KATHRIN MAIER[1]
University of Applied Sciences Munich, Germany
ORCID 0000-0002-2788-0402

JAROSŁAW MICHALSKI[2]
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland
ORCID 0000-0002-4344-7422

PLUS RATIO QUAM VIS: A PROPOSAL FOR EDUCATION FOR PEACE THROUGH RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

PLUS RATIO QUAM VIS: PROPOZYCJA WYCHOWANIA DO POKOJU POPRZEZ EDUKACJĘ RELIGIJNĄ

Streszczenie: Głównym celem prezentowanego artykułu jest przedstawienie propozycji wychowania do pokoju, które niezależnie od prezentowanej opcji światopoglądowej, stanowi ideał współczesnego wychowanie. U podstaw prezentowanej koncepcji leży słynna sentencja autorstwa wielkiego uczonego Pawła Włodkowica, którą później przejęło wiele Uniwersytetów Europejskich jako dewizę swojej działalności akademickiej – dewiza, która brzmi: *„Plus ratio quam vis"*. Co w dosłownym tłumaczeniu oznacza: *Więcej rozumu niż siły"*. Autor więc odwołuje się do klasycznej antropologii – z niej wyprowadza jasny wniosek dla współczesnej edukacji do pokoju: chcąc dzisiaj wychowywać w duchu demokracji i do pokoju, należy w pierwszej kolejności wyjść od podstawowej wartości, jaką jest człowiek.

---

1 **Kathrin Maier** is a psychologist, educator, and professor of educational psychology in social work at The Katholische Stiftungshochschule München (KSH München). Her research and teaching focus on the social-emotional learning of people from disadvantaged backgrounds, as well as in the field of health care with a special focus on well-being, mental health, and spirituality. E-mail address: kathrin.maier@ksh-m.de.

2 **Jaroslaw T. Michalski** is a pedagogue, philosopher of education, full professor at Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw (Uniwersytet Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie) and The Mazovian Academy in Płock (Akademia Mazowiecka w Płocku), director of the Institute of Pedagogy CSWU and head of the Department of Philosophy and Sociology of Education at the Institute of Pedagogy CSWU. Academic interests: pedagogy of religion, relations of pedagogy and upbringing with hermeneutic philosophy, ontological and axiological challenges of pedagogy, re-socialization pedagogy in personal-existential perspective. E-mail address: j.michalski@uksw.edu.pl.

Abstract: The main purpose of this article is to offer a proposal of education for peace, which, regardless of the worldview option presented, is the ideal of modern education. The basis of this concept is the famous sentence by the great scholar Pawel Włodkowic, which was later adopted by many European universities as the motto of their academic activity: *plus ratio quam vis* literally translates to "more reason than strength." Therefore, the author refers to classical anthropology and from it draws a clear conclusion for contemporary education for peace. If today we want to educate in the spirit of democracy and peace, we must first start with the basic value, which is the human being.

Introduction

The main purpose of this article is to offer a proposal of education for peace, which, I believe, is the ideal of modern education for everyone, regardless of the presented worldview option. As is well known, in the recent years of Poland's transformation and a dynamic worldwide situation, one can point to many reasons that prompt us to such a view of the ideal upbringing in modern education.

First, it should be remembered that the period of recent years—a time of war and conflict in Europe and the world—represents for education, as for other areas of social life, a caesura. From this point begins the process of restoring its autonomous powers, redefining its role in the emerging civil society, and redetermining its educational ideal respecting the existence of worldview pluralism and different value systems. This pluralism, however, means the coexistence of comparable and competing views that cannot be superficially reconciled into a syncretic whole. It therefore poses an important challenge for education. From this time forward, more than ever, education is doomed to have to make arbitrary choices, to realize why it advocates certain (and not other) assumptions about the essence of education, especially education for peace.

As is the case with society as a whole, for those professionally involved in education the period of ongoing transition and various conflicts and wars often becomes a time of traumatic experience. These situations force one to find one's feet in new conditions, to objectively assess the past and one's own participation in it. It is not surprising, then, that the behavior of many teachers and educators does not differ from the reaction of most of society to the historical breakthroughs taking place, especially in key situations such as armed conflict, which affect modern societies and indirectly every individual.

