

THE PLACE OF INTELLIGENTSIA IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIETY: THE CREATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Elena K. TABEIKYNA ^{1,*}, Galina T. KAMALOVA², Elnur L. HASANOV³,
Kulyash V. DZHUMAGALIYEVA⁴, Nurgul K. DEMEUOVA⁵

¹*Department of History and Pedagogy, Institute of Economics and Information Technologies, Kazan State Power Engineering University, Krasnoselskaya str. 51, 420066 Kazan, Russia*

²*Department of the Theory of State and Law, Constitutional and Administrative Law, Institute of Law, South Ural State University, Lenin str. 76, 454080 Chelyabinsk, Russia*

³*Department of Ethnography, Institute of Local-lore, Ganja Branch of Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences, Heydar Aliyev Av. 419, AZ 2000 Ganja, Azerbaijan*

^{4, 5}*Department of Kazakhstan History, Faculty of Humanities, S. Seifullin Kazakh State Agrotechnical University, Pobedy Av. 62, 010000 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan*

Received 30 September 2020; accepted 30 December 2020

Abstract. In the context of the socio-economic approach to determining the place and role of the intelligentsia and its interaction with authorities, often only one point is reviewed, in which the intelligentsia is defined as the most progressive layer of society and at the same time oppressed by the authorities for progressive views. Thus, a search is needed between the desire of society for progress and the search for optimal conditions for coexistence between power and the intelligentsia. The novelty of the work is determined by the fact that the historical basis of the interaction between government and the intelligentsia should be considered not only in a historical perspective but also on the basis of an economic or anthropological approach. The authors of the article determine the role economic nature of the intelligentsia in the positive development of a socio-economic nature in society. The practical significance of the study is determined by the possibility of forming social development programs on the basis of philosophical discussions and determining the place and role of the intelligentsia in social development.

Keywords: development, intelligentsia, power, society, structure.

Introduction

The intelligentsia as a specific social phenomenon is called upon to fulfil a conscious and proactive role in the development, preservation and transfer of national values and traditions. However, the generational change of the intelligentsia in the context of sociocultural transformations gives rise to new scientific discussions and myths around this problem. The determination of the main features of the intelligentsia is influenced by historical, cultural,

*Corresponding author. E-mail: tabeikyna4486@ubogazici.in

national, and other factors, which determine the variability of the semantic content of the concept of “intelligentsia”, the determination of its place in the structure of society and its social role, and functions (Vinogradova, 2009). Any discussion, especially if it has a scientific status, should begin with a clear definition of concepts, the contents of which are shared by all participants. Otherwise, the truth will not be born contrary to such discussions (Montaño Hirose, 1995). This is the requirement of the logical law of identity. Since it is difficult for direct participants in the discussion to agree with the definitions of their colleagues, because there is always an irresistible desire to at least disagree with something, we will refer to the authority of outstanding thinkers, the teachings of which has contributed to all scientists formed in such a capacity (Abramov, 2016).

The intelligentsia is the subject of philosophical, historical, sociological, ethical scientific research (Kennedy, 1992). The spiritual, moral, cultural, *etc.* qualities of the intelligentsia were endowed by Dobruskin (2005), Kal'noy (2008), Likhachev (1994), Losev (1989), Ossinsky (2012). As a unique social phenomenon, a social phenomenon, the intelligentsia was studied by A. Bychko and I. Bychko (1995), Uvarov (2005), Saukh (2018). The civil position and the social role of the intelligentsia in the revolutionary period were analysed by Bulgakov (2005), Kistyakovskij (1991), Frank (1980). However, despite a significant amount of scientific research on the intelligentsia, the variability of the content of this concept, its social role and purpose, the question of identifying the intelligentsia in the social structure of society, its differentiation as a specific and exceptional social phenomenon remains open (Shalin, 2017). Therefore, the goal of our article is to analyse the concept of “intelligentsia” in the subject field of social philosophy and determine its place in social development.

Significant distribution and differentiation of connotations “intelligentsia” occurred in German philosophy about 18th – early 19th century. So, Fichte in his work *Science of Knowledge* (2012) identifies the intelligentsia with a free-thinking person who, with the help of intelligence and constructive thinking, “creates” the material world, whereas Hegel (2010) interprets the intelligentsia as the theoretical thinking of the subjective spirit – the theoretical spirit (see Kennedy, 2014). Fichte (2012) proceeded from the fact that the philosopher, abstracting in the process of thinking from the experience of perception of objects, forms his consciousness as the intelligentsia. If it is directed at things, then this is a form of materialism, or dogmatism, since it, and not a person as a subject, determines its content (Epstein & Kheimets, 2000). Since the conference discusses intelligentsia as a social layer, the philosophical vision of the concept of intelligentsia belongs to the category of people who leave the subject-object unity (Ostrovsky, 2017). That is, the intelligentsia is that layer of society that makes itself an object of both knowledge/self-knowledge and the subject of transforming life in accordance with the essential dimensions that make up the content of their individual tribal vocation. Indeed, man is a social being, always belonging to a certain type of popular community (Malyankar & Findler, 1998).

