences: the dehumanization of the victim. Based on this dehumanizing the victim not only loses his human and personal characteristics, but also the aggressor. Crimes are committed by a system of which each individual is only a small part and plays a role, perhaps critical, but in general, insignificant in immoral process. Each can be replaced and is not necessary actions to occur.

Finally, with regard also to the aggressor, the shifting of responsibility is a mechanism by which the moral conscience is released to shift responsibility for the immoral actions to an authority which is responsible for directing behavior. As much as obedience remove us the power to freely decide our behavior, also gives us the vantage point of blaming others for the behavior and consequences thereof. Rarely in a situation of war criminals are tried as most soldiers of the worst performers actions. Rather they are seen as fellow human beings affected by the real creators of such atrocities which are senior officers who decided that these actions were carried out.

One last comment on Bandura's social cognitive theory of moral reasoning (2002, 1991) is interesting role the Canadian psychologist attributed to the cognitive process of humanization. This process can promote disobedience to an order requiring the hurt another human being. If we maintain the perception of the other as a human being, that common humanity leads us to realize the most valuable man in the other and in ourselves. Violate the rights of others to lay the foundations of violence, injustice and destruction of the rights of any human being including the rapist.

Research on forgiveness Enright Group

Is it possible to be pardoned and retain the ill-gotten?

In the corrupt ways of the world

Wealthy hand moves offending justice

And with his evil booty purchase law.

W.Shakespeare, "Hamlet"

Scientific curiosity for forgiveness, in the sense of reconciliation and restoration of a social relationship based not vindictive or punitive justice has been generally aimed at understanding the role it plays in the social historical development Individuals, institutions and social organizations. A pardon does not forget the insults and grievances, but precisely because remember, build new relationships that hinder the recurrence of injury.

In the field of psychology research worth noting forgiveness of Robert D. Enright. In the psychological literature, forgiveness does not mean exonerating the guilty of a transgression or remit his punishment, nor forget the offense. Forgiveness is rather considered as a process in which a decrease of resentment or anger against those who attacked us or hurt, along with the development of positive thoughts and emotions towards the offending occurs. In this process it is possible to forgive and not reach reconciliation with the offender, and may forgive without giving up the search for justice. For the group of Enright, the process of forgiveness leads people to a situation of strength and not weakness. Situation from which the decision to forgive despite having a clear awareness of the injustice done to one (Knutson et al., 2008) is taken.

Enright and his colleagues (Knutson et al, 2008;. Enright, 2001) have proposed a model that includes various aspects integrated into four main phases of the process of forgiveness.

- ☐ Discover and admit the fact of the offense and the consequences thereof
- ☐ Making the decision to forgive, that is, make a commitment to forgive as the best strategy to address the impact of the offense on our lives.
- ☐ Work on developing a broader perspective that allows to consider the offender detached offensive action as a person I can feel compassion and empathy.
- ☐ give a different meaning to the offense that allows discover the benefits of forgiveness. A meaning that is not reduced to being marked for life by a poor person or poor person being hurt and stigmatized forever.

Three points relating to the first phase are: allow a young person being hurt, who feels humiliated and offended by what that person did and recognize the resentment and anger

toward her. While this seems obvious and easily from an external position, recognition of aggression or offense, like any human situation, not always be defined in dichotomous terms as good / bad.

Thus, Enright (2001) proposed that the person to evaluate the aggressor from a perspective that allows you to see beyond their negative effects. That is, try to put yourself in another's shoes and see it as another human being and not a monster. Enright goes further to suggest that the person performing positive actions toward the offender. Which, in broader social terms, is justified if we take actions that end with the causes of crime and aggression rather than only seek ways to exterminate evil.

Moreover, Enright points out the importance for the person to deal constructively pain so it does not affect those who love and support. As well as build a sense of what happened that is not only a brand humiliating and stigmatizing.

Additionally, it is important to recognize that in life I have surely hurt or harmed others probably feel resentment and hatred toward me. And in my process of forgiveness, surely, I will find more support from those around me that so far have received for being abandoned and helpless victim of an injustice.

Finally, this results in the development of a new purpose in life and the fact that feelings of anger, hatred and resentment do not dominate us. This whole process has a cognitive consequence: to turn the enemy into a human being.