Therefore, education for peace—the search for peaceful ways to overcome conflicts, as well as the social and individual conditions for peaceful coexistence

of both individuals and nations—are topics that increasingly define pedagogical reflection and activity today. Of course, the area of problems concerning the pedagogy of religion can by no means be excluded from this (Michalski 2004).

The need to see the problem of pedagogy of religion in this way was not always as clear in the discipline's consciousness as it is today. Certainly, such a challenge of pedagogical-religious activity was influenced by the events of recent history, such as the war in Ukraine, wars and persecution in Syria, and turmoil in other parts of the world.

It should also be noted that not only are today's politicians, scientists, church dignitaries, and the broad masses of society convinced of the necessity of peace studies, but also that great demands are made on pedagogy as such, and on pedagogy of religion in this regard. Our idea is to rethink the assumptions and conditions that make possible the fields of implementation of long-term peace education.

To demonstrate the necessity of peaceful coexistence among people in diverse areas of life and to bring about the effective functioning of peaceful communication in interpersonal private contacts and in social and political behavior, it is no longer sufficient today to point out the consequences of the absence of peace or also the chances of peace achieved and preserved. Nowadays, it is probably more important than ever to educate for peace explicitly and intentionally as a condition and basis for life and its realization. Consequently, the concept of peace should be seen as "a necessary, complete structure for existence, life and history," as if an elementary structure for a successful life (Popielski 2008, p. 135). Linked to this, at the same time, is the statement that the postulate of educating for peace will not promise success if its implementation begins at the organizational level. Above all, the ability and willingness to change to a way of thinking become decisive. Contrary to the seemingly discouraging and negatively aggravating experiences claiming that people are exposed to the forces of violence and the absence of peace, it is necessary to take as a starting point that an individual person— also understood as a part of society— is capable of learning, including in the sense of changing his or her behavior toward peacemaking. This presents a realistically achievable and valuable goal of religious pedagogy (Bałandynowicz 2022, Michalski 2004).

On such grounds, a clear focus on peace education achieves pedagogical priority. Peace, or a peaceful attitude, is the condition of the possibility of common human life and survival. Thus, it can be said that education for peace is an inalienable basic condition for peace, both at the micro- as well as macro-social level (Bałandynowicz 2019). It is also entirely possible to see peacemaking as one of the many directions of the "new education," which should be dealt with by the school, and within it also (and perhaps especially) by religious teaching: church catechesis and church media (Nanni 2017, Benner 2015).

Of course, in light of the above reflections, one should first of all consider the following questions: What value does peace education have? On what foundation

should it be based? How should it be implemented in the perspective of pedagogy of religion?

In this article we will seek an answer to this question. However, I would ask readers to treat this analysis as an open invitation to think about the problem we are signaling, and not as a ready-made concept or some set of premade (final) answers.

The foundation of our proposal—which, by the way, is contained in the first part of the title—is a famous maxim by the great scholar Paweł Włodkowic that was adopted by many European universities as their motto. *Plus ratio quam vis* translates literally to "more reason (or truth) than strength (or force)." It should be remembered, however, that the original meaning of this motto referred to the Christianization of Lithuania, which was to be carried out by the method of peaceful preaching of the Gospel rather than forcing the desired state by fire and sword. Thanks to the marriage of Queen Jadwiga to Władysław Jagiełło, the leader of the pagan people of Lithuania, a partnership community of nations was established in the form of the Union, in which both nations retained their own culture and identity yet at the same time were united by a common destiny. At the end of the 14th century, this vision of the Union was not universally accepted. The Teutonic Knights did not want to recognize the Christianization of the Lithuanians via Jadwiga's marriage to Jagiełło and subsequent peaceful missionary activity. They claimed that the condition for the Christianization of Lithuania was its subjugation. In a sense they believed that Lithuanians, in order to become Christians, must first become Germans. The principle of *plus ratio quam vis* includes recognition of the right of Lithuanians (and more generally, of all peoples) to be baptized without having to renounce their national identity. Christianity transcends any culture in which it is necessarily embodied, so any nation can receive Christian salvation while deepening rather than rejecting its own identity. In the 16th century, this principle took on a different historical significance. Against the backdrop of a Europe torn by religious wars between Catholics and Protestants, *Plus ratio quam vis* signified an ecumenical strategy for restoring Church unity through theological discussion, rather than by the method of forcible conversion of dissenters (Buttiglione 2005; Borowska 2016). The same motto can be a valuable guideline today as we grapple with the conflicts of war and other crises of our democracy and seek an appropriate foundation for peace education.

