FORUM PEDAGOGICZNE

EWA WIŚNIEWSKA[1]
The Mazovian Academy in Płock, Poland
ORCID 0000-0003-1894-1768

TEACHER'S VALUES ARE ESSENTIAL IN EDUCATING CHILDREN AND YOUTH FOR PEACE

WARTOŚCI NAUCZYCIELA ISTOTNE W WYCHOWANIU DZIECI I MŁODZIEŻY DO POKOJU

Streszczenie: Nauczyciel stanowi o jakości i efektywności procesu wychowania do pokoju w szkole. Istotą roli nauczyciela w wychowaniu do pokoju jest przede wszystkim dawanie dobrego przykładu swoją kulturą pokoju i pokazywanie własnym zachowaniem jak żyć moralnie. Na nauczycielach ciąży więc ogromna odpowiedzialność, gdyż wartości, jakimi kieruje się nauczyciel są fundamentalnymi dla młodego człowieka. Celem niniejszego wywodu jest namysł nad rolą nauczyciela w edukacji młodych pokoleń do pokoju oraz uzasadnienie imperatywnych w tym procesie wartości nauczyciela takich jak: tolerancja, dialog i przebaczenie.

Słowa kluczowe: nauczyciel, pokój, wychowanie, tolerancja, dialog, przebaczenie

Abstract: The teacher determines the quality and effectiveness of the peace education process at school. The essence of the teacher's role in peace education is, above all, to set a good example with his or her own culture of peace and to show by his or her own behavior how to live morally. Teachers, therefore, bear a great responsibility, since the teachers' values are fundamental to the young person. The purpose of the argument made in this article is to reflect on the role of the teacher in educating young generations for peace, and to justify imperative values for the teacher in this process such as tolerance, dialogue, and forgiveness.

Keywords: teacher, peace, education, tolerance, dialogue, forgiveness

---

1 **Ewa Wiśniewska** is a professor at the Mazovian Academy in Plock. Her research interests particularly focus on pedeutology, the history of upbringing and pedagogical thought, and andragogy. Address e-mail: wisewa@wp.pl.

Introduction

The end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st is a period of new armed conflicts and political and territorial changes. This was confirmed on February 24, 2022, by Russia's armed aggression against the independent and sovereign European country of Ukraine. Recent events trigger a need for increasing the activity of educating societies for peace. There is a need for daily educational work on peace, the basis of which is the formation of a system of values in the sphere of humanism, tolerance, and human interaction.

A particular interest in human attitudes and actions as important in building peaceful coexistence was observed in the second half of the 20th century. In the 1990s, important publications on this subject were published, such as: *Learning: The Treasure Within* by Jacques Delors (1996, Polish edition 1998), *The World Ahead* by Federico Mayor (1999, Polish edition 2001).

Does world peace in any way depend on a single individual? The affirmative answer to this question is found, among other things, in the preamble of UNESCO's Constitutive Act (1945), where we read: "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed."[2] This statement indicates that everything that happens in the world in terms of wars and peace has its origins in human choices and actions. Thus, every process, including those that today escape the control of participants in armed conflicts, once had its origin in the specific decisions of specific people.

The essence of peace building by individuals is very well captured in the words of Federico Mayor when he argues that "peace should not be imposed only from the outside through economic and political agreements; it should also gain momentum within each of us and within cultures, on the moral and intellectual foundation of humanity. Peace is not imposed from outside: it is an integral part of ourselves and should flourish through our actions and attitudes" (Mayor 2001, p. 473). The human being is not merely the recipient of what happens in the world around him. Within each person, because of his or her history, a unique and changing internal balance of forces is created. Inherent in human nature are inclinations to both good and evil. Humans are capable of empathetic and altruistic actions as well as aggression and destruction. History, however, shows that humans are indeed capable of peace. This is demonstrated by the many peaceful periods in history that allowed the creation of outstanding, lasting cultural works which are the glory of humanity. One of the most important human issues in the modern world, therefore, remains peacebuilding. Today this problem assumes special importance due to the globalized nature of the modern world. Therefore, peacebuilding is one of the most important educational obligations.

---

2 UNESCO.org, "Constitution," https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/constitution (accessed Oct. 20, 2023).

