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ABSTRACT
The importance of the article is determined by the social significance of the problems of education and upbringing in transitional periods - periods of fundamental social transformations, since, despite the importance of economic, scientific, technical and socio-cultural innovations, they cannot be considered separately from the main character of the proposed transformations - man. Only the intellectual, professional and moral potential of man serves as a real guarantor of any changes, the implementation of forecasts and plans for the successful development of the whole society. The article gives a deep insight into the problem that emerged at the end of the XIX - beginning of the XX centuries in the Russian historical tradition of education, when the tasks of forming and educating the younger generation began to come to the fore. During this period, the most prominent minds of Russian science — philosophers, historians, psychologists, and figures in the field of culture and education — began to study the issues of education and upbringing. As a result of creative activity, in the period under review, a large number of scientific works, touching upon the problems of the formation and upbringing of a person, were prepared and published. The authors have proved that this period of time is the time of the revival of the humanization of education, its individualization, the formation of civic-mindedness, patriotic education and, most importantly, the spiritual and moral development of the individual in education.
Introduction

Education is one of the most important social institutions of modern civilization. The pace of technological, economic, and political progress, as well as the state of culture and spirituality in society, and finally, the well-being of a person depend on the quality of education.

The new cultural and educational strategy proclaimed in the country today recognizes education as a priority in the state policy and considers it one of the decisive factors of economic and social progress, a powerful means of preserving, developing and handing down the spiritual wealth accumulated by mankind from generation to generation (Gerunsky, 1998; Zenkovsky, 1991).

The main areas considered by Russian philosophical and cultural thought should be the foundation for the development of the strategic direction and activities of contemporary society. First of all, a fundamentally new approach to assessing the role and place of a person in the world, in all spheres of social life should be referred to the most significant features that characterize the new stage of development of the education system in our country. It consists in the transition from declarations and slogans proclaiming the full and harmonious development of the personality as an end in itself to the realization that human life is the highest value in the world, and the education system must be adapted not only to the needs of the state, but also to the growing educational, socio-cultural and spiritual needs of the person, each person. It is precisely the lack of attention to a specific person’s personality that has generated many speculative schemes of social reorganization, including reforms in education, which instead of an expected positive effect led to stagnation, ideological dogmatism and, as a result, to the collapse of numerous educational paradigms that collapse when they come into contact with real life. The almost unlimited tendency towards nationalization and the mechanical unification of schools of all types led to the domination of authoritarian pedagogy, and therefore to formalism, alienation of students from their teachers, reduced the interest in mastering knowledge and their quality (Kravtsov, 2002; Milyukov, 1993; Masalimova et al., 2019).

The system of education, as well as the economy, did not avoid the “gross” approach. It churned out the corresponding “product”. Meanwhile, it is not enough to teach people how to work productively, you need to train them to think productively. The highest values of humanity are thoughts, and society is strongly influenced by its intellectual members. Speaking about the focus on the person, its two inseparable sides are implied. This is, first of all, a bright, demonstrative and entertaining conversation about a person, the creator of all stages of world civilization. About man who loves, works, suffers; about man who defends justice; about man - whose thoughts and activities gave the world great discoveries. No less important is the other side: the application of all means of instruction, thoughts and speeches of the teacher for the interests and needs of the younger generation. This is impossible without the long-expected shift of school education to knowledge about the modern society which we live in, about the global community of people, about modern civilization. It is clear that these problems are solved in one way or another with all subjects, with the whole structure of school science (Kalinina et al., 2018; Salakhova et al., 2018c).

Sample and Techniques

The main line of development of the content of education today is its fundamentalization. It involves the organization of knowledge itself in such a way as to highlight the fundamental component in it. This presupposes the synthesis of elements of knowledge of specific sciences as the basis of a person’s ideological position. Therefore, the importance of the evolutionary-synergetic concept for general educational institutions is obvious:
it is able to provide students with training for perceiving a single picture of worldview, the problem of the meaning of life.

The importance and practical significance in this regard of the heritage of philosophical and cultural science of the turn of the century only increases and therefore more attention should be paid to these problems while working out the main areas of development and in the process of forming future teachers, which are solved in the framework of studying philosophy and cultural studies in education (Mitin, 2016; Masalimova & Shaidullina, 2017; Salakhova et al., 2018a).

