

HISTORICAL FORMS OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC ENVIRONMENT IN MODERN HISTORY

Gulbarshyn KYRGYZKHAN¹, Gulnar BALAKHMETOVA¹,
Mukhtar MURATKAZIN¹, Nurbolat MANAPBAEV¹,
Dariya ASSYMOVA¹

¹Institute of History and Law, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract: *The scientific research environment at the beginning of the 19th century is formed on the basis of understanding the structural features of the research forms. It should be stated that each of the stages in the development of science is based not only on the comprehension of new research methods and obtaining new scientific and practical results, but also on the development of a social category of scientific research. With that, the structure of the study of new results and methods is predicted as a concept for the development of a new picture of a scientific explanation of the essence of phenomena. The novelty of the study lies in the development of a social basis for new types of research, created within the development of the concept of the target function. At present, all technologies are aimed not only at mass production, but also at the development of a personal attitude towards technology. The authors of the paper demonstrate the development of a value model of technology that emerged in modern history. The paper proves that the leading importance in this case is the extent to which a person defines himself as an integral personality. The practical significance of the study is determined by the structural support for the implementation of these features based on the concepts of social development.*

Keywords: ratiocentrism, dignity, freedom, tolerance, knowledge.

The new philosophy of dignity, despite its ratiocentrism, constantly emphasises that it strives to ensure that the humane does not turn out to be to the detriment of the divine and that the opening of the ways of feelings and a bright flash of natural light do not evoke night and disbelief in the divine sacraments in human souls, so that pure reason, liberated from false images and vanity and yet obedient and devoted to divine revelation, would pay tribute to faith¹. A radical reorientation of values from transcendental to human morality, crystallisation of a utilitarian view of human dignity were combined with the subsequent deistic recognition and content of the idea of God, the idea of an immortal human soul. According to Francis Bacon, “God created the human mind like a mirror capable of displaying the entire Universe”, and “the human spirit is similar to a divine beacon”² which he uses to explore the hidden secrets of nature. In the philosophy of modern history, the principles of

¹ S. Karimi, H.J.A. Biemans, M.K. Naderi, T. Lans, M. Chizari, M. Mulder, “Testing the relationship between personality characteristics, contextual factors and entrepreneurial intentions in a developing country” in *International Journal of Psychology*, 2017, vol. 52, no. 3, p. 227-240.

² F. Bacon, *Works: in 2 volumes*, “Mysl” (Philosophical heritage), Moscow, 1971, p. 590.

secularism and utilitarianism begin to form, through the lens of which the problem of dignity is analysed³.

Without attempting to deny the transcendence of moral forces that are required to mainstream human dignity, the philosophy of modern history sought to substantiate the ethical inherent value and moral autonomy of the human person, thereby reviving the antique ideal: “Internal unrest affects us more than passions, and has much more power over us, than the latter⁴. For the soul to find strength to fight all external anxieties, it always needs internal satisfaction, then they will not only do no harm, but, on the contrary, will increase the joy of life, and, having overcome anxiety, the soul will feel its perfection⁵. And for the soul to be satisfied, it merely must follow the path of virtue at all times.

Everyone who lives in such a way that their conscience cannot reproach them for anything, does what they consider best; this is what it means to walk the path of virtue⁶. The pleasure of realising this is so great, and everyone considers themselves so happy because of this, that the most violent pressure of passions cannot disturb their peace of mind⁷. René Descartes writes about this: “Satisfaction is constantly experienced by those who walk the path of virtue at all times, it is a habit of their soul, the name of which is peace or an easy conscience⁸. The pleasure experienced by those who have just done a good deed is passion, that is, a kind of joy that can be considered the most pleasant of all, because the reason for it depends on us⁹”.

In contrast to the “inner satisfaction” that people receive when they realise the dignity of their deed, René Descartes uses the concept of “pride”¹⁰ to denote the external component of revealing the value of human existence, which he understands as joy based both on love for oneself, and on praise, recognition of the dignity of your deed by others. “Both of these passions are a

³ Y. Shoda, W. Mischel, “Applying meta-theory to achieve generalisability and precision in personality science”, in *Applied Psychology*, 2006, vol. 55, no. 3, p. 439-452.