There is no doubt that education has the power to shape a person, stimulate his development, and direct the changes taking place in him. It influences the mentioned internal arrangement of forces and tendencies in the human individual. This is because the inner potential can make a person have a good understanding of himself, his proficiency and responsibility, not only in the context of his own destiny, but also from the perspective of the future of the world around him. Human behavior also does not occur in a vacuum, but is nested within the context of the family, peer group, community, and society as a whole. The development of behavior is inextricably linked to the values and norms of these groups. Existing values and norms can contribute to behaviors that hinder or promote peace. Peacebuilding should therefore be considered one of the most important educational commitments.

In consideration of the above, I decided to direct my thinking about educating people for peace toward the context of schooling. Thus, the purpose of this thesis is to think about the important role of the teacher in the education of young generations for peace, in particular the establishment of values in the teaching profession particularly desirable in this process. I based the process of argument on the following three theses:

1. Educating the younger generation for peace is an educational goal. The basis of this upbringing is the formation of a system of values in the sphere of humanism, tolerance, and human interaction. The teaching staff are the decisive factor in implementing tasks of education for peace, which must be done not occasionally but daily, deliberately, and with full awareness to fulfill the goals of education for peace.

2. The teacher determines the quality and effectiveness of the peace education process at school. The teacher's role in peace education is above all else to set a good example with his culture of peace and to show by his own behavior how to live morally. Teachers, therefore, have a great responsibility because the teacher's values are fundamental to young people.

3. Among the wide set of values necessary in the teaching profession, I consider tolerance, dialogue, and forgiveness imperative in educating young generations for peace. These are all within the teacher's reach and are an expression of conscious choice.

Introduction to peace in education

Human beings have asked questions about the causes and essence of war, and the possibility of eliminating it, for centuries. The long and rich tradition of these considerations has so far not translated into real, universal, lasting world peace. Although humanity's dream remains unfulfilled, questions about the essence of peace are still particularly relevant. Contemporary scholars of this issue refer to two definitions. Within the so-called narrow definition, peace is equated with the absence of war. These views on peace have the longest tradition. The second,

broad definition, points out that the absence of war is not a sufficient condition that, when met, allows us to speak of full peace. This condition is only a basis, a starting point for building peace as a constructive value, as a principle, regulating relations between people.[3]

Alongside political action, education is becoming essential for peacebuilding. It is as indispensable as political activity. Questions about peace, therefore, also have a pedagogical dimension and should be considered crucial to building a more secure future. Education for peace received its legal legitimacy in 1945, becoming a core activity of the United Nations. The preamble to the UN Charter states that it is a program "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women" (www 2).[4] The essence of education for peace is thus: the process of promoting knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that lead to the prevention of conflict and violence, to the peaceful resolution of conflicts and to the creation of conditions conducive to peace both intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, national and international. It requires participation at many levels such as family, school, workplaces, newspaper offices, playgrounds, communities, as well as the nation (Rosa 2007).

Peace education is primarily an activity aimed at promoting a culture of peace recognized as a value worthy of instilling in children and adolescents, shaping in them attitudes and behaviors of resolving conflicts through dialogue, agreement (Gajdamowicz 1997). Thus, it is an educational initiative that upholds the basic rights of the child, creates a climate of peace and mutual respect in the school environment, implements the principles of equality and non-discrimination, and promotes the skills of peacebuilding and conflict resolution with respect for the rights and dignity of all parties involved.

Beata Mydłowska stresses that "Education must aim at the relentless creation of 'people of peace' capable of accurately identifying the causes of crises and assessing the stage of their development, as well as determining ways to resolve them, regardless of whether they are the result of unpredictable random events or have been deliberately triggered, for example, through manipulation. But theory is not enough—education for peace is also practice—the formation of a worldview based on such values as:

- Recognizing the equality of human rights regardless of color, creed, gender, social status, et al,

---

3 Immanuel Kant's 1785 work *On Perpetual Peace* is considered a landmark in narrow thinking about peace. In turn, the introduction of a broad definition was influenced, among other things, by the views of the Norwegian scholar Johan Galtung (1975), who argues that peace should be considered in terms of a process (Piejka, 2015, p.117).

4 United Nation Charter, preamble, https://www.un.org/uk/node/123231(accessed Oct. 20, 2023).

- Respecting the dignity of every person,
- Agreement without violence with those who think differently,
- Avoiding behaviors that trigger negative emotions such as hatred or fear, leading to outbursts of aggression,
- Promoting tolerance that guarantees everyone's right to self-realization and free expression" (Mydłowska 2021, pp. 64–65).

