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ABSTRACT
The content of the article reflects the scientific search and development results of the social and pedagogical project concerning the model of upbringing for a modern university, the model that is adequate to the needs of a state, society, and a personality. According to the results of content analysis concerning various sources of the actual problem under study, from the culturological approach point of view, the mission of a modern university is revealed. The quality of higher education and future expert training is considered in the context of culture development among all subjects of the university educational process. The relation to everything around is defined as a key criterion of culture. The materials of the article develop the philosophical and anthropological foundations of the modern education theory. Bioethics is considered as a new ecophilosophy, which makes the basis for the creation of the university educational system. The interpretation of the concept "bioethics" is expanded and the author's definition of the term "bioethical education" is given.
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INTRODUCTION
The development of higher education problem, its evolution and institutionalization was and continues to be the subject of an active interest in different countries [4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18]. This interest is determined by the aspiration of scholars to create a general concept of higher education and to discover the mechanism of its interaction with a state and a personality in different historical epochs [8, 13, 17, 18]. The goal set by the article authors was to focus attention on the educational mission of a modern university, on the understanding of methodological approaches to the development of higher education educational potential.

It is important to note that universities, as the world educational and upbringing systems, have gone through the centuries of historical development, during which they changed. On the one hand, they made a significant impact on the accumulation, the preservation and the progress of culture and society as a whole and on the other hand, they felt the diversity of cardinal changes which occurred in society, science and culture of all countries and peoples.

It is believed that the conceptual foundations of university education were formulated and implemented for the University of Berlin by V. Humboldt [3]. Further this theme was developed by J.G. Newman, Ortega y Gasset, N.I. Pirogov, K. Jaspers and others. In the views of philosophers, the mission of a university was seen in different ways. The discussion about a university mission or an idea was started in
1873 by J. Newman, who believed that a university is a place where the universal knowledge is taught, including the theological one, and the university task is to make intellectual culture the sphere of his activity, and its task was to develop intelligence [8].

Ortega y Gasset believed that the primary function of a university is to master the fundamental disciplines from the cultural point of view. In his opinion, the main faculty of an ideal university is the faculty of culture. The philosopher believed that an ordinary person should become a good professional and it is not necessarily to be a scientist for him, therefore Ortega-y-Gasset did not refer scientific research to the main function of a university [18, p. 59].

On the contrary, K. Jaspers, like V. Humboldt, emphasized the research function of a university. He wrote that research is the first task of a university. His second task is training, since the knowledge of truth must be conveyed. Research and training will ensure the development of intellectual culture. Consequently, according to K. Jaspers, a university solves the threefold task: it conducts research, conveys knowledge (educates) and recreates culture [17, pp. 10-14].

The presented statements of foreign thinkers, concentrate three important approaches to the idea of a university: the liberal trend in a university education within its specific British, or, more precisely, Irish understanding (J. Newman); The Spanish enlightenment interpretation of a university (Ortega y Gasset) and the German tradition, which states the scientific, educational and cultural mission of a University (K. Jaspers, V. Humboldt).

In Russia, N.I. Pirogov offered his vision of a university mission. He considered a university as the barometer of the society state. It is important that a famous teacher, in addition to research and teaching, emphasizes the development of morality through study. From the point of view of the scholar, teaching without education and development is not teaching but something different. He believed that a university should educate a person who could positively influence the development of society [9, pp. 346-372].

If we summarize the statements of classics, then we can make a few preliminary remarks about a university mission:

- the upbringing function of a university is one of the main ones, and scientific knowledge, which opens the way to truth, has an exceptional developing and educational value. University education and upbringing should be aimed at the revealing of a man's inner forces, on the spiritual and moral development of an individual;
- a university teacher has an important role in the education of a student's personality, he is a student's assistant who helps to find truth. A student is an active participant and a subject in the teaching and educational process;
- a necessary condition for the upbringing of a person at a university is the freedom of thought, which should be supported by the autonomous position of a university in relation to a state;
- during the process of education in the university environment of professionals one should avoid excessive specialization, which does not correspond to the essence of a university and limits the integrity and the scope of life perception;
- A university is morally responsible for society in respect of an intellectual product and, at the same time, influences the development of society, the role of a social-transforming factor is assigned to it.