Beck cognitive behavioral perspective

*I noticed immediately that my colleagues
irrationally they were convinced
rationality, and make it
tambalease that faith would not be easy
J.E.Stiglitz, "Caída libre"*

When people analyze a situation triggered a series of cognitive structures that allow them, almost automatically, select relevant details and while they are interpreted in the light of previous relevant knowledge traits. The basic components of the organization are cognitive schemas. These subsystems are integrated into Beck (1985) calls "modes" (eg

depressive, anxious, hostile). Enabling this organization determines cognitive perceptions, interpretations, memories and reactions to situations and behaviors of others and of the person. Based on the beliefs and expectations derived from the cognitive organization classify, label them, evaluate and assign meaning to everything that happens in life. So in most cases what happens is seen in line with what we expect to see.

Intelligent beings generally do not treat each object or situation as unique and unrepeatable. We categorize the reality and establish similarities between various events. However, as Pinker (2009) notes, as we try to program a set of criteria determining define a category, it vanishes.

Cognitively to reconstruct reality in mind, the human being, compares and contrasts events or things. To determine what is generalizable from one situation to another (Piaget, 1969) should make a selective abstraction and put aside many of the characteristics of objects, those not linked to the scheme in play, and concentrate on the features relevant to the scheme.

Beck (2009) defines as arbitrary inference process that leads to a conclusion of a situation or experience when there is not enough evidence to support that conclusion or even when it is contrary to the evidence. However, most people accept as facts and truths many assumptions for which no evidence.

In general, when it relates to political, historical or economic areas, we have insufficient evidence to support most of our beliefs. According to Stiglitz (2010), a topic of vital importance in today's world, the actions of men in the economic and financial world and are based on expectations based on firmly held beliefs that often lack substance. As in any case of self-fulfilling prophecies, those expectations generate actions that lead inevitably to compliance. Thus, if it is predicted that there will be many bankruptcies market players bet by charging high interest to compensate for losses and bankruptcies it will still most likely provided. For these reasons, we can infer, also arbitrarily, that the arbitrary inference is very common and almost indispensable in human information processing. If someone proposes an idea based on different beliefs to get socially acceptable rejection

will not be considered as a credible person. For example, the passage through the economic crisis of the beginning of this century, still suffer generated a complaint to economists that none of them predicted, but that no one refers to anyone with credibility for bankers and businessmen that the assembly of voices warning was dismissed as unworthy of reliability (Stiglitz, 2010)

This call cognitive distortion is also attributing features automatically to a person or situation as we assign a categorical label. Sketch reality allows us to make sense of what is around us but never forget that our conception of the world is only a map of reality but not reality itself will probably not be known completely independently of the nervous system and social human (Bateson, 1979).

So, a cognitive mode (Beck, 1999, 2009) is an affective-cognitive-behavioral configuration having a central content around which are activated chord diagrams and beliefs with him on and off those who contradict or refute (Beck, 1985) . It is a subsystem of cognitive organization that allows the survival and adaptation to provide relevant from the perspective of the situations facing the individual. Structured bodies environmental information obtained through various neural systems through schemes that integrate meaningful patterns for those.

The activation of these patterns is automatic nature of such events still would not have to do directly with a person generate interpretations that affect it strongly. For example, the news that a friend or acquaintance will receive immediate recognition triggers in some people so depressed and raises ideas: "I am nobody", "my job does not work", "will never achieve anything" "To me the world does not value me."

Beck described the cognitive modes of depression (Beck & Alford, 2009), of vulnerability that are at the root of anxiety disorders (Beck, et al., 1985), hostility (Beck, 1999) of delusional beliefs (Beck, et al., 2009), among others.

However, this description must be extended to the extent that it is possible to conceive a conciliatory mode based on a perspective of forgiveness; a way of resilience and, finally, a

way of strengthening the human being. As we learn to see the world negatively, to me and to the future, humans develop, while prospects that enable forgive, learn from our mistakes and difficulties or nurture and increase our strengths. In Table 1 we summarize the cognitive triad describes the conception of the self, the world and the future of characteristic cognitive modes relevant to our discussion in this