What exactly does *plus ratio quam vis* mean? At its root we can easily find an anthropological understanding of human nature. Man is a rational and free being (Latin: *ens intelligens et liberum*). As such, he has the task—and the possibility—of recognizing the truth and acting in accordance with it. Like animals, human beings, of course have bodies. Men and women are under the pressure of passions, which can guide them, interfering with and sometimes even preventing them from making a rational judgment. Humans can be guided in a similar way as animals, using the "carrot and stick" method of threatening punishment and promising pleasure. Thus, there are two different ways to influence people: one appeals to their

"animal" nature, the other to their humanity. The word *vis* should be read not only as an announcement of the direct use of force, but also as simultaneously strengthening or weakening the will of man by influencing him with pleasure disconnected from truth. In Aristotelian philosophical tradition, the former model corresponds to the way slaves were treated, while the latter is a model for guiding free people. To induce people to choose unity in a free way, it is necessary to find a good that will be the goal of all people—the common good. In the name of such a common good, unique, independent, and free human beings can be persuaded to act together as members of a community. Through this reference to the common good, a human community is formed, living in peace.

The quality of this community depends, of course, on the quality of the common good from which it grows. The fullest human community grows not from some particular common good, but from that good which is humanity itself. There is a hierarchy of communities depending on the type of bond that makes up the community. The goal of the most perfect community is the development of common humanity, that is, the common development of rational and free people. At the core of such a perfect community are freedom, truth, and peace. And yet, as a rule, every community also has material goals. If the formal goal of a superior community is the good of man as a human being, then this goal must be used as a rule and pursued along with the material goal. For example, in the university, the primary goal of becoming a better person through the disinterested search for truth is reasonably linked to the need to train skills that will make it easier for that person to find a job and earn a better living.

In all existing forms of human existence and collective action, we find both humane and "animal" ways of directing people, that is, appealing so to human freedom as well as threatening the use of coercion. Nevertheless, we can clearly see that the more we trust in reason and freedom, the more the social order corresponds to human dignity. The more we depend on pure force, the more we act not as leaders of men, but as shepherds of animals (Buttiglione 2005).

What can we learn today from classical anthropology, from which originates the motto: *plus ratio quam vis*? How can it be helpful in answering the questions posed above? How does it help educate for peace in the perspective of religious education?

Main areas of implementation of peace education

If education for peace is seen as a task in the field of pedagogy of religion and as a goal of teaching religion, then the question arises as to how such a goal can be met by the activity of pedagogy of religion. In this regard, in addition to other junction points, the following scopes or levels of implementation in particular are outlined, which cannot be ignored. These are undoubtedly: the implementation of basic ethical attitudes and abilities; the introduction of the subject of peace into

the teaching of religion; cross-curricular teaching processes and interreligious education.

Peace is by no means a teaching topic that can be accomplished through appropriate thematization in a few class hours. It requires in both student and teacher an attitude, or ethical capacity (Heitger 2003; Michalski 2008). Such an attitude must be understood in the sense of turning away from purposeless behavior—in the sense of failing to live. If life in the community were to succeed, it then requires basic ethical attitudes that cannot be replaced.

