

Pregledni znanstveni članek/Article (1.02)

Bogoslovni vestnik/Theological Quarterly 83 (2023) 2, 281—292

Besedilo prejeto/Received:10/2022; sprejeto/Accepted:03/2023

UDK/UDC: 39:177.3

DOI: 10.34291/BV2023/02/Wyrostkiewicz

© 2023 Wyrostkiewicz et al., CC BY 4.0

Michał Wyrostkiewicz and Marek Petro

Lie as the Anthropological Destruction

Laž kot antropološko uničenje

Abstract: The theory of post-truth and the conviction that absolute objective truth does not exist have many supporters in the modern world. A lie seen from this point of view appears to be one of the many ways people contact each other. The conducted research shows that this reasoning is incorrect. It proves that a lie is a reality that destroys those who have been lied to and those who are lying, as well as other people who are found in their environment. A lie drives people away from the truth, replacing it with untruth. In this way, it strikes a person and disturbs the order in one's social environment. Thus, it becomes an anthropological destruction. This creates an "alternative world" that "competes" with God's created world. Also, by rejecting God's call to live according to the truth, man moves away from God and draws closer to Satan. The world "created" by a liar is not appropriate to human nature, it cannot become a space for his development, but is only regression and, consequently, destructive. The matter of lying and its consequences appear to be very topical today when the "power of disinformation" is being revealed more and more clearly.

Keywords: lie, disinformation, communication, morality, anthropology, social life

Povzetek: Teorija postresnice in prepričanje, da absolutna, objektivna resnica ne obstaja, imata v sodobnem svetu veliko zagovornikov. Laž se s tega vidika zdi eden od številnih načinov, kako ljudje drug z drugim stopajo v stik. Izvedena raziskava kaže, da je takšno razmišljanje napačno. Dokazuje, da je laž realnost, ki uničuje tiste, ki so jim lagali, lažnivce, pa tudi druge ljudi, ki se znajdejo v njihovem okolju. Laž ljudi oddaljuje od resnice in jo nadomešča z neresnico. Tako človeka prizade, poruši red v njegovem družbenem okolju in postane antropološko uničenje. S tem nastane ,alternativni svet', ki ,tekmuje' z Božjim ustvarjenim svetom. Prav tako se človek z zavračanjem Božjega poziva, naj živi v skladu z resnico, oddaljuje od Boga in se približuje satanu. Svet, ki ga je ,ustvaril' lažnivec, za človekovo naravo ni primeren, ne more postati prostor za njegov razvoj, temveč je le regresija in posledično uničujoč. Vprašanje laži in njenih posledic se zdi danes, ko se ,moč dezinformacij' razkriva vse jasneje, zelo aktualno.

Ključne besede: laž, dezinformacija, komunikacija, morala, antropologija, družbeno življenje

1. Introduction: Context and Methodological Information

Without a doubt, our times present a peculiar moment in dealing with information.¹ On the one hand, the development of a social and cultural civilization has led to the fact that information is recognized as one of the main values of modern society, and within it every person. That's why we mainly talk about the information society in which information is the basic commodity and currency. On the other hand, many claims and theories draw attention to the subjectivity and relativity of information, as shown in the concept of post-truth, which is used by many people, especially journalists and politicians, to characterize our current understanding of information. In addition, the current world situation related to the invasion of Ukraine and the so-called hybrid war makes many people aware of the importance of understanding what disinformation is. And what effects it causes. All this points to the importance of information in a person's personal and social life (Wyrostkiewicz 2022, 4).

The second-mentioned point of view is very popular today. However, there is no lack of people convinced that a lie is bad for society and every person who functions in an environment affected by a lie. This last statement is the main research hypothesis of this study. Demonstrating its validity will take place in several steps. The first step will be to show the relationship between a lie and the truth and to place our reflection on lies in the classical moral-theological context of human deeds. This will be an introduction to the topic showing new original proposals for looking at a lie as an activity aiming to build an alternative reality in which both a liar and the person lied to are to function. The culmination of the analysis will be a theological reflection on the subject of lying concerning God and Satan.