Modo de depresión o (Beck y Alford, 2009)		
Yo	Experiencias, mundo y otros	Futuro
Deficiente, inadecuado, carente de valía, con graves deficiencias físicas, intelectuales o morales. Todo lo hace mal. Los errores son muestra de ineptitud.	Constantes situaciones de fracaso, dificultades y problemas insalvables, con privaciones y derrotas continuas. A nadie le gusta estar con alguien como él.	Un futuro que sólo continuará las dificultades y cargas actuales. Frustración, sufrimiento y desesperanza es lo esperable. Nunca aprenderá y siempre será un fracasado
Modo de vulnerabilidad (Beck, et al., 1985)		
Yo	Experiencias, mundo y otros	Futuro
Los errores muestran los puntos vulnerables, cualquier signo de debilidad constituye un punto para ser atacado. Lo peor que se puede hacer es mostrar inseguridad o vulnerabilidad.	Toda situación extraña debe ser considerada como un peligro potencial. Los demás constituyen una amenaza constante. Debe evitarse cualquier situación que represente un riesgo.	Siempre hay que esperar lo peor. Las consecuencias de los errores propios o de un mal manejo de las amenazas externas serán catastróficas.
Modo de hostilidad fría, calculada (Beck, 1999)		
Yo	Experiencias, mundo y otros	Futuro
La violencia es instrumental, está justificada por los fines. La violencia no está dirigida al otro como persona o como objeto de odio sino porque es un obstáculo para lograr una meta. O bien porque el acto violento es el medio para la propia supervivencia.	Los otros no representan un peligro o amenaza en tanto no se interpongan con los objetivos propios, pero en el caso de tener que hacerles daño o incluso matarlos se hará. La violencia es parte de la vida no como una necesidad sino como una opción en ocasiones inevitable.	La supervivencia a futuro depende de no temer cometer los actos que sean necesarios, porque los demás no dudarán en hacer lo mismo. El ser humano siempre tendrá situaciones en que será inevitable usar la violencia.
Modo de hostilidad reactiva (Beck, 1999)		
Yo	Experiencias, mundo y otros	Futuro
Se es víctima constante de injusticias y es necesario detener a los que tratan así a las personas. Si no se actúa violentamente los demás no van a entender lo que hacen mal y no se podrá vivir en paz.	La única manera de lograr que el mundo acepte la verdad y entienda lo que es justo es a través de la fuerza y el poder sobre los demás. Aquí el más fuerte es el que gana. El mundo no es para los débiles. Es necesario acabar con los malos que perjudican a la sociedad.	Mientras existan enemigos no habrá paz. Para lograr un futuro tranquilo para los seres amados, hay que imponerlo a la fuerza, porque los seres humanos no entienden razones.
Modo de resiliencia ¹		
Yo	Experiencias, mundo y otros	Futuro
Las deficiencias y los errores son modificables y pueden quedar bajo el control del yo en buena medida. Los errores y las dificultades deben afrontarse, corregirse y ser resueltos.	Las dificultades y experiencias negativas son inevitables y no es conveniente evitarlas como método. Representan una oportunidad para aprender, para aumentar las propias fortalezas y	Las decisiones pueden producir consecuencias negativas, pero es necesario asumir el control de nuestras acciones. Si surgen problemas ya se verá cómo se resuelven y se desarrollarán

	capacidades.	estrategias adecuadas para salir adelante.
Modo de fortalecimiento personal (Con base en Seligman, 2006)		
Yo	Experiencias, mundo y otros	Futuro
Capaz de generosidad, honestidad, valentía, gratitud, amor por el conocimiento y curiosidad. Autocontrol. Mente abierta y crítica.	La belleza y la armonía son parte de las cosas junto con las dificultades y los problemas.	Esperanza y optimismo en que las cosas tienden a mejorar. Los problemas pueden ser resueltos con voluntad, trabajo y justicia.

Table 1. Cognitive modes

Overall, the first four modes in Table 1 are the hostility and anger. In this aggregate, if the person believes that the only way to survive in this world full of hostility and violence among human beings, is the angry and even stronger than the other action, feelings that occur towards others they are hatred and hostility. The violence is instrumental, so is justified by the purpose, then, violence is not directed to another as a person or object of hatred but because it is an obstacle to achieving a goal. The hatred is directed to the other as if it were an annoying and cumbersome object to be removed. If the other is subjected, and not because of disgust and anger, there may be no cause lower occupancy in the minds of the hostile person. But you generate the perception that the other has done something that is impossible to ignore, that is, without a vengeful or retaliatory action, anger will not go away.