What then is a culture of peace? Federico Mayor defines a culture of peace as a culture "of coexistence and sharing based on the principles of freedom, justice and democracy, tolerance and solidarity; […] that rejects violence, seeks to prevent conflicts at their source and to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation; […] that ensures full rights for all and the possibility of full participation in the endogenous development of society" (Mayor 2001, p. 468). Also, Agnieszka Piejka (2017) defines a culture of peace as a culture of action and involvement, of civic responsibility, of renouncing violence in favor of negotiation and dialogue.

Thus, the culture of peace of the human-teacher appears to us as: a pattern of basic assumptions, values, norms, rules, symbols, and beliefs that constitute one's identity, affecting the way one perceives his environment as well as feels and thinks about peace. A person's culture of peace thus consists of three components: the pattern of basic principles, assumptions, norms, and values shared by a person in relation to peace in the broadest sense. This involves the ways in which a person perceives challenges, opportunities, and threats in the environment, and the ways in which he or she thinks about peace—the qualifications and attitudes, behavior and actions of a person in relations with others.

In the broader sense of a culture of peace, it also means that people with a high level of peace culture think about peace not only through the prism of their own needs and interests, but also consider the interests of other people operating in closer and more distant surroundings. This way of thinking about peace is essential in crisis situations, which we are now experiencing and are likely to experience in the future. Indeed, one of the basic conditions for dealing with crises is the need to rise above natural human selfishness (Cieślarczyk and Kuriata, 2005).

A culture of peace, therefore, refers to the attitudes and behavior of specific people. It therefore involves a person's personal commitment to the world as a home, an obligation to make it better. Therefore, shaping this in people should be considered one of the most important ways to build and strengthen peace in the world. This process also brings a human being closer to his or her creative powers, better able to see him- or herself as a sensitive, creative, causal, and responsible being. A culture of peace thus serves both the individual and the world.

The culture of peace and its creation, in my opinion, should be treated as a universal value, idea, and goal of education, combining it with an attitude of respect for others and oneself, respect for dignity, tolerance, and continuous dialogue. There is no doubt that it is the teacher's culture of peace, his or her values

and attitudes, that determine the quality and effectiveness of this educational pursuit.

Selected imperative values for the teacher in educating young generations for peace

The social space in which we can shape the ability of young generations to coexist peacefully is, before all else, the school space, which should become a space of peace. In such a space, it is possible to teach peaceful and constructive coexistence with others, develop the moral imagination of children and young people, and form in their consciousness the conviction that violations of dignity—crossing the boundaries of bodily integrity—do not and cannot go unpunished.

The recognition and realization by the individual of the values of freedom, justice, responsibility, dignity, equality, solidarity, and a sense of security—as well as with its activity for the benefit of the human community and the protection of the environment—is considered the main issue inherent in the idea of education for peace (Wojnar 2000, pp. 119–120). "Education for peace helps students to transform attitudes toward conflict in their own lives, to understand and respect other individuals and cultures; in general, it helps to form an attitude of tolerance toward all otherness. Teachers conducting education for peace should encourage students to cooperate with each other, think critically, solve problems in a constructive way, participate in responsible decision-making, express themselves openly, share their feelings and sentiments. They should also develop knowledge of the origins, dynamics and consequences of conflicts, especially armed conflicts. The described skills and respect for the values of peace, life and humanity are essential for survival in an increasingly interdependent world, where violence has become a tool of politics and continues to breed violence" (Badowska 2015, p. 274).

The formation of peaceful attitudes at school is carried out mainly through imitation. This includes the teacher's values and actions, which, as directed toward peaceful coexistence with others, are an expression of his culture of peace. Children are good imitators and learn from observing others what behaviors are valued and desirable, and what behaviors bring negative consequences. The teacher works with hist or her whole self, so he or she not only imparts knowledge but also models behavior and attitudes for the students. The teacher must be a role model, with an attitude showing the values and importance of being a responsible person and citizen. If he or she only speaks about this, without a personal commitment to these values, credibility will be lost.

Looking at the teacher's activities around educating students for peace, the priority values are those that are embodied in subjectivity and partnership in the treatment of students. Thus, among the values identified by the teacher essential in educating children and young people for peace I include tolerance, dialogue, and forgiveness.

Tolerance

Only a tolerant teacher can effectively educate for peace! Tolerance is the boundary between love and hate. It is a willingness to help in the name of values. Tolerance is a general human value but also exists on an individual level. It has a lot to do with understanding oneself. It is a strength of personality. Every human being is entangled in the drama of tolerance/intolerance. The presence of tolerance is simply essential. At the same time, it is a relatively new phenomenon, spoken about for two hundred years at most.