The subject of this article is lying. It deals with the problem of the consequences in one's social and personal life. The purpose of the text, as the title of the article states, is to give a synthetic presentation of a lie as a factor effectively disrupting the development of man and society, and therefore creating anthropological destruction. In particular, it is about supplementing the current moral-theological concept of a lie with new original theses developed based on biblical premises and the reflections of anthropologists who are not theologians. Therefore, our assumption is to shed new light on the current knowledge about a lie and its consequences, both in the social and personal lives of the liar and the person lied to. In the era of the above-mentioned post-truth and the rejection of classic values, it appears to be an important task for researchers to answer the most important questions posed by people to lead them to integral development (their absolute fulfilment, meaning achieving fullness in life, meaning salvation from the theological point of view) (Nęcek and Nagórny 2005, 474–475).

As the title of the article states, the basic and primary source materials for this study are the works of theologians, philosophers, and sociological representatives

¹ The article is a part of the project funded by the Ministry of Education and Science, Republic of Poland, "Regional Initiative of Excellence" in 2019–2022: 028/RID/2018/19.

of the Lublin scientific community (this is evidenced by the source literature). They are mainly associated with the Catholic University of Lublin, Poland. In this group is also included Karol Wojtyła – John Paul II. Before his pontificate, he was a professor at this university.

2. Searching for the Essence of the Lie

In its most basic understanding, a lie is giving someone information that does not agree with the objective state of affairs. It is a statement that diverges from the truth, an act of deliberately misleading someone (Wyrostkiewicz 2005, 258–259). The basis of a lie is the perpetrator's freely undertaken decision to express information incompatible with his knowledge and belief in a given matter (Communicating this information does not have to be through words or verbally. It can be a gesture or other means that the recipient will see as a clear representation of the information.) Thus, we are dealing with giving someone information that the informer knows (or at least thinks) to be untrue. The premise of lying is to be aware of the truth. Therefore, a lie is a persuasive type of activity (Chudy 1992, 88–89).

The natural consequence of this condition is leading the deceived person into a lie, meaning that they will make the wrong decisions based on the (false) information obtained. As we can see, misleading someone confuses them, leading to wrong thinking and wrong decisions. In this way, it can be shown that the ultimate goal of a lie is not to present what is untrue, but to make sure that the person lied to will undertake decisions and perform actions that would not have happened if they knew the truth. This thesis is the original understanding of a liar's purpose.

According to the point of view presented above, a liar's great cunning is revealed. Attempting to make changes in the world that are not in accord with the truth, a liar tries to use other people for this purpose from whom he hides the truth. He wants to build an "alternative world" (which will be discussed later) through the actions of other people.

It is worth adding that a lie is not just "simply" presenting what is untrue as true. It is also the transmission of doubtful information (unverified and uncertain) without appropriate commentary. This raises doubts and thus indicates its uncertainty, meaning the potential falsehood of the information presented (Wyrostkiewicz 2007, 49–50).

Because a lie is not passively blocking someone's access to the truth, it is not simply a static obstacle that the person lied to has a chance to recognize and bypass. A lie always requires human activity. Thus, it is assumed that the liar will try to give the person lied to the least chance to suppose they are being lied to. Therefore, a lie is an action that not only stops the person being lied to from accessing the truth but actively directs him or her to an untrue area. This is because a liar gives false information by presenting it as true information, and so getting to the truth is difficult (Chudy 1992, 89).

This does not depend on the cleverness, ability or knowledge of the person lied to (as in the case of manipulation, for example) (Wyrostkiewicz 2014), because the truth is completely hidden, “secured” and “blocked” from the recipient. These “safeguards” are the human person’s natural traits, such as those arising from their deepest needs, and therefore recognized as obvious, the pursuit of truth and goodness, and living according to them. It also includes solidarity, justice and the need and willingness to affirm the human person (Nagórny 1997, 174–201; Pokrywka 2000, 141–73). In other words, an honest man will hardly question what the other person presents to them as being the obvious truth. Inscribed in human mentality is trusting people, faith in their natural goodness and living in solidarity with one’s neighbour; these are factors that favour liars.

3. A Lie is an *Actus Humanus*

Our reflections up to now have shown that lying is not a simple or accidental act. It is a human activity with all its attributes, and therefore it carries both temporal and eschatological consequences (Nowosad and Wyrostkiewicz 2005a, 129–32). Lying is an action that not only directs people into the area of untruth but also puts untruth instead of truth into the consciousness of the deceived and into the world in which they function (Chudy 1992, 89–90). The key in the moral-theological assessment of a lie, perceived as an *actus humanus*, is to draw attention to the intention of the informer (*finis operantis*) and the necessary, inalienable effect (*finis operis*) that false (ambiguous, incomplete) information will produce.