The last two modes in Table 1 configure the nature of cognitive mode conducive to strengthening social action to forgive. As already noted, the process of forgiveness can produce benefits to the person at various levels, allowing you to change your view of the injustices that occur in life and consider from a dichotomous perspective not the aggressors and violators the basic respect for human life and, no less important standards, correction of a fatalistic view of the person itself as being passively bound to suffer and endure the injustices of others.

However, well considered, the process of forgiveness may leave his interpersonal sense, since not directly dependent on interaction with the offender. Even in the extreme case, the person can make the decision to forgive those who commit injustices against her,

without the offender learns the process. This often occurs in situations where there is no link or some social reason why it should be any contact between the people involved after the occurrence of wrongful or criminal action. Also, this happens in cases where injustice was committed in an impersonal way, as in the war to be killed persons loved by an enemy bombing which the known culprit is the government and the military leaders of the country or aggressor army. In such cases it is difficult to know the face or the name of the murderer responsible for launching the offensive.

At the same time, the conditions under which, in one way or another, there is a relationship that requires some kind of contact between aggressor and victim may be a need to hold negotiations to allow subsequent interactions with the least possible hostility. In this case the process of forgiveness may serve a purpose for the operation and nature of the relationship (Maio et al., 2008). Thus, compared to an action that hurts one of the participants in a relationship, due to resentment, hostility and fear that result, you can produce a withdrawal or avoidance of the offending person, in evolutionary terms, forgiveness may be more effective in the case of relations between parents and their children. According to Maio et al. (2008) the proximity and maintaining relations of protection and care are needed in many cases at least until the independence of children. Therefore, these authors point out that the conduct of reconciliation, which can be regarded as an expression of forgiveness, serving the function of protecting relationships. In forgiveness family interaction is affected by the possibility of repetition of the offense, the quality of the relationship and the emotional closeness of the members including the insult occurred (Maio *et al.*, 2008).

Paleari, Regalia y Fincham (2010) distinguish at least two relational dimensions of forgiveness. On one side is a set of persistent negative reactions to the offender, such as thoughts, feelings and actions of avoidance, resentment or revenge. This assembly can be considered the aspect of inclement or irremissableness (unforgiveness). The second dimension, benevolence, implies the existence of thoughts, feelings and actions and attitudes conciliatory goodwill toward the offender.

In the context of this last dimension, conciliatory offer three different ways: a person can reach a compromise with someone, who in the past has made negative actions against it, to avoid an unsustainable escalation of the conflict or to obtain certain social benefits, but without any genuine concern for the perceived sins forgiven. Oppositely, the person may be benevolent towards each other and forgive offenses without giving up one's position and decide to establish, if necessary, treated with respect without resetting the relationship, ie a settlement without any additional relational commitment (Paleari et al., 2010). And finally, one can choose to forgive any injustice or offense settlement last week with a reciprocal commitment to prevent future repetition, without the use of extortion or blackmail, or humiliation or offense and to continue working together on projects that unite essential way.

Also Paleari et al. (2010) have pointed out that forgiveness is both a strategy of conflict resolution as a way to respond to offenses, assault or harmful actions in the context of family relationships and partner.

In the case of social conflicts that transcend the boundaries of family relationships and, in many ways, do not depend on the good or bad will of the individual participants is not easy to reach through forgiveness a process of social reconciliation. In this context, Affouneh (2007) has highlighted the problem experienced by children caught in armed conflicts. In most of these major hostilities of the affected population are children and adolescents. Many of them have been attacked and destroyed your city, your school, your home, or have even experienced the death of their parents, relatives or friends. Affouneh makes the question about how, in that atmosphere of deep injustice, which generates hatred, resentment and revenge, the child can develop a moral sense of forgiveness and reconciliation. Is a moral education that promotes peace while remaining conditions of aggression against what the child loves and values? When children and adults with whom they live daily, live surrounded by violence is very difficult to see another way out of their situation rather than violence itself. Affouneh collects testimonies of children used as part of your everyday vocabulary words as martyrdom, revenge and hate.