Authors describe it as a social phenomenon and as a value and attitude of humankind, through which people express a part of themselves, their personalities. They usually refer to the Latin noun *tolerantia*, which means patient endurance, and the verb *tolerare*, translated as "to endure, to suffer," assume that tolerance is most generally the patient enduring of something (Wagner 2003, pp. 187–192)

In the encyclopedia we read that tolerance is an attitude of consent to others professing and proclaiming views with which we do not agree, and to practicing a way of life of which we strongly disapprove. In this we consent to the fact that the collectivity of which we are members is internally diverse in important respects. In the most general sense, tolerance is associated with an attitude that excludes discrimination against people whose way of behavior and belonging to a certain social group may be subject to the disapproval of most of society. It is also usually distinguished between intellectual tolerance—which means respect for other people's views, expressed in allowing them to be heard—and moral tolerance, found in the fact that one allows (while maintaining elementary moral norms) different lifestyles, attitudes, customs, and habits (www 3). It can also be religious—related primarily to belief or disbelief in God.

The essence of tolerance stems from its humanistic and timeless value, associated with openness, rapprochement, trust, and understanding. The basis of tolerance is respect for human beings, respect for their dignity and individuality, their freedoms and entitlements, treating another person's views and beliefs as equal to one's own. It is therefore a peculiar value, as it stems from humility and appreciation for another human being. A full attitude of tolerance is a disposition to express and realize mutual respect for the values, beliefs, tastes, actions, capabilities and needs of the Other, which does not mean giving up one's own beliefs and values, which are its condition. It is possible to reveal no position by one's attitude, and it is also possible to state it clearly and firmly without refraining from revealing one's values.

The fact that definitions of tolerance presuppose acceptance does not mean that this is the same as the principle of not opposing anything. In place of passive resistance to evil, tolerance introduces the postulate of fighting evil, not laced with one's own selfish motives for action. Neither despicable motives of action, nor passivity and weakness, nor, finally, indifference to someone else's fate, have anything to do with tolerance properly understood. Accordingly, tolerance therefore

means disagreement with aggression against another person and disagreement with taking away the dignity of another person. A tolerant person can be known by the fact that he is characterized by xenophilia: love of the other, the alien, the different, the foreign. An intolerant man, on the other hand, is characterized by xenophobia, which is the fear of the other, of the alien, and on which all intolerance grows. The dilemma is the limit of tolerance, which must exist, because if they did not exist, evil would have to be tolerated. However, legal regulations ensure that a minimum of social morality is maintained. In this aspect, human rights (e.g., personal, economic, cultural) set the limits of tolerance, because anything that leads to the violation of another person's rights cannot be tolerated.

School is undoubtedly a place of diversity: from characters to religions and cultures to economic status. A teacher's interaction with diversity at the classroom level implies the need to focus on the student, his multiple needs, and his predispositions. Thus, it presupposes, not only a far-reaching individualization of teaching and upbringing on the part of teachers, but, above all, a genuine attitude of tolerance. Diversity involves the need for the teacher to make sometimes difficult choices. A tolerant (that is, an accepting and non-aggressive) teacher guarantees the joy of being together.

As mentioned above, tolerance is a value but above all an attitude. What does it mean? The attitude of tolerance in a person, and therefore also in a teacher, is characterized by a close connection with the sphere of spirit. This is because tolerance is a spiritual attitude in a person, and as such belongs to moral fitness, or virtue. It finds concreteness in the humble recognition of the right of others to have their own opinion and in the conviction that no one but God possesses the fullness of truth (Skowronek, 2006). Each person can arrive at the truth in different ways, so the teacher allows for disputation with students during dialogue. An important characteristic of a tolerant teacher is kindness to others whose way of thinking and living is not in line with his or her own feelings, and can thus live peacefully with students, including those who have different views or adopt attitudes incompatible with his. Antagonism is alien to such a teacher; he or she is eager to learn about his beliefs, opinions, and recognized values that differ from his or her own.

Tolerance as an attribute of a teacher is therefore associated with respect for each student, his or her dignity and individuality, right to freedom, independence of thought, expression of his or her own views, and choice of his or her own path in life. The tolerant teacher is also able to listen carefully and engage in dialogue or other forms of nonverbal communication to support students in discovering the truth. He is open to students' feedback. Through tolerance, he or she can eliminate ruthlessness and intransigence in him- or herself, which over time can lead, for example, to antipathy, prejudice, and even hatred. Consequently, it grants students the right to think freely, proclaim their views, and direct their lives (Kozlowski 2000). With this comes the capacity for empathetic and assertiveness, as well as for partnership and honesty. Teacher-inspired activities are indispensable. Through

these, the student can shape, develop, and consolidate the attitude of tolerance. It is noteworthy that this inspires cognitive independence, motivating the search for truth and verification of previous thinking. It also creates opportunities for purposeful action aimed at mature choices and hierarchizing alternatives that value certain situations, opinions, and views.