According to moral theology’s theory of human action, *finis operis* and *finis operantis* are the two basic sources of morality (*fontes moralitates*) of a person’s actions. This means that, based on them, a decision determines whether the act is morally good or evil. The latter situation occurs when at least one of these goals (*finis operis* or *finis operantis*) is evil, meaning that it is incompatible with the sense and purpose of man’s and the world’s existence, i.e. when it harms the nature of one or the other (Nowosad and Wyrostkiewicz 2005a, 131).

To deepen our analysis of lies as a human activity (*actus humanus*), it is worth emphasizing the fact that a lying person’s goal (*finis operantis*) is to mislead someone by allegedly providing them with true information and causing the recipient to recognize as true something that is not true. Treating what is untrue as true by the deceived is the basic effect of a lie (*finis operis*); the fact is that truth in his consciousness is replaced by untruth.

The decision (willingness, intention, and disposition) for someone to obtain false information is a key issue for a liar. The real truth of the message being conveyed is secondary. What the person giving the information thinks about it is fundamental. If he or she wants to mislead someone, even when they accidentally transmit true information (for example, due to ignorance), we are still dealing with a lie (Catechism of the Catholic Church 1993, can. 2482–2484; Wyrostkiewicz 2005; Chudy 1992; Rubinkiewicz 2002).

In this context, it is worth stating that in the Catholic tradition adopted by moral theology, a lie is included in the category of acts of the highest level of evil. We are talking about actions referred to as intrinsically evil (*intrinsece malum*), meaning those that will not reduce their evil status regardless of the circumstances. Due to their subject matter, there is also no way for good to come from them. Such activity is always “greatly evil” and causes harm to a man who finds himself in its sphere of influence (John Paul II 1993, 80; 1984, 17).

Comparing earlier reflections on a liar’s goal with the above theory of a human action allows us to state that a lie is clearly an evil deed. This is due to both the intention of the lying person (*finis operantis*) as well as the purpose and effect of the action (*finis operis*). When an act is bad, it means that its necessary consequence is a specific evil that takes on many forms. To some extent, it “stays in the villain” and “works” there. This “work” consists of making changes in the area of his reason and will, which are reflected in his or her transformed thinking, evaluation and limited freedom. In an obvious and necessary way, this results in a weakening of the fundamental option (John Paul II 1993, 65–68) focused on the good and the creation of vices that systematically reduce one’s sensitivity to evil, thus facilitating doing evil, and sometimes even imposing evil (Wyrostkiewicz 2013, 52–56). This means that the evil “working” in a man destroys his good nature and pushes him to perform further evil deeds. Another area of evil arises as a result of a morally wrong act “entering into the world” and “working” there, thus contributing to the emergence of evil structures that become the context of other actions (Mariański 1998, 19–32), which will be discussed later.

Further exploring the issue of the essence and impact of lies, it is worth reaching as deeply as possible in search of the essence of both its mentioned goals (*fines = finis operis + finis operantis*) and their common basis. Not only should we look at a specific single act, but also see it as a link in the whole sequence and discover the goals and effects (*fines*) of a complex action. This concerns seeing the entire spectrum of both the effects and their contexts. Only this will lead to an understanding of the aforementioned lie. This proposition to pay sufficient attention to circumstances (*circumstantiae*) is more than a suggestion which, as already noted, constitutes the last of the two mentioned objectives (*fines*) from among the three sources of the morality of an act (*fontes moralitatis*) (Nowosad and Wyrostkiewicz 2005a, 131).

It is also something more than the implementation of a just postulate developed within the framework of the concept of a moral situation stating that it is necessary to include a variety of unique conditions in the moral assessment that create the subjective (though not relative) space of action for a specific subject being a rational and free being. Here we are dealing with stressing the truth that every act, as mentioned, is part of a larger whole (activity) constituting a collection of related individual works; thus, the effects of one action are the conditions for other actions. Relating all this to the evil act of lying and keeping in mind the truth about the social dimension of such an activity, it is impossible not to notice that it generates evil structures, as we have already pointed out. These, in turn, create a new

environment in relation to the original environment of man's life and functioning, which becomes the source of subsequent activities (John Paul II 1984, 16).