⁴ P.J. Giordano, “Personality as continuous stochastic process: what western personality theory can learn from classical confucianism”, in *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 2014, vol. 48, no 2, p. 111-128.

⁵ T.B. Neilands, D.H. Silvera, J.A. Perry, A. Richardsen, A. Holte, “A validation and short form of the basic character inventory: personality and social sciences”, in *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 2008, vol. 49, no. 2, p. 161-168.

⁶ J. Head, “A model to link personality characteristics to a preference for science”, in *European Journal of Science Education*, 1980, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 295-300.

⁷ W.A. Rottschaefer, “Philosophical and religious implications of cognitive social learning theories of personality”, in *Zygon*, 1991, vol. 26, no. 1, p. 137-148.

⁸ J.W. Jones, “Personality and epistemology: cognitive social learning theory as a philosophy of science”, in *Zygon*, 1989, vol. 24, no. 1, p. 23-38.

⁹ R. Descartes, *Discourse on the method for the correct direction of reason and the search for truth in the sciences*, “Eksmo”, Moscow, 2015, p. 135.

¹⁰ R. Descartes, *Discourse on the method for the correct direction of reason and the search for truth in the sciences*, “Eksmo”, Moscow, 2015, p. 135.

sort of two kinds of self-respect, two kinds of joy, because respecting others gives rise to self-respect”¹¹.

In René Descartes¹², considers respect and neglect as important value-emotional states of a person, which “have a special meaning when we turn them to ourselves, that is, when we respect or despise our own dignity”¹³. Every person who honours their personal dignity should be aware of “what they can respect and what they can despise themselves for”. There is only one foundation on which a person's self-esteem is based – it is the freedom of will and power of a person over their own desires: “For only actions that depend on our freedom give reason to praise or find fault. Freedom of will allows us to rule over ourselves and thus makes us godlike to a certain extent, if only through our own faintness we do not lose the rights that He gives us”. The conditions for human dignity are the principle of human freedom and the principle of rationalism, since a person must consciously limit their own desires, and thereby acquire the status of dignity¹⁴.

The true value of a person, which allows them to respect themselves, lies in the realisation that in fact they only have the right to control their own desires, and recognition and censure depend only on whether they use this right well or badly¹⁵. Furthermore, such a person feels in themselves a firm and unshakable confidence to take this right for granted, that is, to take on everything they consider best and to complete what they started; this is what walking the path of dignity means¹⁶. Those who have this realisation of personal dignity will easily be convinced that everyone can find this feeling in themselves, because there is nothing in it that would depend on others¹⁷. People who have this feeling never neglect anyone; although they often see others making mistakes

¹¹ R.J. Davidson, “Toward a biology of personality and emotion” in *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 2001, no. 935, p. 191-207.

¹² R. Descartes, *Discourse on the method for the correct direction of reason and the search for truth in the sciences*, “Eksmo”, Moscow, 2015, p. 135.

¹³ P.A. Rosen, D.H. Kluemper, “The impact of the big five personality traits on the acceptance of social networking website”, in *14th Americas Conference on Information Systems*, Toronto, Curran Associates, Inc, 14-17 August 2008, Curran Associates, Inc, Toronto, vol. 2, p. 1083-1092.

¹⁴ R.R. McCrae, “Personality theories for the 21st century”, in *Teaching of Psychology*, 2011, vol. 38, no. 3, p. 209-214.

¹⁵ G.E. Atwood, S.S. Tomkins, “On the subjectivity of personality theory”, in *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 1976, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 166-177.

¹⁶ G.P. Hodgkinson, M.P. Healey, “Toward a (pragmatic) science of strategic intervention: design propositions for scenario planning”, in *Organization Studies*, 2008, vol. 29, no. 3, p. 435-457.

¹⁷ M.R. Buckley, S.M. Comstock, J.A. Cote, “Measurement errors in the behavioral sciences: the case of personality/attitude research”, in *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1990, vol. 50, no. 3, p. 447-474.

that reveal their weakness, they are more likely to forgive than blame, and attribute those mistakes to ignorance rather than lack of goodwill¹⁸.

