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**ABSTRACT**

This article discusses Pragmatism, one of the basic teachings of philosophy. Pragmatists put forward a program of "repairing philosophy." They believe that philosophy should not consist only of understanding the basic principles of existence and knowledge, but also of solving the various life situations and problems that people face in the course of their activities. Pragmatism promotes the idea that in practice, what is most beneficial to a person should be given more importance. The article provides an extensive analysis of this doctrine.
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**DISCUSSION**

Pragmatism is a philosophical current, based on practice as criteria of truth and semantic significance. Its origin is associated with the name of the American philosopher of the XIX century, Charles Pierce, who first formulated the "maximum" of pragmatism. Further pragmatism developed in the works of William James, John Dewey and George Santayana. Among the main directions of pragmatism are instrumentalism, fallibilism, anti-realism, radical empiricism, verificationism, etc.

The philosophy of pragmatism denies the meaningfulness of metaphysics and redefines the truth in some area of knowledge as a temporary consensus between people who are exploring this area.

Attention to pragmatism grew substantially in the second half of the 20th century with the emergence of a new philosophical school, which focused on criticizing logical positivism, relying on its own version of pragmatism. They were representatives of analytical philosophy Willard Quine, Wilfrid Sellars and others. Their concept was then developed by Richard Rorty, who later switched to the position of continental philosophy and criticized for relativism. Early pragmatism was strongly influenced by Darwinism. Schopenhauer previously held a similar way of thinking: the idealistic concept of reality, useful to the organism, can differ greatly from reality itself. Pragmatism, however, departs from this idealistic conception, dividing cognition and other actions into two independent spheres of activity. Therefore, pragmatism recognizes the existence of an absolute and transcendent truth over cognitive activity, which is behind the actions of the body to
maintain its life. Thus, an ecological component of cognition appears: the organism must have an idea of its environment. The concepts "real" and "true" in this aspect are considered terms of the process of cognition and have no meaning outside this process.

Pragmatism, therefore, recognizes the existence of an objective reality, although not in the ordinary strict sense of the word (which was called Pathnam metaphysical).

Although some of William James's statements have given rise to consider pragmatism as one of the theories of subjective idealism, the view that beliefs make reality true has not been widely supported by pragmatic philosophers. In pragmatism, nothing useful or practical is necessarily true, as well as the fact that at some short time the body helps to survive. For example, the belief that a deceiving spouse remains true helps her deceived husband to feel better at the moment, but definitely will not help him in the long run, if that belief does not correspond to the truth.

When one talks about pragmatic history, one usually has in mind or is particularly pushing forward one of the three: either the purely political content of history (state affairs), or the way of historical exposition (the establishment of causality), or, finally, the goal of the historical image (teaching). That is why the term Pragmatism suffers from some uncertainty.

The central point of Pragmatism can be regarded as the image of human actions in history, even if not exclusively political and not for the sake of teaching, but in which their causes and effects are primarily sought, that is, the motives and goals of the actors. In this sense, the pragmatic history differs from the cultural one, which deals not with events consisting of human actions (res gestae), but with states of society in material, mental, moral and social relations, and links individual facts not as causes and consequences, but as different phases in the development of one form or another. From this point of view, historical facts can be divided into pragmatic (events and human actions, their components) and cultural (the state of society and forms of life), and the historical connection can be either pragmatic (causal) or evolutionary.

According to this understanding, pragmatism in history should be called research or the depiction of the causal relationship that exists between the individual actions of individual historical figures or between whole events in which not just individuals but also entire groups are acting persons, for example, political parties, social classes, whole states, etc. Such an understanding will not contradict the definition given by Polybius and the majority of historians who used the term pragmatism.

In any case, pragmatism is interested in the person acting in history, her motives and intentions, her character and passions, in a word, her psychology, which should explain her actions: this is the psychological motivation of historical events. Causality, reigning in the world of phenomena, manifests itself in different areas of this world in various ways, as a result of which the need for special studies of causality (eg, causality in criminal law) appears. In the field of history, this question has been developed very little (see N. Kareyev, "The Essence of the Historical Process and the Role of the Person in History", St. Petersburg, 1890).

The theory of pragmatic history should explore how certain events are engendered by others, resulting in different changes in the willed sphere of the actors under the influence of the actions on them of those or other events, which themselves, in the last analysis, are only some actions. Pragmatic history differs from a consistent penetration into the inner world of people, with the aim not only to tell the event, but also to present its immediate effect on the thoughts and feelings of contemporaries, and also to show how it itself became necessary because of the existence of people who committed it, other motives and intentions. Cf. E. Bernheim, "Lehrbuch der historischen Methode" (1894).
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