To conclude this part about the essence of a lie and its moral-theological assessment revealed in this context, it is worth emphasizing the thesis noted earlier that a person who is lying does not say (or even transmit at all even non-verbally) that he does not know the truth. He does it because he wants someone to accept as true the news that he, the liar, is convinced to be untrue. A liar is trying to build an "alternative world" whose leaven, foundation and bond is falsehood, which he presents as the truth.

4. Lies Result in an "Alternative World"

Looking at the information presented above from a different perspective, meaning searching for the basic goal and effect (*finis*) integrating both of the above-mentioned goals and effects (*finis operantis* and *finis operis*), one can see that a person who is lying is about to construct an "alternative world". It is a "world" that will not be based on the truth, but on what they want, that others (the deceived) will recognize as such, and that this "world" creates false information in the consciousness of the recipients. These people will function within this "world" with the conviction that it is real (that it is based on truth, on the objective state of affairs). At the same time, the liar knows what the truth really is.

A liar is also aware of what knowledge the person lied to possesses and the "world" created as a result of this knowledge. Paradoxically, the lying person counts on the honesty of the recipients, and this happens even when he is not aware of it. A liar's realization of this fact is a confirmation of his premeditated and even perfidious action. His action is based on the belief that the person lied to (a person who is honestly seeking the good resulting from basing his actions on the truth) will make decisions based on the information presented to him (Nowosad and Wrostkiewicz 2005b).

Obviously, these decisions will be different from those this person would have made if they had known the truth. In that case, some other, different action would be considered the right thing to do. Being convinced that the untruth presented by the liar is true, the recipient will do what he normally would not have done if he knew the whole truth. That's what a liar assumes and counts on. This is his goal (*finis operantis*).

One cannot fail to notice that, thanks to the premeditated actions of the liar and the other person applying false knowledge based on lies, this "alternative world" becomes a reality. It is no longer a "world" existing only in the consciousness of a deceitful person, but it is now a fact made real based on other people's actions performed according to false information. This "alternative world" is "activated" by the deeds of a person who was lied to. Next, it is systematically built up by subsequent actions which were somehow the results of the initial lie, or

those whose starting, or reference point were the actions of those who were lied to. This expresses the previously mentioned generation of evil structures.

It is not difficult to see at this point that the spiral of evil is winding up. Therefore, all subsequent activities, which, according to the intentions of the acting person were to result in good, do not bring about such effects. These do not meet the minimum level assumed by the acting person who was lied to, the one who initiated his actions from the knowledge that was based on lies. The reality in which the deeds are carried out does not correspond to the one it should, meaning that the perpetrator "adapted" his actions to the situation because he possessed the wrong knowledge. These actions apply to the "false world," which, as a result of obtaining false information, were created in the consciousness of the person who was lied to. They are implemented in the real world in a way that turns out to be different from the original one.

Due to the inherent social dimension of every human activity (and therefore including lies), it should be assumed that they affect other people living in the vicinity of the liar (if we call the liar the "first" person and the person lied to the "second," then anyone else who is surrounded by the second person may be called a "third" person). There is no doubt that this act also becomes a condition of their actions. It is not a question of directly misleading a third person. The point is, however, that the third person must confront his thinking and actions with the activity of the person lied to or the "changed" person, who is also being misled. This "transformation" of the second person is evident in the fact that the person who is now overwhelmed behaves in a manner inadequate to the real situation. The third person must face the lie of the first person.

Based on the above thesis and referring to previous analyses, it is not difficult to conclude that a "changed" liar transforms the world according to their new vision, sensitivity and altered valuation. One person's transformation always leads to a transformation in the environment in which other people live, function, and make decisions. Every person comprises part of the environment along with other people. This means that the environment affects people's actions, lives and even their identities. Liars live in an environment of people, meaning they see it from a different perspective to the environment they belong to. Liars want to exist in this "changed" environment that includes people feeling the effects of the mentioned change in their minds and wills. They naturally adapt to it, considering it to be the right solution.