They do not consider themselves inferior to those who have more earthly blessings, who are more honoured by others, who are smarter, more enlightened, or more beautiful than they are, and generally dominate in any respect¹⁹. They also do not consider themselves superior to those who they, in turn, dominate over, because all this seems insignificant to them in comparison with the goodwill for which they respect themselves and which they somehow assume in every person²⁰.

The decent person is usually the most obedient²¹. This virtuous humility manifests itself in the fact that we reflect on the weakness of our nature, on the mistakes that we once made or are still capable of making, that these mistakes are not lesser than the mistakes of other people, and therefore we do not put ourselves above others and believe that others, who, like us, have free will, can also use it²². In this aspect, a person is granted the status of moral autonomy based on awareness of their own dignity, their own freedom, as a result of which a person becomes a moral subject²³.

Human dignity criteria in the context of modern rationalism

In the modern history, all people, albeit formally, were recognised as having the right to be people and to respect themselves. Thus, for John Locke, “the natural state of people is a state of complete freedom with regard to their actions and opportunities to dispose of their property, personality in accordance with what they consider best for themselves “within the boundaries of the law of nature”; and this state is also a state of equality, natural equality, and only God can put one above the other, granting “the unconditional right to domination and sovereignty”. This “natural equality”, according to the

¹⁸ A.W. Kruglanski, “That “vision thing”: the state of theory in social and personality psychology at the edge of the new millennium”, in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2001, vol. 80, no. 6, p. 871-875.

¹⁹ D. McIlwain, “Reasoning pleasure: drives and affects in personality theory”, in *Philosophy of History and Culture*, 2011, no. 30, p. 755-801.

²⁰ D. Cervone, W.G. Shadel, R.E. Smith, M. Fiori, “Self-regulation: reminders and suggestions from personality science”, in *Applied Psychology*, 2006, vol. 55, no. 3, p. 333-385.

²¹ S.B. Kaufman, “Opening up openness to experience: a four-factor model and relations to creative achievement in the arts and sciences”, in *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 2013, vol. 47, no. 4, p. 233-255.

²² A.H. Church, C.T. Rotolo, A. Margulies, M.J. Del Giudice, N.M. Ginther, R. Levine, J. Novakoske, M.D. Tuller, “The role of personality in organization development: a multi-level framework for applying personality to individual, team, and organizational change”, in *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 2015, no. 23, p. 91-166.

²³ J.A. Johnson, “Correcting a longstanding misconception about social roles and personality: a case study in the psychology of science”, in *Behavioral Sciences*, 2018, vol. 8, no. 6, p. 57.

philosopher, is self-evident and irrefutable, which makes it the basis for the “duty of mutual love between people”, the establishment of mutual obligations towards each other on the basis of “great principles of justice and mercy”. All people are equal and independent, therefore “no one is allowed to harm the life, health, or property of another person”. These “rules of reason and universal equality” constitute the natural “benchmark established by God for the actions of people for their mutual safety”.²⁴

As is evident, the philosophy of modern history continues the substantiation of the principle of egalitarianism, through the lens of which the dignity of a person is analysed. But just as during the Renaissance and Reformation, the emergence of a new image of human dignity took place gradually and constantly required significant intellectual, moral, and political-legal efforts to overcome traditional clichés²⁵. It can be argued that this process has not received its logical conclusion even now. Even in the conditions of modern reality it is still very far from the real establishment of the dignity of each person. The understanding of a person as a moral subject in the philosophy of modern history took place within clearly delineated boundaries.