The search for an “ideal” model of the reform of public education in the 1980-s, attempts to limit local innovations in the most important parts of the school (in the broad sense of the word) ended unproductively. Ultimately, the need to abandon evolutionary development in favor of fundamental changes, the transition from the development of local education problems to macrosocial solutions was recognized. This means that the strategy for reorganizing the school is based on the interrelationship of educational institutions with culture, science, industry and social relations. The implementation of such a global strategy required a new socio-pedagogical and cultural-educational thinking, which allows seeing the problems of education in the context of a dynamically changing world, interrelated with the contradictions of the real dialectic of social development, both in the scale of individual countries and in the universal dimension.

The need for new educational thinking is dictated in part by the consumer order existing now. At the same time, it is well known that the quality and level of products is the same as the culture of producers, and the latter, we would like to note, is largely shaped by the education system. Hence the social need for humanitarization and humanization of the educational sphere, aimed at cultivating individuality in the most direct and exact sense of the word. As Pierre Bourdieu (2007), a French sociologist, wrote, “educational institutions in their totality, ranging from the organization of strictly individual work that they assume to the classification schemes that they deploy, always give preference to the original to the detriment of the prevalent and seek through the content of the material taught the manner of its presentation strengthen the tendency to individualism ...” (Bourdieu, 2007). The system of education, which cannot do this, leaves its students, at best, to perform a limited number of clearly defined duties, but does not give them the ability to think outside the box and, moreover, to make non-standard decisions.

If earlier the primary concern of socialization was the adaptation of the younger generations to the existing order of things, now the task of preparing young people for the creation of a new society, incorporated by the efforts of the entire world community into the post-industrial civilization, has come to the fore.

At the same time, as academician N. Moiseev (1996) points out, “no matter how strong the tendencies towards the economic integration are, the world will stay separated and will be full of various contradictions of unpredictable acuity in the coming decades. But it will be a world of “new individualism”, a society that will strive to ensure that the individual can demonstrate his creative abilities to a maximum extent.” It is quite natural that this world of “new individualism” does not mean a return to the understanding of individualism as “every man for himself” (Moiseev, 1996). On the contrary, it means the elevation of the individual to the level of personal responsibility for everything that happens to him and around him. It is such individual who becomes today as the base element of all ongoing social changes. It should be especially emphasized that under conditions of a change in the social system, the direction of further development will be determined by the values of society (Moiseev, 1988; Moiseev, 2001).

The choice that Russia faces today is by no means only political or only economic one. This choice has a universal, socio-cultural, general civilizational sense: will Russia be guided by the main, determining human
dimension of its development or will it continue to subordinate this dimension to impersonal-institutional parameters? At present, quite definite processes are taking place all over the world, characterized by the humanization and humanitization of man’s knowledge. If the first half of the 20th century was marked by the priority development of physics, and then chemistry and biology, then the 21st century will become the century of the humanities about man and mankind. As the writer S. Zalygin (1987) rightly remarked, “we want all sciences, without exception, to acquire the expediency that is determined by the sense of measure, and this measure can be called truth. Ethics for all sciences is what is needed first of all. But such ethics should obviously be designed by the humanities, for ethics is the essence of humanism. The subordination of science and technology to the genuine and long-term interests of mankind, contrary to the interests of temporary, seeming interests, is a problem that people must solve today, without postponing” (Zalygin, 1987).

The problem of humanization of education is extremely important for secondary general and higher educational institutions. Its emergence in the field of education is not accidental and is associated with the humanization of our whole life, with an awareness of the role of man in the development of society (Salakhova et al., 2018b; Mitin et al., 2017; Mitin et al., 2018).

Results and Discussion

We understand humanization as an introduction of human criteria into education: criteria of high morality - professional activity, responsibility, beauty.

The formation of a free and responsible person should be placed at the center of the entire system of education. If, under the conditions of an authoritarian-repressive culture, the younger generation was given the role of the recipient of those norms and attitudes that the older generation set, then under new conditions, young people do not recognize this automatism and the immutable distribution of roles, which is determined by the disintegration and discredit of various forms of traditional authoritarian culture (Stepashko, 1999; Masalimova et al., 2014).

With all the internal factors of humanization of education, the socio-economic situation in the country, which determines the real prestige of education, professionalism and competence of each member of society, is crucial for building a humane and effective system of education, training and human development. Only a combination of external (socio-economic) and internal (psychological-pedagogical) incentives and motives will allow moving from good wishes to building efficient and effective educational and training structures that satisfy the needs of both society and a developing person.

Social efficiency of the system of education is a measure of conformity of its level, quality and scale with current and future needs, in both individuals and society.

The success of each reform of the system of education is determined not only by material, economic, socio-pedagogical and organizational reasons, although, in the end, this has always come to the fore. No less important is the problem of the conceptual guidelines of the reforms, the balance of its two sides: the substantive essence of the modernization, which really should introduce and assert the new, and preserve the identity of the national culture, rely on it, what we call continuity in the best sense of this word.