Therefore, they agree to live according to these "transformed" points of view that are not in accord with the truth (referring to the title of this part of the text and our previous analyses, we can talk about alternative points of view). People who do not agree with this and are forced to do so experience restrictions on their freedom. In this way, every single lie becomes the cause of the structure of evil (more or less built up and more or less intensively affecting others). It makes living according to the truth and freedom difficult (i.e. a truly human life characteristic of personal beings), and in extreme cases makes life almost impossible. Lying be-

comes a way to achieve the appearance of fulfilment and gives the delusion of development, seemingly natural and harmless, and maybe even becomes a helpful element of the world's functioning.

The analyses carried out so far clearly show that the term "alternative world" given in the title of this section, which is the result of lies, has a dual meaning. First, it means a "world" that arose in a deceived person's consciousness. This happened against his or her will and without their awareness. It is an "alternative world" to the one in which a person lives. Second, it is all about an "alternative world" that is created in the mind of a liar. In effect, the liar tries to live in both worlds simultaneously. Reconciling these two roles is very difficult and requires great effort.

It also requires further lies that would confirm the "truthfulness" of previous lies (because one cannot find their confirmation in the "real" or "original" world, so one has to generate more lies). A lot of commitment is needed to hide the real world from other people and the fact that a liar is the creator of an "alternative world". Lying to oneself also requires someone who has started living in this "alternative world". It is where the actions of the person lied to take place. By lying to others, the liar builds a realm of untruth around himself. This is not only moral but also mental and temporal (Chudy 1992, 91–93).

5. A Liar's Relationship with God and Satan

For a moral theologian, a lie is not only a bad deed, but above all a sin. It violates the eighth commandment of the Decalogue, which forbids bearing false witness (Ex 20:16). Lying also appears to be an abuse of the gift of speech received from God (or more broadly, the ability to communicate), which is an evident misappropriation. Actions against God also go against the man whom a liar wants to treat instrumentally as part of his plan to acquire the good he does not deserve. In this way, a lie also turns out to be an act of injustice, which bears the marks of sin (Derdziuk 2002).

Exploring the problem of lies in the above analyses presents them as actions contrary to the will of God and the love revealed in Christ's saving work. It allows us to see a lie as misappropriating God the Creator, the Savior and Sanctifier, and even as offending Him, an injustice towards Him. Lying is undoubtedly turning away from God and a disorderly turning towards creatures. This means it's a sin (Greniuk 2006, 238–242).

Drawing attention to the object of a lie as emphasized above, these deeds are classified as *intrinsece malum*, and Catholicism includes them in the category of mortal sins (Derdziuk 2002, 182). Classifying lies as such also results from the fact that a liar works in a conscious, voluntary, and intentional way, thus violating the order established by God in very important spheres of human existence, meaning towards God, one's neighbour, the world and oneself. We can see it as a desire to

break contact with God, who is the guarantor of order in the world. All this makes a lie a mortal sin (Greniuk 2006, 345).

When sinning or rejecting God, man does not remain alone. This is due to man's nature, being a person who does not lock himself up in his natural state. He replaces God's authority and plans with a pseudo-authority, Satan's devious plan. As a consequence, a sinful man acts like Satan and executes his deeds. This strong and even dramatic statement not only results from the anthropological knowledge pointed out earlier, but also from research on sin. According to it, whoever sins becomes a child of Satan (1 Jn 3:6). The above thesis, which applies to every mortal sin, in cases where the sin is a lie, is reinforced by the words of Jesus himself. He stated that everyone who lies is a child of Satan, the "liar and father of lies" (Jn 8:44).

An important original argument, which not only confirms but also strengthens the correctness of the thesis discussed here stating that a liar enters into a relationship with Satan and performs acts characteristic of the devil, is the concept of the liar outlined above as the creator of an "alternative world". Here we can find a community that thinks like Satan, whose destructive activity comes from the desire to be "like God" by rejecting the truth about his identity as a creature. A liar creating an "alternative world" succumbs to the devil's suggestions and tries to be "like God" (Gen 3:5); he deludes himself into thinking he is a creator. He wants to become the creator; he wants others to function according to the rules he proposes. A liar treats other people like tools that he needs so that he can implement his plan. This gives his activity a satanic character.