On the one hand, it was noted the need to open a new path to the human mind, different from the one that was known in the past, to provide it with new means of assistance so that this spirit could exercise its rights to nature: people do not know either about their wealth or about their powers and imagine the former as larger, and the latter as smaller than they really are. From this proceeds that they, upon putting an excessive value on the inherited arts, do not seek anything more or simply humiliate themselves, wasting their efforts on the insignificant things, without putting them into what is essentially important. Education and self-education, a scientific approach to obtaining knowledge, according to Francis Bacon, are needed “for the benefit and dignity of the humane”²⁶. In this sense, human rationality, which constitutes the basis for acquiring knowledge, becomes the foundation for justifying utilitarian measurements of the use of this knowledge for benefit. Moreover, the degree of knowledge in the context of modern rationalism is a criterion of human dignity. From this perspective, analogies with ancient philosophy are traced, with its principle of ethical rationalism, where knowledge constitutes the criterion of a person's wholesomeness. On the other hand, the emphasis on human potential was combined with the recognition that a person has one drawback: the very knowledge received by a person can be dangerous for them, can make them arrogant, vain, and cruel when it is not combined with

²⁴ J. Locke, *Works: in 3 volumes*, Mysl, Moscow, 1985, p. 560.

²⁵ S. Larocco, “Ideology, affect, semiotics: towards a non-personal theory of personality”, in *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 2014, vol. 48, no. 2, p. 129-142.

²⁶ F. Bacon, *Works: in 2 volumes*, “Mysl” (Philosophical heritage), Moscow, 1971, p. 590.

the antidote, which is a virtue capable of containing the exorbitant claims of human knowledge.

It is noteworthy that in modern European philosophy, the dignity and true greatness of a person is determined by the combination of these two components: knowledge and virtue. Knowledge, in turn, is viewed as spiritual wealth as opposed to material wealth, the thirst for which leads to the levelling of human virtue and the dominance of the desire for profit. Wealth in the form of knowledge is the only important value that distinguishes a worthy person from others. In this aspect, under the wealth of knowledge that a worthy person should possess, one should most likely understand the wealth of the human mind.

It is precisely in this aspect that the paradigm of ratiocentrism becomes the criterion of human dignity in modern history, emphasising the priority of rationality in human life and society. Francis Bacon wrote: “Thanks to science, man has an advantage over other people, just as man has an advantage over animals, because thanks to science, the human mind rises to heaven, which the body cannot do”. Science, according to Francis Bacon, allows a person to become immortal, to pass on the acquired knowledge to future generations, and thus to ensure their worthy development, because “science brings the good to which man first of all strives, namely, immortality and eternity. Because that is why people give birth to descendants and try to glorify their name”²⁷.

Modern history philosophers, reflecting on the tendencies associated with formational shifts, did not ignore such a delicate problem as the correlation between human dignity and socio-economic rights and living conditions. Obviously, there is nothing in common between human dignity and good living conditions. If this were so, they argued, it would mean that dignity belongs only to individuals who have a high level of material well-being. Consistently adhering to this approach, it would be necessary to admit the existence of different levels of human dignity, the existence of a more decent life and a less decent life according to the criterion of possessing material goods.

Human dignity does not depend on wealth, says René Descartes: “Those with the most immortal soul are the most arrogant and vain, while the decent ones are the most modest and humble. People who are strong and generous do not depend on their wealth or on the misfortunes that sometimes happen to them, while people with a weak and worthless soul are ruled by chance; well-being serves them no less a basis for superiority than unhappiness does for humility. We often observe how they shamefully humiliate themselves in front of those from whom they expect some benefit or some kind of evil, but at the same time they arrogantly rise above those from whom they do not expect

²⁷ *Ibidem*.

anything and whom they are not afraid of"²⁸. In this context, the views of René Descartes also suggest the idea of moral egalitarianism based on dignity. Similar ideas of moral egalitarianism were developed in Protestantism during the Reformation.

With regard to wealth and poverty, according to the thinkers of the modern history, it is the poor people who develop culture and morality, while the life of those whose only goal is to get rich is reduced to barbarism and debauchery. According to Francis Bacon, "wealth should be spent on gaining knowledge, and not using knowledge to accumulate wealth", because wealth itself is incapable of bringing good to a person. As an example, the philosopher cites the words of Solomon: "There is no benefit from great wealth, except the ability to distribute it". In this context, it is worth remembering that King Solomon, albeit possessed such external benefits as glory, power, wealth, did not take anything else from all this glory except the honour to seek and find the truth"²⁹.