Undoubtedly, educating for peace through tolerance, while not impossible, is not an easy task for a teacher. Teachers must constantly search for middle paths between the extremes of coercion and arbitrariness, the need to individualize the individual and not allow exuberant individualism, education for freedom, and the formation of a sense of responsibility, the development of creative and innovative tendencies, and the consolidation of discipline and the ability to conform—making the student aware of his rights and at the same time consistently enforcing his obligations as a member of the school community.

Dialogue

The most appropriate way to establish and maintain peace is through dialogue. The basic premise of dialogue is the search for what is good, true, and just for each person and social group. The prerequisite for dialogue is openness and readiness to be accepting, which is expressed in the ability to listen considerately to the problems of the other party. It should be conducted with dignity and without demeaning, ridiculing, or insulting others. It excludes deceit and cunning. People engaged in authentic dialogue want mutual understanding, not victory. They want to share with each other what they hold most valuable. In authentic dialogue, a person transcends the boundaries of his own selfishness, sees the Other person, wants to meet him and engage in conversation, treating him as an equal. Genuine dialogue has at its core the assumption made by its participants: neither of us can know the truth about each other if we remain at a distance, but we must look at each other, as it were, from the outside: I with your eyes, you with mine.

Dialogue is needed because every issue or problem, looks different from different points of view. Respect for another's point of view is a condition for arriving at the truth. As Genowefa Koć-Seniuch emphasizes, "Dialogue is a general human value, and education for dialogue is included in general human values and goals" (Koć-Seniuch 2000, p. 404). Dialogue encapsulates two different elements: personal contact and factual contact. It is also the most mature communicative category, aiming to agree on positions, views, and opinions, which leads to shared meanings. The realization of dialogue is associated with the verification and justification of one's own beliefs, criticism, and defense of these beliefs, with the elimination of conflicts and the search for a common position, with the recognition of differing views, but also treating one's own rationale as uncertain, susceptible to change (Palka 2003, p. 483).

The opportunities arising from dialogue in teacher-student relations, in educational practice, are very significant. Using dialogue depends on teachers, on their pedagogical culture. At play are, among others, the following factors: teachers' preparation in the process of their own education, their self-education, and their in-service training to organize a subjective situation, a dialogic situation. This is because the dialogue teacher considers that the pupil and his "I" is the center of educational interactions. As a person, he or she has his own value, which means that the student cannot be treated as an object. Such an educator is an active partner, seeking genuine contact and open communication. He or she cares about the student's freedom, facilitates the creation of individuality, the use of one's own developmental potential. Educational interactions become "encounters"—deep personality relationships. Such an educator accepts himself, is not afraid of novelty, recognizes different personalities, has imagination, helps through communication and dialogue, inspires trust, respects his or her own and others' needs, and is sincere and creative.

True dialogue between teacher and student requires several conditions: the presence of the student as a person, acceptance of the pupil, reciprocity, cooperation, autonomy and equality of partners, respect for partners, responsibility, sincerity, partnership, trust, overcoming selfish attitudes, patience, empathetic skills, and so on. On the surface, these conditions seem simple to meet, but in practice they are rather rarely realized. After all, you need to give up an instrumental treatment of the student, you need to recognize him as a partner of the same existential rank. And this requires humility!

True dialogue is impossible without mutual trust. It presupposes respect for the dignity of the educator and objective truth. Adults do not always know how to communicate with children or adolescents, because they fail to listen to them and enter their world. Listening to the child is necessary to encourage confidences and to get closer to the reality in which the child lives. For the dialogue to be effective, goodwill must also be demonstrated. It should come from the educator, who must reckon with the fact that the educator, too, may have his own rationale. These rationales should be justified by the compatibility of the words or ideas proclaimed with one's own actions. One of the very important qualities of a teacher manifests itself here, namely authenticity. The pupil, when he senses the insincerity of the educator, reacts to it with silence or indifference. His statements are then formulated as if at the request of the educator. The dialogue teacher must also adopt a non-judgmental attitude, listen carefully to what the students say, refrain from making remarks and watch for similar behavior from the students.