Nowadays, it is no longer enough to get out of one's own way when tensions arise. Rather, it is increasingly desirable to be able to spot such tensions and areas that give rise to conflict, so as to approach them without any of the dramatization that might be associated with unnecessary exaggeration.

Peace education must first and fundamentally arise from the need for gentle action in conflict, oriented to its process, open to surprises and peaceful resolution (Guardini 2012). Approaching conflict in this way, both in and out of school, is rightly referred to as the focal point of peace education (Heitger 2000, p. 69). However, at the same time, it must be seen in all its fullness that upbringing—which is considered a function of cultural ingrowth, socialization and emancipation—by no means runs *a priori* conflict-free anymore (Bauman 1994). Likewise, in all age ranges of adolescence it would be an illusion to assume that a conflict-free upbringing and coexistence is possible. Conflicts indicate that both the individual and society are subject to continuous developmental processes, and the resulting interdependence and influence on each other give rise to conflictual situations. Therefore, upbringing does not lead to the right goal when one is unwilling to recognize conflicts or negates them, wanting necessarily to achieve harmony. The supporting factor for the pursuit of peace is not the rejection of conflict situations, but the prevention of a "destructive approach to resolving conflict situations" (Bałandynowicz 2022, p. 189; Michalski 2004).

This means that education for peace in the sense of conflict resolution is not only the task of the family, but, above all, also of school and religious education. Here, religious teaching is incorporated into the canon of compulsory subjects in a wonderful way. Namely, the biblical message of peace will be accepted as a challenge only if the basic ethical ability to deal with conflicts skillfully and to approach them constructively is also introduced and conveyed in religious teaching. A willingness to dialogue, overcome distrust, and admit one's own mistakes are as essential here. So is a practiced style of teaching and learning that is free of authoritative behavior and "pressure from above" (Heitger 2000).

This kind of conflict resolution is a "continuous perspective" of religious education in the framework of elementary school, and later in the subsequent stages of school education. At the same time, it is necessary to explicitly point out that conflicts are possible to be considered and resolved only in the area where violence

is rejected, that is, "on the third way, situated between violence and passivity" (Bałandynowicz 2019, p. 57).

It must be considered, of course, that such a path of conflict resolution also depends— to a significant degree— on such extracurricular factors as an unfavorable model of upbringing in the family and genetic and personality factors present in the child (i.e., overactivity). It is in such a context that resolving disputes "as a way of removing conflicts through nonviolence and reducing violence" is assigned a position that must be evaluated not only as "democratic thinking and acting," but which, as a potential for conflict resolution, corresponds to ethical learning processes within the framework of religion, and thus is not only an important contribution to peace education at school (Kühn 2005, p. 102).

Tolerance and spiritual opening

In a similar way to the ability to overcome conflicts, in the pedagogical pursuit of peace education, in relation to a culturally and religiously pluralistic society, the basic capacity for an attitude of tolerance and thus for spiritual openness towards others also acquires importance (Michalski 2011; Maritain 2011).

After all, the notion of "pluralism" seems to represent today the aspect of controversial plurality within the pedagogy of religion when it comes to grasping the contemporary socio-religious situation. The more education is directed at showing adolescents also the broadest possible horizon of thinking, evaluating, and acting in matters of religion and faith, the more it will become possible to avoid or remove superstition, as well as to build positive tolerance, on the basis of which faith in the truth will not be abandoned—and one can, however, come to the humble confession—that "the truth can be found on yet another path and presented in an attitude other than one's own" (Buber 2015, p. 98). Tolerance as a task of education and upbringing in teaching in general, as well as the study of religion in particular, brings significant progress in both the hermeneutics of existence and the nurturing of affect. It seems to represent an elevation above the limitation of a point of view that considers itself absolute, as a triumph over the destructive tendencies we experience when we encounter a stranger of great difference (Maier, Surzykiewicz 2019).