Whether Israel (The Mal' é Rachamim) and the world of Islam (Bismil-Lahi r-Rahmani r-Rahim) there is a merciful God, full of compassion and forgiveness. According to both traditions, God gives us an example of tolerance, mercy and forgiveness. But these conceptions take second and the dominant perspective is focused on the victimization itself and the other evil. However, in the case of armed conflicts the boundary between offenders and offended usually fades and both sides should take responsibility for the war. The two adversaries should recognize and express their aggression, humility, remorse for the evil done. But in addition, each must, as the offended party, be able to forgive unconditionally generate desire to revenge or suffer other what has already suffered. According to Affouneh this is not possible for Palestinian children and Israeli children likely to either, because a process of education in forgiveness demand justice process to stop violence forever.

However, even when written and spoken much of the increasing deterioration of the world and of humanity in general, every society at various periods throughout history has faced economic problems, insecurity and violence, health as well as social injustice. here it is important to note that there are authors who have a more optimistic outlook and believe that man is getting better and is better able to maintain a healthy balance in nature (see for example: Pinker, 2011). Therefore it is essential, whatever the point where we are between those two extreme cases, the child develops cognitive mode which requires strengthening and a new conception of what it means to be human (Csikszentmihalyi, 2004). Brooks and Goldstein (2003) emphasize the need to change our mindset to respond efficiently to the problems facing man in today's world way. These psychologists, speaking of strengthening the character of the child, point to the urgent task of promoting the development of a perspective based on human qualities rather than their deficits, and in an attitude of admiration and respect for the world around it.

Contrary to this, according to Seligman (2006), most of the social pressures on children of the XXI century are concentrated on developing high self-esteem, self-confidence, autonomy, uniqueness, wealth, success, entrepreneurship, competitiveness, good body image. For this American researcher these are not the qualities that his research in the

field of what he called positive psychology, found in the development of people living constructively and successfully. The strengths that he found in various cultures, which can be acquired through education or foster social processes form the basis of what we call here as cognitive capacity building, virtues and skills of human beings.

Basically, parents and educators can help develop in children the love of learning, curiosity, ingenuity, social intelligence and an open mind. It is also essential to encourage in children the courage, shown when they decide to deal with situations that cause fear and uncertainty, or those which may fail. Perseverance, impartiality and integrity and, goodness, forgiveness and gratitude are the result of an optimistic view of the self, of the future and of other human beings. Parents and adults are role models for the children's enthusiasm, a positive mood, hope and self-control that can help children to work to achieve creative goals. Meanwhile, Csikszentmihalyi (2004) emphasizes that we do very little to teach children to be magnanimous, that is, we do not give any importance in education to train human beings with a soul.

In the mode of human strengths, the longer perspective centered on the individual and takes responsibility for their actions in relation to other human beings and with respect to its future consequences (Csikszentmihalyi, 2004). The person perceives that there are people who love you and who loves you. She believes that men generally want to live in peace and justice even if, often, seem prisoners of hatred and dependent poor economic and political systems.

These cognitive subsystems are socially constructed in a world where it is impossible to be alien to most men and women. So you can be activated easily depressed, hostile or vulnerability mode, but are also inherently human conciliatory modes. With the advancement of knowledge of cognitive processes, and its powerful influence on the way in which life is perceived, it is possible to achieve a greater decision-making about the kind of person you are. It is no longer possible to discover the determinants of their own behavior, it is possible to choose the set of beliefs and expectations that determine the behavior and emotions.

In accordance with Csikszentmihalyi (2009), it is not only a cognitive process by which a person develops more optimistic views and see the world and the future with a positive light, but the only way to have a happy and satisfying life is building a reality that allows a better quality of life, with social, urban, economic and political factors that favor the maximum development of the talents, skills and strengths of human beings. This construction of social justice and equity conditions depend to a large extent, there is a generation of human beings generous, grateful, lovers of knowledge and justice who decide to build a more just society and put aside immediate rewards and satisfactions by the desire to achieve broader social goals of welfare, although distant in time. A community before covet power and fortune developing this wisdom that allows to have a perspective that a sense of the future, with the exercise of the strengths of hope, foresight, purpose, faith in humans and the enthusiasm. Psychology, and in general, the social and human sciences should not only seek ways to change the way we perceive and feel life, but lead to the development of strategies to improve life itself (Csikszentmihalyi, 2009).