Speech and language play an important role in dialogue. Important is not only the content of speech, or linguistic correctness, but also its tone, the way it is conveyed. Accent, melody, volume of voice either softens the utterance or provokes aggression. In his or her educational work, the teacher must realize the role, the meaning and consequences of spoken words. He should present even asceticism

of speech, restraint, discretion, the art of silence, as this is the most effective way to preserve peace in the environment in which we live. What the language of peace serves must be expressed in gestures of peace such as shaking hands, a hearty hug, an embrace, a smile, etc. If these are lacking in a teacher, his or her language of peace will become pure rhetoric.

The dialogical structure of contacts enables the exchange of thoughts, information, proposals, feelings, judgments, etc. An individual who in interpersonal contact performs reflection, negotiation, and dialogue, has the chance to experience a sense of subjectivity, acquiring the ability to communicate with other partners. Such skills are becoming quite indispensable today, in a world entangled with multiple interdependencies and conflicts of human collectivities.

Forgiveness

Forgiveness seems to be a thing rather foreign to our times, which are marked by envy, terroristic actions, and legalism. But even in these circumstances there is no lack of humanity's longing for something more, for a more perfect reality. Freedom and human rights, respect for life, the aspiration to link equality with justice – these are manifestations of the commitment of individual people and humanity as a whole to a better human experience. One expression of these aspirations and a revelation of a better humanity is forgiveness.

Leszek Kołakowski, dedicating one of his short essays to forgiveness, distinguished three senses of the term. The first is bureaucratic forgiveness, the second is psychological forgiveness (he also describes it as "spiritual"), and the third is "metaphysically grounded." The first refers to formal situations— formally established guilt and punishment imposed or suspended, such as legal and official decisions. The third is the realm of religion and faith, in light of which only God can fully forgive and completely erase guilt (Kołakowski 2004 after Olbrycht 2016, p. 46).

Forgiveness is an important problem of human life and education, which emerged with the advent of Christianity. It is a most human fact, testifying to the greatness of humanity, but is sometimes viewed as a manifestation of weakness or lack of courage. Different perspectives on forgiveness are illuminated by aspects that are psychological, social, or environmental, sometimes also philosophical, and especially theological. The human condition, according to nature, is doomed to the possibility of error and the necessity of forgiveness as a value with which one can be raised from childhood. In the act of forgiveness, the forgiving person converts feelings of hatred, anger, or resentment (also his harsh judgments and behaviors related to revenge or the pursuit of retaliation against the culprit, usually more or less justified) into positive feelings and judgments related to respect, acceptance, and the pursuit of understanding and forbearance, which prevail over the harm or injustice suffered.

Forgiveness is a phenomenon of religious origin, first present in traditional educational systems, especially Christianity. Over time, however, especially in the social sciences, the therapeutic and educational value of forgiveness was discovered, noting its positive aspects: forgiveness strengthens self-esteem, relationship skills, hope for the future, reduction of anxiety. All of these values of forgiveness—discovered on the ground of social sciences—led to interest in this phenomenon also in the humanities, philosophy, and theology, emphasizing its value also on the ground of pedagogy (Nowak 2016, pp. 27–28).

We can say about forgiveness that it is a universal, multidimensional phenomenon. It is universal because it applies to every person, by virtue of the fact that everyone experiences guilt and feelings of hurt. It is multidimensional because we can talk both about forgiving ourselves, forgiving another person, and receiving forgiveness (King 2000–2001, p. 103). We can best see the value of forgiveness by observing the effects in people's lives of refusing or not being able to forgive. A lingering sense of hurt most often leads to serious abnormalities in surviving relationships to oneself, other people, and the wider environment. Forgiveness, therefore, means an internal decision to give up the harm suffered, a decision that becomes a fact that changes the existing situation and the relationship between the culprit and the wronged party. The wronged person gives up retaliation, the sense of despair at having been harmed, and the guiltiness of the one who wronged him. The guiltiness is, as it were, removed from the culprit by the wronged party, which does not mean either that it has been forgotten or that the culprit, regardless of the forgiveness obtained, does not have to deal with its effects and consequences and take responsibility for it.