Thus, the orientation of a modern university toward high moral ideals, and the orientation of higher education on the general cultural development of students is one of its priority positions historically.
METHODOLOGY
The content presented in this article was received by the authors from diverse sources and processed with the use of content analysis, which was carried out within the following logic: 1) the study of various sources (scientific literature, regulations) containing the information on the status of an issue under study; 2) the qualitative analysis of texts and textual arrays for the purpose of the subsequent meaningful interpretation of the obtained data; 3) the reflection of the subjective scientific, pedagogical and managerial experience of authors in the sphere of higher education; 4) the transformation of various textual and thoughtful material into the content of the article text (the formulation of concepts, the description of problems and contradictions, the justification of upbringing model for a modern university).

MAIN PART
The performed analysis showed that the transformations which take place at the moment with Russian higher education institutions lead, first of all, to the discrepancy between culture and education. Education, which initially acted as the process and the result of education and purposeful development of culture, acquired gradually the features of isolated self-sufficiency, modernizing more and more. A graduate of a modern university is a person of a clip consciousness, often knowing, but not conscious, moralizing, but immoral, informed, but not cultured [4, 5, 11].

Let us note that the psychological and pedagogical sciences develop general issues of the cultural approach implementation in the educational process, and its role is one of scientific discourse subjects. But the fact is that almost all publications, devoted to the analysis of contemporary problems and the prospects of higher education development, state that the most important task faced by Russian universities is the overcoming of the emerged gap between the education and the culture of a person with higher education in a short term, the increase of a university cultural status in society [2, 11, 14].

The researches see the solution of this problem for the modern universities of Russia in the culture-centricity of higher education, which actualizes the culturological approach, puts it among the most significant methodological concepts of university educational activity. In other words, the development of the culture among all subjects of the educational process is a common task for the whole system of Russian higher education.

This is the aim of the Magna Charta Universitatum, which was adopted at the University of Bologna during the congress of European university rectors on the occasion of the 900th anniversary of this oldest educational institution of Europe on September 18, 1988. The Charter emphasized the special role of universities in the modern world as the centers of culture, knowledge and research. One of its main principles is the autonomy of universities that perform the function of reality critical comprehension for the purpose of culture dissemination through teaching and research [12, 19].

Scholars speak about this as well. According to E.V. Bondarevskaya, with whom the authors are solidary, it is important to make the transition in pedagogy from the educational paradigm to the cultural one (from the "an educated man" to "a cultural man"), realized within the framework of professional personality-oriented education, where the culturological approach, prescribing the turn of all components of education to culture and a man as its creator and a subject, capable of cultural self-development, should become the main method of its projecting [2, p. 87].

In essence, the upbringing with the center at a university grows the people of future who, due to their ethos, their vision and life, solve the issue why the state claims itself and its people [4]. If a state lost itself on occasional short-term goals in higher education, and speculates only on the apparent directly visible tangible effects, i.e. it is engaged in the training of "qualified personnel" with certain competences and performing professional functions in an increasing number, then, as the part of education development, a state leads an institution to the loss of its own tasks and itself. Such a state disposes with the means of an unimaginable scope in its own purposes. But comparatively meager funds, allocated for the search of truth
free from any purposes, for the education and the upbringing of the way of thinking, and especially for historical and human sciences, are also wasted on the empty school production that kills the spirit [17, pp. 10-39].

The multiplicity and diversity of points of view on a modern university, and its mission, indicates that the conceptual model of a modern university as a socially forming and culturally creating phenomenon is not developed and the role functions of teachers, students, managers are not completely clear, which allows, on the one hand, to express ideas for the development of such a model of a university and the strategy of its development, and, on the other hand, gives the ongoing study of a modern university educational mission the signs of an even greater relevance and scientific novelty, the signs of theoretical and practical significance.