The principle of ratiocentrism of modern history as a basis for the interpretation of dignity

Modern history is a period of relative emancipation of the individual based on the provision of a person with the status of moral autonomy of the individual. This is particularly evident in the philosophy of dignity of Francis Bacon³⁰, René Descartes³¹, and John Locke³². By absolutising freedom, they reflect on the idea of moral improvement of a person, in which individual interests are at the same time social. In their philosophy, they strive to prove that the wealth of subjective human abilities is capable of synthesising isolated individual interests and social movement at large. The existing contradictions are overcome by such best human abilities as reason and activity.

Human nature is mobile, changeable, life-affirming, full of strength; by one's own activity, a person unfolds all the abilities inherent in it. He is not afraid of struggle and is not afraid of the dangers and villainy of this world – to live in the world, even if it is thoroughly infiltrated with selfishness, is a positive value. Thus, this dynamic understanding of man places good along evil, and society along a particular individual, where and from the standpoint of which everything looks not so gloomy. Reason, which balances passions and allows a person to control oneself, plays a decisive role in the transition from

²⁸ R. Descartes, *Discourse on the method for the correct direction of reason and the search for truth in the sciences*, "Eksmo", Moscow, 2015, p. 135.

²⁹ F. Bacon, *Works: in 2 volumes*, "Mysl" (Philosophical heritage), Moscow, 1971, p. 590.

³⁰ *Ibidem*.

³¹ R. Descartes, *Discourse on the method for the correct direction of reason and the search for truth in the sciences*, "Eksmo", Moscow, 2015, p. 135.

³² J. Locke, *Works: in 3 volumes*, Mysl, Moscow, 1985, p. 560.

evil to good, from the individual to society. A person full of dignity and reasonably experiencing this spiritual strength, guided by wisdom, is capable of enjoying life to the fullest.

The wisdom of a worthy person is to control one's passions and manage them so skilfully that one can easily withstand the evil they cause and turn it into the good. All that a person can do and what it should strive for is to use what nature has given it in the best way, to prevent those vices and shortcomings which its constitution is most susceptible to". The person's natural gifts on the principles of the mind must be developed to the maximum possible limit. For the philosophy of modern history, it is indisputable that the basis of all virtue and dignity is the ability of a person to refuse to satisfy one's desires when reason does not approve of them. In this aspect, respect for the human mind, and at the same time, the principle of ratiocentrism and the significance of the achievements of reason can be considered the basis for the interpretation of dignity in the modern history, since wisdom and knowledge, and rationality in general, are identified with dignity.

In fact, in the philosophy of dignity of modern history, pessimism associated with the statement of unworthy motives and aspirations of real individuals turns out to be ignored. As John Locke wrote, because humans are unable to provide themselves with everything necessary for the life that human nature aspires to – “a life that corresponds to human dignity”, in order to overcome the shortcomings and imperfections that are inherent in humans, “when they live separately and exclusively by themselves”, people naturally tend to seek communication and comradeship with others”³³. The selfishness of particular individuals dissolves in the good that unites the entire society – the ultimate utilitarian goal. Moreover, the Enlightenment of the 18th century will have come to the idea of the possibilities of endless moral, intellectual, and social improvement of a person on the basis of a rational method of education.

For the founder of the European Enlightenment John Locke, the goal of such education is “an honest, active, and worthy man who loves his country”, for which it is a matter of honour and an unchanging duty to serve his country to the fullest extent of his capabilities. John Locke's concept of upbringing a decent person (“gentleman”) is organically linked to his epistemology. He opposed the theory of “innate ideas”, arguing that “in the soul there is no knowledge of general and self-evident maxims until a person begins to reason”³⁴. That is, both knowledge and moral prescriptions refer to ideas not innate, but acquired. Experience proves that only after learning them a person knows them much better than before. All moral precepts require proof, which denies their innateness. If innate ideas really existed, they would inevitably have

³³ J. Locke, *Works: in 3 volumes*, Mysl, Moscow, 1985, p. 560.

³⁴ *Ibidem*.

to be naturally recognised by all people, but the experience of life shows the opposite.