Precisely the aspects of explaining existence and thus worldview, at which something else can also be accepted, possibly without superstition, as well as negative affects should be nurtured, which are reactions during an encounter with others, are of greater importance for intercultural and interreligious learning today than ever. Tolerance as a spiritual attitude should therefore make itself present not in "empty space," but always realized against the background of concrete common life and learning in the family, school, and society, as well as in the relationship between churches and religious communities. Only then will it become possible

for people with different basic beliefs, from different cultural backgrounds and religions, to "communicate" with each other (Petzelt 2002).

Mutual communication in the spirit of tolerance is therefore an essential condition and basis for schooling, also from the point of view of the requirements of religion. It should also be borne in mind that today tolerance must be communicated in the sense of spiritual openness –in increasing measure also between male and female students who are bound by Christianity to the Church, who consider themselves Christians only, but without reference to the Church, and finally the so-called "irreligious" (Michalski 2005). With the goal of education for tolerance are connected the following goals and tasks, having significance in the pedagogy of religion for education for peace:

- Showing respect for other people's beliefs;
- Overcoming prejudices that are mostly related to judgment and looking at everything only in black and white colors;
- Enduring or recognizing the validity of the views and opinions of others, as long as they do not challenge one's own religious beliefs and one's own understanding of faith;
- Having concern for interreligious understanding, which, of course, does not have to turn out to be a syncretic amalgamation or reduction to elementary communities, but the discovery of (often obscured) unity in (claiming its own dignity) multiplicity (Popielski 2008; Michalski 2008).

In such a context, it becomes clear that it is also through the study of religion, in which an atmosphere of spiritual openness and tolerance is present, that the foundation of a community defined by a peaceful disposition, a desire for mutual understanding and respect can be built. To what extent such education for tolerance can be understood as "a preliminary step to the recognition of differences," rather than just "putting up with something," however, cannot be sufficiently defined today in terms of interfaith learning.

Empathy and solidarity

The ability to empathize is, from the point of view of peace education pedagogy, another important basic ethical ability and attitude. It must be categorized largely in the emotional sphere. It is characterized by the fact that someone able to enter and "empathize" with the role of another person (Picchi 2021; Maritain 2011; Nowak 1999). The process of empathizing can lead all the way to identifying with that other person, including his or her attitudes toward various issues and ways of acting. This means that also through school-led endeavors toward education and upbringing—particularly through religious instruction—the ability to maintain a primal sensitivity to the suffering of others is conveyed against various resistances (Michalski 2008), and to discover how to bring help through solidarity. It also constantly includes an element of pondering, sorting out, examining, and taking

reality seriously; a readiness to understand people who think and act differently, to empathize with their motives and intentions.

Education for peace in terms of empathy is aimed at imparting the basic ability to see a situation through the eyes of another person. Such "education for sensitivity, even for desensitization to suffering from ongoing injustice" arouses compassion and sympathy for victims of hatred and violence, as well as disgust for violence and war (Zasępa 2002, p. 61). Empathy seen in this way almost allows itself to be embraced as a teaching principle that co-creates education and upbringing in school, and thus the process of teaching religion. Under the term "compassion" (sharing with someone the consequences of feeling and acting), which in Johann Baptist Metz's inadequate expression of the word "empathy" evokes associations that tend too strongly toward "privacy." This basic ability and attitude are especially in recent times convincingly open and fruitful in the aspect of pedagogy of religion also during practical implementation (Metz 2007).

By fostering in students during religious instruction the basic capacity for empathy, leading to "compassion," there is a sharpening of the outlook of adolescents growing up on the issue of solidarity with people who are suffering, disenfranchised, marginalized, and affected by violence. However, on the path of such complicit and compassionate solidarity, the ground can be prepared for the necessity of peaceful coexistence among people.

Arguably, the basic abilities and attitudes presented can be fully understood as generally important social and pedagogical goals, and not only evaluated in terms of the pedagogy of religion. However, the task of teaching religion at school, which needs to be implemented in the conditions of opportunities created by the social environment, is to a special extent also to take into account education for peace in such a way that, starting from the Christian responsibility for man and the world, to sensitize all the basic ethical abilities considered to contribute to the promotion of peace (Zarzycka, Tychmanowicz 2015; Michalski 2004).