Also, the process of upbringing is not free from incidents that require forgiveness, and this on the part of both the educator and the educator. How the educator behaves in such situations is a test of his reliability in educating for peace. It is also important that negative emotions do not accumulate in the educator or the student, so that the sense of injustice is not perpetuated. The problem of forgiveness seen from the perspective of upbringing, including for peace, takes on even more significance. The relationship between the educator and the one being educated is not always easy. Further, it is not free of conflicts that can lead to inappropriate, reprehensible, hurtful behavior. In this context, it is necessary to talk about the problem of forgiveness from the educator to the one being educated, and forgiveness from the one being educated to the educator. It is also worth taking a closer look at the educational aspects of forgiveness.

In the process of upbringing, parents and educators should focus on shaping and strengthening "factors that favor the process of forgiveness and eliminating, if possible, factors that hinder forgiveness" (Ostrowska 1997, p.7). Aldona Król, in her article on forgiveness in upbringing, focuses on strengthening the factors that favor the process and weakening the factors that hinder it. Among the favorable ones, he mentions the following four: 1) proper understanding of forgiveness; 2) recognition of the limitation of man by evil; 3) the ability to see positive qualities in

the person of the wrong-doer; 4) the ability to communicate one's own emotional states to others; 5) the religious aspect in upbringing for forgiveness (King 2000–2001, pp.111–116). Each of the indicated factors conducive to forgiveness requires persistent, patient educational work carried out from an early age. Its goal is to develop a predisposition to forgive.

The internalization of forgiveness as a moral principle and value occurs most through identification with real or literary persons or historical heroes who manifested such attitudes. Specific models shown by so-called "significant people" from our environment: parents, educators, and teachers, but also symbolic figures and educational ideals, should show the value of forgiveness in its specific contexts, as well as in specific attitudes.

An example of an educator who placed a high value on forgiveness is Janusz Korczak. The children's Court of Fellowship was one characteristic of his educational system was. Its purpose was primarily to understand and forgive the accused culprit. Korczak himself developed the code and rules of procedure that formed the basis of the Court's work, which read, among other things: "Anyone can be a judge. Once a week, five judges will be drawn by lot and they will judge the more important cases. […] Judges will be able to forgive or assign punishment. The judges will forgive if someone does something wrong because he didn't know or didn't understand. The judges will forgive if someone does something wrong, but tries to improve and repents. The judges will forgive if someone hits in anger or makes a joke, or does something unintentionally, through carelessness. The judges won't forgive if someone doesn't want to listen at all, or doesn't want to try, or doesn't want to improve. The judges will not forgive and will assign punishment" (Korczak 1978, p. 77).

This form made it possible not only to teach children to always try to understand the culprit and give him or her a chance to improve. It also to made them aware that one must first try to forgive, look for all possible reasons for forgiveness, and to punish only when this proves impossible. It is significant that in Korczak's Court, the mildest punishment was the very announcement by the Court that an offense was unforgivable. However, punishment did not close the way to improvement. On the contrary, it was supposed to mobilize for it. Thus, this was in practice an original program of educating for forgiveness (Olbrycht 2016, p. 49).

Looking at the teacher's activities in the area of education and the formation of a culture of peace in students, it should be said that the teacher should focus on the good and not accumulate the bad, as well as forgive (www 4). To concentrate on good experiences and forget bad ones. Not to accumulate bad memories or hold memories of others' shortcomings. Think about students' successes, what they have already succeeded in doing, what they have achieved. This does not mean to ignore problems, but it is important not to dwell on them. People who are resilient in the face of adversity draw on the positive emotions they experience and thus overcome difficult experiences.

Often students do not behave as the teacher would like. This can arouse anger. The teacher begins to dislike the student who is rude, nursing a grudge that destroys wellbeing. It is worth learning forgiveness, the ability to look at an aggressor or rude person in a new way. It is necessary to realize that the only person suffering from experiencing resentment is ourselves. Forgiveness also applies to oneself, one must be able to forgive oneself for failures and mistakes.

Conclusion

The upbringing for peace of the younger generation is still an ongoing task for schools, and its implementation is important due to the situation in the modern world. The decisive factor in the implementation of the tasks of this upbringing is a competent teaching staff, which in daily school life, not occasionally, but deliberately and with full awareness, will fulfill the goals of education for peace.

The formation of peaceful attitudes at school is carried out mainly through imitation. Children are good imitators and learn from observing others which behaviors are valued and desirable, and which behaviors bring negative consequences. A teacher who not only imparts knowledge but also models the behavior and attitudes of learners through his values and attitudes, must become a role model, with his attitude showing values and their importance. If he or she only talks about these things, without a personal commitment, credibility will be lost.