Final Thoughts

In this paper we reviewed the development of cognitive structures that support human actions that are considered as good or bad from a moral perspective and have been studied by several researchers from different theoretical and methodological approaches. We have seen the emergence of reversibility by reciprocity in thought (Piaget (1985) is one of the pillars on which the notion of justice and equity is built. Reciprocity that opens the door to forgiveness and reconciliation with those who do not He has respected our rights. However, this same mechanism of thinking can also support a strict justice which can lead to revenge and execution of cruel acts on the basis of the justification of these actions they have been won or are deserved by the victim.

We have taken the Beck perspective when considering that human thought is organized into schemas and cognitive modes. We also accept that cognitive processes in the moral sphere are based these organized sets of beliefs that are essentially social constructions

which lead us to the path of hostility or forgiveness. Therefore, it is the interpretation of the situation and the intentions that motivate the behavior of others and self, which determines the moral evaluation of human behavior. This assessment is immediate, through automated and more elaborate thoughts as justification, condemnation or forgiveness of the "facts" is required from the mode of anger and hostility the first two and capacity building, virtues and powers of the human being the last.

In many cases these cognitive processes can be made after the "immoral" actions and, sometimes, only if we are socially required to give meaning to our actions reprehensible. In cases of justification and condemnation, man, in the words of Javier Marias (2006), perhaps

act without premeditation, knowing that later find the proper judgment or argument to justify what they have improvised their taste or instinct, that is, to explain his actions and his words, knowing that anything can defend itself and that any contrary conviction can be rebutted, reason can always give himself and all can be counted if it is accompanied by his exaltation or excuse or mitigating or mere representation, count is a form of generosity, anything can happen and everything can be stated and accepted, all you can get away with, or even more, undamaged, codes and laws and commandments does not always hold and are convertible into wet paper (p. 160).

Bibliography

- Affouneh, S.J. (2007). How sustained conflict makes moral education impossible: some observations from Palestine. *Journal of Moral Education*, 36(3), 343–356. doi: 10.1080/03057240701553321.
- Allen, L. (2008). Getting by the occupation: How violence became normal during the Second Palestinian Intifada. *Cultural Anthropology*, 23(3), 453–487. doi: 10.1111/j.1548-1360.2008.00015.x
- Arendt, H. (2000). *Eichmann en Jerusalén, un estudio sobre la banalidad del mal*. Barcelona: Lumen.

- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(2), 101 – 119. doi: 10.1080/0305724022014322.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman & Company.
- Bandura, A. (1991). *Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Bateson, G. (1979). *Espíritu y naturaleza*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
- Beck, A.T. (1999). *Prisoners of hate*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Beevor, A. (2005). *La guerra civil española*. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Bickerton, I.J. & Klausner, C.L. (2007). *A History of Arab-Israeli Conflict*. Upper Sadle River; Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Brooks, R. & Goldstein, S. (2004). *El poder de la resiliencia*. México: Paidós.
- Brym, R.J. & Maoz-Shai, Y. (2009). Israeli state violence during the second intifada: Combining new institutionalist and rational choice approaches. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 32(7), 611–626. doi: 10.1080/10576100902961797.
- Cercas, J. (2009). *Anatomía de un instante*. Barcelona: Random House Mondadori.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2004). What we must accomplish in the coming decades. *Zygon*, 39(2), 359–366. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9744.2004.00579.x.
- Levi, P. (2002). *Si esto es un hombre*. Barcelona: Muchnik editores.
- Maio, G.R., Thomas, G., Fincham, F.D., Carnelley, K.B. (2008). Unraveling the Role of Forgiveness in Family Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(2), 307–319.
- Marías, J. (2006). *Mañana en la batalla piensa en mí*. México: Random House Mondadori.

Piaget, J. (1969). *Biología y conocimiento*. México: Siglo XXI editores.

Piaget, J. (1985). *El criterio moral en el niño*. México: Ediciones Roca

Pinker, S. (2011). *The Better Angels of our Nature: Why Violence has Declined*. New York: Viking Penguin.

Pinker, S. (2009). *How the mind works*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Seligman, M.E.P. (2006). *La auténtica felicidad*. Barcelona: Ediciones B.

Shakespeare, W. (1911) *Hamlet*. En W.G. Clark & W.A. Wright (Eds.) *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap

Sicilia, J. (2011). *Estamos hasta la madre*. México: Temas de hoy.

¹ Based on the proposals on resilience Brooks & Goldstein (2004).