In any case, attitudes beneficial to peace education can come from learning strategies for overcoming conflict, educating for openness and tolerance, and introducing empathy. Among these must undoubtedly be mentioned: becoming aware of one's own limits, showing respect for others, and committing to decisions based on conscience and personal merit, meaning personal discretion (Dürckheim 1996).

Peace education as part of interreligious learning

Both younger and older students are equally affected by the statement that in teaching and learning at school it is necessary to implement and nurture such basic attitudes and abilities as those mentioned above, which lead to conflict resolution, tolerance, and peaceful relations between male and female students. Seen in this way, peace education is not, as a rule, an elaborate pedagogical program with many

guidelines, learning goals and objectives, but finds its foundation in the practical experience that each student, or pupil, learns and practices in school such relations to others as he or she would wish for himself or herself. It is on such a basis that peace education is one of the most essential tasks of education and a central educational goal, requiring a solution as broadly as possible. This also includes, with its appropriate prominence, the explicit thematization of teaching, above all regarding religious instruction.

Peace education today is increasingly possible through the aforementioned junction points also in terms of learning involving multiple religions. As some announcements rightly recognize, many conflicts (and situations with the origins of conflicts) arise at the intersection of cultures and religions. Also, adolescents growing up today are increasingly confronted with a multiplicity of forms and lifestyles, both on a private and social level. They should therefore familiarize themselves with the large number of projects needed to understand themselves and the world. Added to this is the pluralism of values, making it difficult for adolescents to acquire an ethical identity. Thus, religious learning processes should be carried out within a framework of deep pluralism (Michalski 2008). Modern schools have become, for a large part of the students—as a result of their diverse cultural and religious backgrounds—places of cross-cultural as well as cross-religious encounters. To a significant extent this is because of the enormous mobility and flow of information associated with the ubiquity of media. In addition, it must be said that the knowledge of foreign cultures and religions has grown enormously in broad sections of society. In such a context, interreligious learning is a momentous task of education and upbringing, and thus also of religious instruction. Such learning, which is decisively differentiated from mono- and multi-religious learning, "implies not only the pursuit of mutual understanding, tolerance, respect; it also implies self-reflection and self-criticism" (Heitger 2003, p. 93). To the extent that one's own religion "will not be spared from critical self-reflection and self-construction in this learning," through which there may also be moments of uncertainty, interreligious learning cannot only mean fully "interesting, challenging and fascinating" (Heitger 2000, p. 53) dialogue, in the sense of experimenting with religion, to which young people are particularly open. Dealing with religion will be open to interreligious learning processes within religion in our postmodern times and in the future. However, when interreligious learning, in the above-mentioned terms, is supported primarily by learning through encounters, then schools, and with them teaching processes, almost as places in the rank of institutions for creating opportunities for learning processes, occupy an important position (Heitger 2003). In doing so, students come together as members of various religious groups for the daily life practice of a community composed of learners. Here an opportunity arises for them to share thoughts with each other about their religion and faith, regardless of how simple and elementary the content is conceptually and structurally (Michalski 2005).

In the lifelong and concretely experienced exchange of thoughts on other religions, forms of objectification regarding the images of man and God underlying these religions are also undertaken, followed by the rituals and forms of worship services, various ethical connections, and assistance to the weak and needy. In this way, interreligious learning processes that are close to concrete life can be initiated (Michalski 2007).

In doing so, interreligious learning exhibits the following aspects:

- Learning through encounter: this can transcend the narrow school framework when direct relations are established with members and representatives of other religions.
- Perception without bias: even when perception and recognition takes place without being influenced by one's own point of view, the idea is to enter and empathize with the other person's situation, problems, and outlook as unbiasedly as possible.
- The principle of fostering recognition of the other person: a stranger and of a different faith will not be seen as a threat to one's own point of view. Namely, this is "the principle of recognizing another person in his or her distinctiveness" (Metz 2007, p. 142).
- Cross-curricular teaching: the points of one's own religion and the other's religion cannot be thematized in a substantive way with the relevant aspects of general history and history of religion, language in the context of religion, and sociology. Images of God, Holy Books, prophets and founders of religion, initial ethical principles and obligations, gender roles or religious practice can be mentioned as single examples linked to the content.

