

Forgiveness Without Naivety: The Psychology of Release and Boundaries

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE | 15 OCTOBER 2026 | VIII. Human blindness, shame and recovery

Abstract

This concept paper examines forgiveness without naivety: the psychology of release and boundaries. It develops an argument drawn from *Everyone Is Full of Sh*t*, identifies the relevant biological or clinical mechanisms, and considers where that argument may fail. This is a narrative perspective, not a systematic review or an original clinical study.

The central problem

Forgiveness is frequently confused with excusing harm, restoring trust, reconciling relationships or forgetting what occurred. The source manuscript sharply separates these concepts. A medical-psychological paper can ask whether reducing sustained retaliatory rumination or hostile preoccupation changes distress and stress physiology, without treating forgiveness as mandatory or suggesting that it repairs unsafe relationships.

Mechanisms and causal architecture

Persistent anger and replay of interpersonal injury can engage attention, sleep and physiological stress responses. Some forgiveness-based interventions may reduce distress for willing participants, but benefits depend on definition, context and personal readiness. An abused person may appropriately disengage and maintain strict boundaries; doing so can coexist with reduced rumination or with a personal decision not to forgive. Trust, unlike emotional release, requires credible evidence of reliability over time. Reconciliation requires mutual participation and safety. Psychological health cannot be measured by how quickly a person absolves an offender.

A discriminating example

Someone can decide to stop replaying a betrayal without inviting the offender back into their home. Their improved sleep may come from emotional relief, reduced contact, greater physical safety or all three. This distinction is essential: reconciliation, forgiveness and trust are separate variables. No patient should be pressured to choose renewed exposure to harm in order to demonstrate healing.

Competing explanations and limitations

There is a substantial risk of spiritual or therapeutic coercion if forgiveness is prescribed to someone experiencing ongoing abuse. Pressuring reconciliation can increase exposure to harm. Conversely, chronic resentment is not always an irrational failure to regulate; it can reflect justified appraisal of injustice. A physiological hypothesis must not convert complex moral choices into medical prescriptions.

What evidence would change the interpretation?

Useful outcomes include sleep, intrusive rumination, anxiety, functional behavior, perceived safety and freedom to set boundaries, rather than requiring a particular moral declaration. Improvement after time and increased safety might explain reductions in distress independently of forgiveness-specific interventions.

Implications for medical interpretation

The proposed public essay should defend both mercy and realism: one may relinquish obsessive pursuit of an impossible apology while preserving memory, accountability and distance.

Selected scientific reading

McEwen (1998), Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators, New England Journal of Medicine.
<https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199801153380307>

Wade et al. (2014), Efficacy of psychotherapeutic interventions to promote forgiveness: a meta-analysis, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035268>

Original source: Everyone Is Full of Sh*t. All source books supplied by the author.

Conceptual research commentary. Not a peer-reviewed clinical study, original trial, systematic review, validated diagnostic instrument or treatment protocol. Consult qualified care for medical decisions.