An interesting idea is suggested by the words of the former UNESCO Director-General F. Major, who said that "global education" should be the most important factor to solve global environmental problems [1, p. 163], which provisions the introduction of environmental issues solution at the center of all educational programs, starting with preschool institutions and ending with universities, the training of teachers and management staff. Developing this idea, we add that from our point of view, the core of global education should be represented by ecological knowledge and bioethical education, through which a value attitude can be developed to all representatives of living nature and to all manifestations of life.

Our reflections on the model of upbringing for the university are connected with the search for a key idea that should be put in the basis of such a model. From the point of view of the team of authors, such an idea can and should be represented by bioethics, considered as a new ecophilosophy. At the same time, we do not mean the introduction into the educational professional program of another academic discipline, which, by the way, is taught in a very reduced form at some universities, but we mean the development of an upbringing and educational system [6, 14, 15] aimed at the development of bioethical value orientations among the subjects of university education and a corresponding bioethical behavior.

Let's recall that the term "bioethics" includes two roots - bio and ethics, which indicates its origin from two areas of knowledge: the science of life and the science of morality, i.e. bioethics is the ethics of life or the doctrine of a moral, value attitude to life. V.R. Potter, who proposed the term "bioethics", associated it with the future of civilization, because he believed that the domination in bioethical philosophy society can ensure the survival of mankind in the conditions of further scientific and technological progress. The author of the term meant by bioethics the field of research, designed to connect biological sciences with ethics in the name of a man long-term survival as a biological species and the provision of a decent quality of life [10, p. 267]. According to the scholar's opinion, which is close to the authors' one, it is necessary to understand bioethics as a new ethical teaching, uniting humility, responsibility and competence as a science that is inherently interdisciplinary one and which unites all cultures and significantly enriches the meaning of the word "humanity".

In our author's interpretation, bioethics is a meta-subject field of various sciences, a subject of study, a worldview, a moral culture, and a new kind of human wisdom based on the use of scientific knowledge for social well-being provision. The object of bioethics is life as a special phenomenon, and its subject is the study of condition system under which the preservation and the development of all life forms on Earth (including a man) is possible. Its philosophical (ethical) basis is the awe of life, considered in the widest context [6, 10, 14]. In the ontological foundations of bioethics, the gnosiological, methodological, value and praxiological elements of philosophical knowledge are interrelated closely. In contrast to ethics the specific features for bioethics are the following ones:

- bioethics may evaluate only the attitude expressed in practical activity, in an act or in an inaction;
bioethics considers new, currently emerging life problems and the relationships that did not receive a proper moral sense so far, or those in which the understanding of evil and good is ambiguous;

- significant objects, phenomena and connections are correlated with the world of living matter, under which they should understand the whole biota, a man and society, as well as non-biotic active systems of the transforming type.

Thus, the main thing in bioethics and in bioethical education is attitudes. According to V.N. Myasishchev [7], the relation is an objective, really existing connection between a person and a certain object and as a subjective reality reflected by human consciousness at the same time. This characteristic of the relationship is important for our research, since they are of great importance during the organization of practical pedagogical activity in bioethical education, especially when human relations can be changed in one way or another under the influence of objective changes in his life.

Summary. The carried out research and the interpretation of the content analysis data made it possible to single out bioethical upbringing as a moral priority of university pedagogy, which is justified by the influence of the ongoing social and pedagogical processes. This upbringing is based on universal ethics, which expands the scope of philosophy and complements the circle of persons (objects) in relation to which a person must feel responsible.

Bioethical education is not only (not so much) the process of a harmoniously developed and professionally competent person in the sphere of bioethics, but the development of a personality guided by a bioethical (biocentric) morality in his actions, the personality who assesses the needs of each living being in justice and takes them into account in his activities.

The proposed model of upbringing for a modern Russian university will allow to adjust purposefully the bioethical value orientations of all subjects of the educational process at a university and to make the transition from the professional moral model of Russian higher education based on the traditional ethics of paternalism to a new model based on the principles and norms of biological ethics.
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