Referring to the reflection on the "alternative world as the effect of a lie", it can be stated here that the world "created" by a liar is a devilish world. It is marked by evil structures and based on them. Although they are the results of the accumulation of many lies, they always begin with one specific lie. Each subsequent lie strengthens and expands already existing sinful structures. In this process, every lie is significant. The alternative presented by the "world" described here created by a liar consists of being different from the world planned by God the Creator.

This "alternative" was not born out of love, but out of selfishness and injustice. These are its characteristic traits and also its basic principles. They leave no place for solidarity or even empathy. What counts is self-interest and achieving goals. Basing something on what is untruth is an obstacle to reaching the truth and, consequently, also the good that is integrally connected with it (Nowosad and Wrostkiewicz 2005b). Such a world does not correspond to the nature of man created in the image of God (Gen 1:27), who is Love (1 Jn 4:16), Truth (Jn 14:6) and the only Good (Mt 19:17). Thus, this is a world in which it is difficult to live and fulfil oneself; it is difficult to achieve one's goal and find meaning in one's existence. It is a world in which man constantly gets tired (although he is often not aware of it).

6. Conclusions: A Moral Theological Synthesis

The analyzes carried out and presented above most certainly shows the correctness of the hypothesis that a lie is harmful to a person who is within its reach. Research conducted according to the methodology of moral theology (i.e. referring to the Bible and according to man's experience, which in this case means using the achievements of philosophy and social sciences, including theological anthropology) (Mroczkowski 2011, 42–60) leads to the following conclusions: a lie is evil. It destroys man. This applies to both those who have been lied to and those who lie.

Due to the social dimension of this act, a lie adversely affects the entire society that it creates together with other people. This means that the effects of lies are also felt by those who are not directly involved in them. A lie strikes every person it touches on various levels of their existence: the personal and social levels, including in relation to God. Lies hinder man's integral development and fulfilment. It is no exaggeration to say that a lie creates anthropological destruction.

A lie is a planned activity, a purposefully executed human activity. It is characterized not only by actions but also by sophistication and premeditation. It is an action that not only directs man into the area of untruth but also imposes untruth instead of truth into the consciousness of the deceived and into the world in which these people function (Chudy 1992, 88–89). A liar tries to replace the truth with what is false. In this way, a liar becomes a kind of creator of an "alternative world".

By creating this "alternative world", a liar imposes "new rules" on the deceived according to which they both try to live. However, since these rules are incompatible with human nature and the world, they come from "another creator" and do not give man the opportunity to find fulfilment. Man was created in God's image, he comes from God, and in order to achieve our natural goal and find meaning in our existence, we must rely on God's rules. This means that people must know the truth that comes from the Eternal Truth. Man must associate with the truth and live according to it. This is because only the truth can set us free (Jn 8:32), meaning that it opens up the way for man to be fulfilled (Nowosad and Wyrst-kiewicz 2005c).

Trying to live happily in an "alternative world" is to condemn oneself to constantly generate lies. No lie or no evil gives man real peace but forces him to undertake activities that will make him create alternative worlds for himself and others. These are actions contrary to God's actions. Thus, it is also contrary to man.

Man, created in the image of the God of Truth (Gen 1:26-27), is unable to realize himself in life except by imitating God. This imitation, however, does not mean the need to create a "new world". It is a call to live according to the truth and good. Here we are talking about a life where there is no room for egoism; it is one in which man "rejects lies" (*deponentes mendacium*) (Eph 4:25) and moves towards a real community of persons (*communio personarum*) by "speaking the truth in love" (*veritatem facientes in caritate*) (Eph 4:15). Research in moral the-

ology leaves no doubt that this is the only way that leads to man's natural existential fulfilment in society (Nagórny 1997, 149–154; 273–338).

The above analyses lead to the belief that from the point of view of moral theology practiced in the spirit of personalism, one cannot agree with statements and concepts that recognize any positive sides of a lie and consider it to be one of the tools in communication for maintaining and regulating social relations. A lie is an act of *intrinsece malum* that cannot be considered beneficial in any case, regardless of the circumstances and goals of the actor. In other words: there is no situation where a lie can be considered a source of good (Derdziuk 2002, 182).