The only thing that John Locke recognises as innate in the human soul is that: “Nature has invested in man the desire for happiness and aversion to unhappiness. These are truly innate practical principles, which, as befits practical principles, operate constantly and continuously affect all our activities. This can be observed invariably and everywhere in all people, of any age. But they are tendencies arising from the natural desire for good, and not imprinted truths in the mind”. Although moral rules “are not written in the hearts of people”, many come to agreement with them and to the conviction of their obligation in the same way that other things are learned: under the influence of upbringing, the environment, the customs of their country: “no matter how this conviction was obtained, it activates our conscience, which is nothing more than our own opinion or judgment about the moral correctness or unworthiness of our actions”³⁵.

People usually come to their principles and beliefs on the basis of everyday experience, but they are laid as early as in childhood in the process of education aimed at the “gullible and impartial” children's mind, since it is “white paper that accepts any letters”. Although there are people who by nature have a good constitution, both physical and spiritual, and this “strength of their natural gifts” is enough to “strive for beauty” and “be able to work miracles”, such examples are few. And, as John Locke notes, “nine-tenths of the people we meet are who they are — good or evil, useful or useless — because of their upbringing”³⁶. It is precisely upbringing that, according to the philosopher, creates the greatest differences between people. This denied the idea of innate inequality and noted the great importance of the social environment, the influence of society on the development of a person.

An important and even decisive role in the upbringing process is assigned to reason, since thanks to it, the satisfaction of certain desires of a person is sanctioned or prohibited. A person acquires and improves this ability to the level of a habit through education, and if developed from an early age, it becomes easy and natural. It is unacceptable, according to John Locke (1985), to use humiliation or corporal punishment while raising a child, because “when the child's soul is too depressed and humiliated, when its mind is nailed and broken by too strict an attitude, it loses its strength and energy” and finds itself in even worse condition than when the arbitrariness or pranks of the child are being ignored. In the latter case, “self-willed youths, who were distinguished by their cheerfulness and intelligence, can sometimes still get on the right path and, thus, become active and big people; but oppressed, timid and sluggish

³⁵ *Ibidem*.

³⁶ J. Locke, *Works: in 3 volumes*, Mysl, Moscow, 1985, p. 560.

souls, spiritually undeveloped people are hardly able to ever rise and very rarely achieve anything³⁷.

Education is a “great art” in which the most important thing is to find a way to keep the child's soul natural, active, free". Therefore, honour and shame are the most effective tools for educating a worthy citizen. They are “the most powerful stimuli of the soul when it is already capable of appreciating them”. John Locke notes: “When you managed to teach children to value a good reputation and to fear shame and disgrace, you put the right principle into them, which will always show its effect and incline them to good”³⁸.

This rational approach to developing a sense of dignity has an important utilitarian moment, namely: a person who is praised and exalted for decent behaviour “will certainly meet love and affection from everyone, and as a result, he will have other beautiful things”; and vice versa, the one who, by his unworthy behaviour, causes disrespect for himself and does not care about maintaining a good reputation, will inevitably “become an object of indifference and contempt, and the result will be the absence of everything that could give him enjoyment and pleasure”.

A person should take care of his good name – reputation. Reputation is his personal capital, which is expressed in recognition and approval, which "the mind of other people gives, as if by common consent, virtuous and respectable deeds". In this aspect, the rationalism of the modern history, which underlines reason as the basis of human existence, constitutes the foundation for the development of ideas of progress and human improvement. Its driving force is the mind, like a continuously operating machine that produces ever more perfect results. The becoming and development of capitalism equates dignity and initiative, dignity and the ability to be successful.

Real dignity is also possessed by a person who is not content with the position of a hired worker, which is rather difficult and humiliating at the time of the initial accumulation of capital. A person does not dream of forever exploiting a withered aristocratic authority, but shows ingenuity, courage to establish oneself as a bourgeois entrepreneur. Dignity is obtained and protected by a person who is not only capable of inheriting wealth, which is fading away every day, but also knows how to increase and accumulate what is at hand. In this aspect, human knowledge and skills are aimed at the practical side of their implementation. This testifies to the development of elements of utilitarianism and pragmatism, since the success of a person becomes the criterion of their dignity: “Knowledge of our cognitive abilities warns us against scepticism and mental inactivity. When we know our strengths, we will know better what we can apply with the hope of success”.