Interreligious learning that pays attention to these moments can be pursued whether or not the students are in the Church community. Through such learning, as much as possible, all those taking part in religious instruction should be included in a learning process that, in addition to awareness of one's own culture and religion, includes acquiring the ability to notice both one's own and another's religious behavior. Becoming sensitive to the other in his or her difference, which also relates to the religion or faith he or she professes, expands tolerance toward him or her, including understanding his or her religious distinctiveness. For this reason, interreligious understanding must also, taken seriously, become, in terms of multicultural coexistence, "an integrated moment of religious education and training" (Michalski 2007, Bałandynowicz 2022). In school and in the teaching of religion as the main space for gathering experiences, through such teaching processes the foundations of understanding, often increasingly necessary for peaceful life in families, society, and also in relations between nations, can be initiated and created.

Instead of a conclusion

The analysis and thoughts presented can be applied to a certain text from Haggadic theology, also with great power of expression in the aspect of educating for peace (Metz 2007). There we encounter the following story: Rabbi Baruka of Chusa often went to the marketplace in Lapet. One day he met the prophet Elijah there. Then he asked him this way: In all the crowd of people gathered in the marketplace, is there even one person who will share in the world to come? Elijah replied: No, there is no one like that.

Later, however, two other men came to the marketplace, and then Elijah said to Rabbi Baruk: Just both of these men will share in life in the world to come. Then the Rabbi turned to the newcomers with the question: What is your profession? They answered: We are clowns, when we see someone who is sad, then we cheer him up. On the other hand, when we see people quarreling, we try to reconcile them (Metz 2007, pp. 23–24). The share in life—in the world to come—is, according to this, the one who comforts the afflicted, ends disputes and acts of violence, brings about reconciliation and thus contributes to peacemaking. As religious teaching makes its contribution to peaceful coexistence with the help of its goals and content—on the concrete level of the relationship and interaction between teacher and student, and above all through the person of the teacher—it will give "participation in life in the world to come." This participation was promised by Jesus in His Beatitudes spoken in the Sermon on the Mount, saying: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God" (Matthew 5:9). This peace must also be realized in the place of religious instruction, through religious education.

Pope John Paul II, speaking to an international movement of canon lawyers gathered with personalities from the UN, UNESCO, the Council of Europe, said: "It is to be desired that every program, every plan for the social, economic, political, cultural development of Europe, should always put in the first place the human being with his highest dignity and with his inalienable rights, the indispensable foundation of authentic progress" (John Paul II, 1980).

For education for peace, a clear conclusion flows from this. If we want to educate in the spirit of peace and for peace, we should first start from the basic value, which is man. Paraphrasing the words of the unforgettable John Paul II that the human being is the way of the Church, we can say that the human being is also the way to true peace in Poland, Europe, and the world.

Bibliography

Bałandynowicz A. (2019). *Probacja. Resocjalizacja z udziałem społeczeństwa. Konteksty antropologiczno-filozoficzne*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.

Bałandynowicz A. (2022). *Pokój fundamentem człowieczeństwa*. Warszawa: Difin.

Bauman Z. (1994). *Wieloznaczność nowoczesna – nowoczesność wieloznaczna*. Warszawa: PWN.

Benner, D. (2015). *Allgemeine Pädagogik. Eine systematisch-problemgeschichtliche Einführung in die Grundstruktur pädagogischen Denkers und Handelns*. München-Weinheim: Juventa Verlag.

Borowska, T. (2016). *Pedagogika ograniczeń ludzkiej egzystencji*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IBE.

Buber M. (2015). *Problem człowieka*. Warszawa: PWN.

Buttiglione R., *Plus ratio quam vis. Koncepcja demokracji na progu XXI wieku*. Ethos 69-70, 2005, s. 441–449.