In the history of national education, three stages are clearly visible, which corresponded to pedagogical concepts and theories of a particular humanistic orientation, as a rule, alternative to the official line in the educational sphere of society. The anthropological and humanistic trend in the theory of education and upbringing in the 1920-s is represented by such names as P.F. Kapterev (1982), S.L. Rubinstein (2000), K.N. Wentzel (1982),
and others, supporters of developmental education. While the idea of “class” upbringing was consistent with the idea of “class” education, the particularity of the interpretation of the problems of education and upbringing by educators-anthropologists in the 20-s of the 20th century was that their attention was paid not only and not so much to class, social political and ideological aspects of these problems, but to the natural-science and psychological aspects of the educational process, the search for effective incentives of personal development (Kapterev, 1982; Rubinstein, 2000; Wentzel, 1982). The main methodological message of supporters of this trend is that the action of external motivators can activate the deployment outside the original psychological structure of the organism, ensure the optimal development of its individual invariant, but not create anew the required personal quality.

The goal of education is to restore and develop further the traditions of the Russian school and education. All trends are in line with the development of the humanistic tradition, in the history of which there are three leading ideas that have withstood the test of time and, unfortunately, have not yet been mastered in life practice. Among them - the idea of free development (representatives of the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, utopian socialists, theorists of free education); Kant’s idea of a categorical moral imperative, revealing the essence of humanism (man is not a means, but a goal), also in the educational process; the idea of adapting the educational system to man, and not vice versa.

In the field of upbringing activity, the whole complex of problems is being rethought, united by the theme “a group of people and a person’s personality”. The principle of the subordination of personal interests to the public, brought to the point of absurdity, did not withstand the test of life, neither in the educational sphere, nor throughout the whole system of social relations. One of the characteristic features of the modern state of the problem of socialization is the fundamental change in its paradigm.

Understanding socialization as a process of social reproduction, in which an individual acquires the ability to distinguish himself as a subject of his own life and life creation, contributing not only to maintaining and reproducing the existing social system, but also changing it, focuses our research on the interaction of two opposing tendencies of social formation - communication and separation of personality (Masalimova & Chibakov, 2016).

Separation is a process of autonomy of a person in society. The result of this process is the need of a person to have his own views and the existence of such (value autonomy), the need to have his own attachments (emotional autonomy), the need to independently solve his personal issues, the ability to resist those life situations that prevent his self-change, self-determination, self-realization (behavioral autonomy). Thus, separation is a process and a result of the formation of a human individuality.

Communication and separation are socially necessary and inextricably interconnected forms of the social life of an individual, in which the main trends of his development as a person in society find their expression.

The concepts of a person and personality are not identical. A person becomes as personality in the process of learning social functions and roles, developing consciousness and self-consciousness. Man cannot become as personality without other people, without communicating and interacting with them. Socialization of personality occurs only in society through the social activity of the individual. But each person has his own spiritual world, interests and value orientations, experience, therefore he constantly strives to be not only in society, but also himself. Personality is separated in order to realize and affirm its “I”, its dignity. Communication and separation manifest today in the relationship of the individual with nature (Kalenik et al., 2018).

In the process of socialization, an individual acquires general civilized features as a representative of the social milieu as well as signs that are determined by the specific conditions of social communities whose members are individuals: ethnic, demographic, socio-professional, regional, class, estate, and others. The signs of
personality of various levels, the purpose, focus and content enable it to carry out diverse social activities, to perform various roles and perform and free to make social choices, determine the meaning of life, the nature of the interaction with other people and social institutions. Comprehensive analysis allows one to comprehend personality as a system of social relations and individual positions, as a relatively independent unit of society and its culture. An individual character of personality expresses a set of features that determine the originality and uniqueness of its functioning and development, behavior, communication and activity.

Conclusions
The formation and development of personality in the process of education should be based on an anthropo-oriented pedagogical paradigm. The anthropo-oriented pedagogical paradigm (from the Greek “anthropos” - man) is the educational paradigm of self-realization of the individual - the formula of modern humanistic pedagogy, modern humanistic education and upbringing. Thus, humanistic pedagogy, the lack of which we don’t experience in the historical roots, comes from the recognition of human self-value, of course, in combination with the social nature of his being, which requires a definite system of values and norms of behavior. The most widespread type of educational institution that gives a person a start in life is a comprehensive school, which is currently in the zone of heightened public and scientific attention; it is general education, considered as the basic link in the system of continuous education (Salakhova et al., 2018a).
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