The above statements, however, do not include a naive belief that people will always say “the whole truth and nothing but the truth”. Its goal is not to develop an imperative that would oblige people to do so. Nor is it an absolute ban on deforming the truth. There are situations where telling what is not true cannot be treated as evil. Here we mean, among others, telling jokes, promising confidentiality, so-called defensive speech, or a white lie. However, one must be able to see the difference between these forms of expression and a lie.

Separate research should be devoted to these issues (which is the author's intention). Let it suffice to state that there are situations in which telling untruths does not mean lying. It concerns such a deformation of the truth that we clearly see it is a lie. This distinguishes it from lies. The later are always bad, something worth emphasizing at the end of the reflections undertaken here. Therefore, one cannot agree to justify a lie under any circumstances or obstacles in communicating the truth.

The thesis that lying is an element of communication is inconsistent with the knowledge presented above. Therefore, it can be seen as ideological. First, this point of view is not rational. Second, it is used to justify the behaviour of people who use lying for their own benefit. Especially for influencing. It can therefore be said that the theory that lying is a normal element of communication and building relationships between people resembles an ideology (Chlewiński 1993; Janeczek 1993). Because interdisciplinary scientific research shows that lying is an anthropological destruction – It destroys man and society. Here we can see the “spiral of destruction”: destroying society is destroying man, and destroying man is destroying society.

References

- Catechism of the Catholic Church.** 1993. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Chlewiński, Zdzisław.** 1993. Ideologia: Istota. In: *Encyklopedia Katolicka* 6, 1409–1411.
- Chudy, Wojciech.** 1992. Kłamstwo jako korupcja antropologiczna. *Ethos: Kwartalnik Instytutu Jana Pawła II KUL* 51, no. 17:88–96.
- Derdziuk, Andrzej.** 2002. Kłamstwo: W teologii moralnej. In: *Encyklopedia Katolicka* 9, 181–183.
- Greniuk, Franciszek.** 2006. *Studia z teologii moralnej*. Sandomierz: Wydawnictwo Diecezjalne i Drukarnia.
- Janeczek, Stanisław.** 1993. Ideologia. In: *Encyklopedia Katolicka* 6, 1406–1407.

- John Paul II.** 1984. *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia. Apostolic Exhortation*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- . 1993. *Veritatis Splendor*. Encyclical. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Mariański, Janusz.** 1998. *„Struktury grzechu” w ocenie społecznego nauczania Kościoła*. Biblioteka Kolegium Teologicznego. Płock: Płocki Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Mroczkowski, Ireneusz.** 2011. *Teologia moralna: definicja, przedmiot, metoda*. Płock: Płocki Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Nagórny, Janusz.** 1997. *Posłannictwo Chrześcijan w Świecie*. Vol. 1, *Świat i wspólnota*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL.
- Nagórny, Janusz, and Krzysztof Jeżyna, eds.** 2005. *Jan Paweł II.: Encyklopedia Nauczania Moralnego*. Radom: Polwen.
- Nęcek, Robert, and Janusz Nagórny.** 2005. Rozwój. In: Nagórny and Jeżyna, 474–477.
- Nowosad, Sławomir, and Michał Wyrostkiewicz.** 2005a. Czyn Ludzki. In: Nagórny and Jeżyna, 129–132.
- . 2005b. Dobro Moralne. In: Nagórny and Jeżyna, 147–149.
- . 2005c. Wyzwolenie – Teologia Wyzwolenia. In: Nagórny and Jeżyna, 587–589.
- Pokrywka, Marian.** 2000. *Osoba, uczestnictwo, wspólnota: refleksje nad nauczaniem społecznym Jana Pawła II*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL.
- Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard.** 2002. Kłamstwo. W Biblii. In: *Encyklopedia Katolicka* 9, 177–178.
- Wyrostkiewicz, Michał.** 2005. Kłamstwo. In: Nagórny and Jeżyna, 258–260. Radom: Polwen.
- . 2007. Czy można usprawiedliwić kłamstwo? *Katecheta* 51, no. 4:49–51.
- . 2013. Dlaczego ludzie grzeszą? *Katecheta* 57, no. 5:49–53.
- . 2014. Manipulation and Communication – Manipulation as an Anti-Communicative Act. *Biuletyn Edukacji Medialnej* 12, no. 2:21–32.
- . 2022. Dezinformacja. *Europa Christi* 6, no. 51:4.