Dienelt, K. (2015). *Pädagogische Antropologie. Eine Wissenschaftsteorie*. Köln-Wiemar-Wien: A. Henn Verlag.

Dürckheim K. (1996). *Der Ruf nach dem Meister. Die Bedeutung geistiger Führung auf dem Weg zum Selbst*. Bern: Piper Verlag.

Guardini R. (2012). *Sorge um den Menschen*. Würzburg: Werkbund-Verlag.

Heitger, M. (2000). *Beiträge zu einer Pädagogik des Dialogs. Eine Einführung. Mit einem Beitrag von Ines M. Breinbauer*. Wien: Franz Deuticke Verlag.

Heitger, M. (2001). *Die Abrichtung des Menschen. Von der Gefahr Gegenwärtiger Pädagogik ihr Subjekt zu verlieren*. Vierteljahresschrift für wissenschaftliche Pädagogik, nr 1. Jg. 62, s. 41–51.

Heitger, M. (2003). *Lehrer sein heute*. Innsbruck: Werkbund-Verlag.

Jan Paweł II. (1980). *Per construire L'Europa degli uomini*. La traccia, n. 10, Roma.

Kuczkowski S. (1998). *Psychologia religii*. Kraków: WAM.

Kühn, E. (2005). *Pädagogik aus Verantwortung. Überlegungen zur Aktualität prinzipiengeleiteter Erziehung in der Schule*. Frankfurt am Main: Springer Verlag.

Längle, A. (2019). *Wege zum Sinn. Logotherapie als Orientierungshilfe*. München: Piper Verlag.

Maier K., Surzykiewicz J. (2019). *Hoffnung und Spiritualität als vernachlässigte Ressourcen*. Göttingen: SAR.

Maritain J. (2011). *L'educazione della persona*. Brescia: La Scuola Editrice.

Metz J.B. (2007). *Memoria passionis. Una evocacion provocadora en una sociedad pluralista*. Madrid: Sal Terrae Editorial.

Michalski, J. (2004). *Edukacja i religia jako źródła rozwoju egzystencjalno-kognitywnego. Studium hermeneutyczno-krytyczne*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.

Michalski J. (2005). *Wartości w procesie wychowania. Znaczenie i konieczność,* Forum Oświatowe 1(32), s. 38–55.

Michalski J. (2007). *Doświadczenie przeżyte czy rytualne wdrożenie. W kierunku współczesnej edukacji religijnej,* Problemy Wczesnej Edukacji nr 1/2 (5/6), s. 33–49.

Michalski J. (2008). *Edukacja religijna a epoka ponowoczesna,* Paedagogia Christiana nr 1 (21), s. 229–240.

Michalski, J. (2011). *Sens życia a pedagogika. Impulsy myśli Viktora E. Frankla.* Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika

Nanni, C. (2017). *Introduzione alla filosofia dell'educazione. Profesione pedagogista teorico?* Roma: LAS.

Nowak M. (1999). *Podstawy pedagogiki otwartej. Ujęcie dynamiczne w inspiracji chrześcijańskiej.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

Petzelt, A. (2002). *Wissen und Haltung. Eine Untersuchung zum Begriff der Bildung.* Freiburg: Quelle und Meyer Verlag.

Petzelt, A. (2003). *Von der Frage. Ein Studie zum Begriff der Bildung.* Freiburg: Quelle und Meyer Verlag.

Picchi, M. (2021). *Progetto Uomo.* Milano: Editrice La Scuola.

Popielski, K. (2008). *Psychologia egzystencji. Wartości w życiu człowieka.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.

Tomaszewski T. (2012). *Człowiek i otoczenie.* W: Tomaszewski T. (red.). *Psychologia.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, s. 13–36.

Zarzycka B., Tychmanowicz A. (2015). *Wiara i siła. Religijność w procesach koherencji.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Zasępa E. (2002). *Personalny wymiar religijności a poczucie koherencji i poczucie bezpieczeństwa.* „Studia Psychologica", nr 53, s. 52–67.