³⁷ *Ibidem*.

³⁸ *Ibidem*.

The increase in wealth and the transformations of the world, which, in turn, give profit and glory – these are the virtues of the capitalist consciousness, its cultural and everyday understanding of the concept of "dignity". The best illustration of the tendency outlined is the call of Francis Bacon: "While philosophers are arguing about what is the main thing – virtue or pleasure, look for a means to master both. With the help of wealth, virtue becomes the common good"³⁹.

Laziness, inertia, complacency, contemplation, and even stoic apathy, valued by Antiquity, do not constitute components of dignity of a person in the modern history, since human dignity begins to be interpreted in a pragmatic aspect, which emphasises the activity and success of a person. The intentions of the modern history are rather symptomatic, reflected in the words of John Locke: "A person's happiness or unhappiness is mainly the work of their own hands. And a person whose spirit is an unreasonable leader will never find the right path"⁴⁰.

A person should be purposeful, active, passionate and, most importantly, not with his heart, but with his head should be cold and pragmatic in order to quickly and clearly calculate the possible benefits and probable losses. This position testifies to the growing role of the principles of utilitarianism and pragmatism in the era of modern history. Authors also note that rationalism became the basis for the development of utilitarianism and pragmatism in this era.

The role of freedom and tolerance in the development of philosophical attitudes of modern history

Formally, from the standpoint of modern society, everyone has the right to express their dignity, of course (this is what profoundly differentiates capitalism from the hierarchical class of feudalism), but only the successful people have real dignity. That is, despite the principle of formal egalitarianism, the pragmatic aspect of dignity dominates in the views of modern philosophers, which emphasises the success of a person. Entrepreneurial success constitutes that magical force that makes a person worthy in the eyes of others and allows to be proud of oneself with sufficient reason, to value yourself: "Wealth exists to spend, and spending – to do good and thus earn honour".

However, René Descartes (2015) has his own special position on this issue. Following Aristotle, he argues that to have a good that a person is not worthy of, – means to cause evil in a certain way. When fate endows someone

³⁹ F. Bacon, *Works: in 2 volumes*, "Mysl" (Philosophical heritage), Moscow, 1971, p. 590.

⁴⁰ J. Locke, *Works: in 3 volumes*, Mysl, Moscow, 1985, p. 560.

with benefits that they are really unworthy of, envy may awaken in a person who reflects on this, because, “naturally striving for justice, we are angry that it was not observed in the distribution of benefits, then this envy can be excused, especially when the good that others envy is of such a kind that in their hands it can turn into evil, for example, when this good is a certain position or service, in the performance of which they can act badly. Even when they want the same benefit for themselves, and the possession of this benefit is set up because it is in other, less worthy hands, envy can still be forgiven when anger concerns exclusively the unfair distribution of benefits that they envy, and not those who owns or distributes them”⁴¹.

The concept of the rational soul and the theory of human self-disclosure built on it acquire special significance for the dignity of the philosophy of this period. Due to them, humanism fundamentally expanded its boundaries. These aspects remain significant and retain their significance for understanding dignity in modern post-industrial society. It is personal initiative and personal achievements that open up the breadth of an objective measurement of dignity for a person. The person who created oneself, embodied their abilities in successful deeds, overcame obstacles and difficulties can be proud of oneself and be worthy of recognition. The pragmatic and utilitarian approach of modern history philosophers to the problem of dignity is clearly traced here.

Freedom appears as an important condition for personal initiative and, consequently, dignity. Freedom provides for the recognition of freedom of another person, the basis of which is their dignity. Human dignity cannot be understood outside of freedom. Dignity requires solidarity and positive action. In the conditions of civil society development, according to John Locke, freedom determines the dignity of a person in the ability to act of their own free will in all cases when it is not prohibited by law. The opposition to freedom of dignity means neglect of the human being at large. Freedom, without regard for dignity, is alienated from a person. Dignity separated from Freedom is incomplete dignity. According to René Descartes, “a decent person does not attach importance to the benefits that can be deprived of them, and, on the contrary, highly values freedom and complete power over oneself”⁴². Freedom and dignity are interdependent.