In the context of education for peace, a number of issues should be considered as requiring in-depth theoretical reflection and thorough research. Above, the importance of selected teacher values was mentioned, recognizing these as crucial to the practice of education for peace. This is because it is not a matter of closing education for peace within the boundaries of a single subject of education, especially for these purposes; rather, on the contrary, that the possibilities of building and strengthening peace can be talked about in very different contexts, that this issue should be treated as a kind of overarching and interdisciplinary issue—that these concepts should saturate the holistic and broadly understood process of human education.

Bibliography

Badowska M. (2015). *Programy szkoły wielokulturowej w kontekście zwiększania integracji społecznej i komunikacji międzykulturowej.* „Edukacja Międzykulturowa", nr 4, s. 263–284.

Cieślarczyk M., Kuriata R. (2005). *Kryzysy i sposoby radzenia sobie z nimi.* Łódź: Wydawnictwo naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Kupieckiej.

Delors J. (1998). *Edukacja jest w niej ukryty skarb.* Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Oświatowców Polskich, UNESCO.

Gajdamowicz H. (1997). Pedagogika pokoju- refleksje aksjologiczno-metodologiczne. W: E. Ponczek (ed.). *Biuletyn Centrum Badań nad Pokojem Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo UŁ.

Korczak J. (1978). *Pisma Wybrane*, t. II. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.

Kość-Seniuch G. (2000). *Dialog i humanizm w działaniu nauczyciela*. W: Gajda J. (ed.). *O nowy humanizm w edukacji*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo „Impuls".

Kołakowski L. (2004). Mini wykłady o maxi sprawach. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.

Kozłowski J. (2000). *Wolność i tolerancja – konsekwencje pedagogiczne*. „Wychowanie na co dzień", nr 6, s. 24–26.

Król A. (2000-2001). *Przebaczenie jako wartość w wychowaniu*. „Roczniki Nauk Społecznych" Tom XXVIII-XXIX, 2, s. 103–120.

Mayor F. (2001). *Przyszłość świata*. Warszawa: Fundacja Studiów i Badań Edukacyjnych.

Mydłowska B. (2021). *Wychowanie do pokoju jako ważna kategoria pedagogiki*. „Rozprawy Społeczne" Tom 15, nr 3, s. 61–74.

Nowak M. (2016). *Przebaczenie w wychowaniu*. „Pedagogia Christiana", nr 2/38, s. 25–44.

Ostrowska K. (1997). *Psychologiczna analiza procesu przebaczania (w aspekcie wiary chrześcijańskiej)*. „Biuletyn Stowarzyszenia Psychologów Chrześcijańskich", nr 8, s. 3–7.

Olbrycht K. (2016). *Wychowanie do przebaczenia*. „Pedagogia Christiana", nr 2/38, s. 45–61.

Palka S. (2003). *Dialog w dydaktyce ogólnej i praktyce kształcenia*. W: Karpińska A. (red.). *Teoria i praktyka kształcenia w dialogu i perspektywie*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo: Trans Humana.

Piejka A. (2015). *Kształtowanie kultury pokoju w ludziach – perspektywa globalna*. „Pedagogika Społeczna", nr 1(55), 115–127.

Piejka A. (2017). *Kultura pokoju jako wyzwanie edukacyjne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe ChAT.

Rosa R. (2007). *Filozofia i edukacja dla bezpieczeństwa*. Siedlce: Akademia Podlaska.

Skowronek A.J. (2006). *Tolerancja i nietolerancja po chrześcijańsku*. „Przegląd Powszechny", nr 4, s. 125–136.

Wagner, I. (2003). *Tolerancja jako wartość w poszukiwaniu perspektywy aksjologicznej w wychowaniu*. „Tolerancja", nr 10, s. 187–192.

Wojnar I. (2000), *Sztuka i edukacja – zagadnienia podstawowe*. W: Wojnar I. (red.). *Humanistyczne intencje edukacji*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak".

Online (Polish) Sources

www 1. *Preambuła aktu konstytutywnego UNESCO* (1945), https://www.unesco.pl (accessed August 27, 2022).

www 2. *Wielka Karta Narodów Zjednoczonych*. San Francisco, 26 czerwca 1945 (Dz. U. 1947, nr 23, poz. 90), http://libr.sejm.gov.pl/tek01/txt/onz/1945.html (accessed August 27, 2022).

www 3. *Tolerancja*, http://encyklopedia.pwn.pl, (accessed September 10, 2022).

www 4. Sterna D. (2019). *List do nauczycieli,* https://osswiata.ceo.org.pl/2019/09/05/1791/ (accessed September 24, 2022).