The rationalisation of tolerance as an important condition for the establishment of human dignity in the modern history found its place in John Locke's Letters of Tolerance, and later in the Act of Tolerance, which in 1689 was adopted by the British Parliament under the influence of the philosopher's ideas. According to John Locke, tolerance is not only the recognition by the

⁴¹ R. Descartes, *Discourse on the method for the correct direction of reason and the search for truth in the sciences*, “Eksmo”, Moscow, 2015, p. 135.

⁴² R. Descartes, *Discourse on the method for the correct direction of reason and the search for truth in the sciences*, “Eksmo”, Moscow, 2015, p. 135.

state of the freedom of the “other” to legally conduct their own civil and private affairs at their own discretion, but also the obligation of the state to protect their freedom from any encroachment or restriction⁴³.

Freedom itself, in particular freedom of worldview and religion, was recognised by John Locke as an inalienable human right. The institutional introduction of the instrument of tolerance by the British state allowed to quickly overcome intolerance and humiliation on religious grounds, created a favourable legal space for the coexistence of citizens of different confessions, and united the country. Thus, for the first time, tolerance has demonstrated its potential as an effective tool for achieving political agreement between various forces, while maintaining their legal freedom and the right to be themselves. This experience of the modern history has demonstrated the effectiveness of a rational approach to eliminating inequality, discrimination, deep grievances and humiliations on a confessional basis between citizens; experience in achieving civil unity and affirming the dignity of the nation through the recognition of the dignity of each citizen. Later, this narrative became the leading one in the American Constitution of 1787 and later played an important part at all stages of the becoming of Western civilisation.

Conclusions

An important achievement of the modern era and, in fact, an important lesson of the Reformation is the understanding, in the context of the idea of freedom of conscience, of the principle of tolerance as an important basis for ensuring human dignity. Although the concept itself has been known since the times of Antiquity, special emphasis was placed on it as a result of the religious wars of the Reformation. The capitalist spirit of the modern era is also transforming the concept of estate honour. Dignity becomes not hereditary, generic, but individual-personal and professional: the dignity of a creator, a master of his craft, a specialist, a successful entrepreneur, organiser, manager. A “connoisseur” is a professional and responsible person: a scientist, teacher, administrator, financier – an important and respected figure in the new capitalist world.

In this aspect, the principle of professional egalitarianism is developed in the philosophy of modern history, that is, the profession makes people equal and decent, regardless of class origin. Decent people are naturally inclined to do great things, but at the same time they do not take on what they do not feel capable of. They believe that there is nothing better than doing good to others, while neglecting their own interests. According to modern history philosophers, the more noble and magnanimous a person is, the more inclined they are to give people their due. Thus, a decent person not only expresses

⁴³ J. Locke, *Works: in 3 volumes*, Mysl, Moscow, 1985, p. 560.

deep humility before God, but also shows respect for people without any inner resistance, and despises only flaws. On the contrary, those whose spirit is insignificant and weak are better subject to sin and negative perception of the environment.

Therefore, a developed intellect, freedom, tolerance, responsibility, dedication to the cause of good, individual initiative, orientation towards success, concern for one's reputation – these are the socially significant components of "dignity" in the ratiocentric paradigm of the modern history, which is gradually gaining utilitarian and pragmatic dimensions. As in modern history, at present, dignity with full moral right is experienced not just by a free individual, but by the one who discovers their individuality, their creative potential in freedom. A person of the modern history values and respects oneself precisely because they are not like others, not like everyone else, because they have their own face, because they are capable of building their own happiness.

In this aspect, modern rationalism becomes the basis for the further development of the principle of individualism, which can also be considered the basis for the interpretation of human dignity. In general, in the philosophy of modern times, the idea of dignity is considered on the basis of concepts such as moral autonomy of a person, human freedom, tolerance, progress. Also, the idea of human dignity in the era of modernity is interpreted through the lens of such methodological principles as secularism, humanism, rationalism, ratiocentrism, utilitarianism, pragmatism, professional and moral egalitarianism and individualism.