To be involved in the people, one should have the intelligentsia as an internal state of the soul, as the spirit of vital activity. This makes clear at the same time the feeling of necessity that accompanies certain ideas: the intelligentsia experiences some influence from outside in them, but in this act, it feels the limits of its own being. Hence, it is not entirely correct to define the intelligentsia as a layer of people engaged in mental work. Knowledge that has not

been raised to the depths of the internal state of mind does not make a person intelligent, attractive to others, an example of proper behaviour (Berryman, 2019). We have a broader definition of the formation of the spirit of objectivity in Hegel's dialectical system, in his *Science of Logic* (2010). When he claims that the absolute idea decides to let himself go into nature, into life, this means that the spirit of knowledge in a person begins to determine the way of its activity as rational-volitional, and not affective. He emphasised that the mode of being of consciousness is knowledge (Hegel, 2010).

1. Materials and methods

The methodological basis of this study was the theoretical methods of scientific knowledge. To consider the place of intelligence in the socio-economic development of society, an analysis of scientific literature on the research topic was used. In this work, methods of synthesis and analysis of information are used. Using the methods of analysis and synthesis, the generally accepted concept of the intelligentsia, as well as its main characteristics, were considered. The historical method was also used to study the concept of the intelligentsia in the works of 20th century writers.

The intelligentsia cognises the object and turns subjective knowledge (“knowledge of consciousness”) into objective, thereby providing knowledge of the truth and concrete knowledge of the object. Schelling (1997, pp. 535–568) in his work *The System of Transcendental Idealism* (1800) also assigns a leading role to the intellect in creating objective reality. However, Schelling (1997, pp. 535–568) intelligentsia is also a spiritual process, which together with a logical act creates objects and forms of consciousness. Despite some differences in the characteristics of the intelligentsia of German philosopher scientists, one can still identify common features: intellectuality and spirituality. The intelligentsia arises as the intellect, as well as the subject, contemplating, cognising and creating objective reality, the material world. Thus, representatives of intellectual professions at that time significantly increased their social role in society thanks to mental activity. However, intellectuals are a common phenomenon that fills the concept of intelligentsia with ambiguous and contradictory content.

Marx and Engels (1981) somewhat specified the meaning of the concept of “intelligentsia”, which has lost the idealism of the Enlightenment and acquires objectivity (see Bryson, 2018). They “gifted” the intelligentsia with such characteristic features as education, mental work, the spread of scientific knowledge and culture. Marx and Engels believed that it is the social position of a certain layer of people that forms social interests. Post-revolutionary France and Germany in the mid-19th century characterised by the division of society into classes and, accordingly, the fragmentation of that time intelligentsia. Each class of society had “its own intelligentsia”, which represented its interests. In the second half of the 19th century the class struggle has deepened, the number of industrial intelligentsia has increased, it has become politically active. Therefore, the intelligentsia in the scientific community has increasingly been identified with mental workers.

At the same time, the concept of “intelligentsia” gained considerable popularity in the Russian Empire. Thus, the writer Boborykin, through his artistic images, described the real types of the intelligentsia of that time: the “salon intelligentsia”, which worked in the

“highest society” for “material handouts and food”, as well as the intelligentsia, which opposed their own interests to the ruling ideology (2003). The writer draws the images of intellectuals who are ready to sacrifice material wealth, exchange their own mercantile interests for high noble ideas.

Around this period, long discussions began regarding the identification and social purpose of the intelligentsia. One of the key places among scientific researches on the intelligentsia is occupied by scientific works in the collection of articles *Vekhi/Landmarks* (Shatz & Zimmerman, 2015). The output of the work caused a stormy mixed reaction in the scientific community, associated with criticism of the revolutionary intelligentsia of 1905 by the authors of *Vekhi/Landmarks* (Shatz & Zimmerman, 2015). Berdiaev, one of the compilers of *Vekhi/Landmarks*, in his article “Philosophical Verity and Intelligentsia Truth” (2015) raised the problem of Russian pseudo- and true intelligentsia. Thus, the author writes about book lovers, ascetic philosophers and contrasts them with “intelligentsia” – pro-government, inert and conservative. Berdiaev (2015) and Bulgakov (2015) point to the problem of knowing the truth, its incompatibility with the service and representation of the interests of social classes, in particular, the “lower classes” of society. The philosophers emphasise that the love for people good paralysed the love for truth. The intelligentsia could not disinterestedly regard to philosophy, because it was selfish about the truth itself, it demanded that the truth become an instrument of social upheaval, national welfare, and human happiness. Why does the author raise the problem of knowledge of philosophy among Russian intellectuals? Because philosophy contributes to the awareness and reflection of the human spirit. Berdiaev (2015), in his article, attributes the thirst for knowledge of philosophical truth to spiritual values (see Zysiak, 2019).

Struve in the text before *Vekhi/Landmarks* (Shatz & Zimmerman, 2015), “Intelligentsia and Revolution” (1980), points to its rejection of social values and resistance to political power. In particular, the author noted that in the intelligentsia one can distinguish between a constant element – a solid form, and a more variable element – content. The ideological form of the Russian intelligentsia is its alienation from the state and hostility to it. At the same time, the self-denial of the intelligentsia and service to the people deprived the moral and educational significance of its activities. Struve (1980) emphasised the need to work on culture, but this requires a creative struggle of ideas.

Frank (1980) in his work for the collection “Ethics of Nihilism” raises the problem of morality and values of the Russian intelligentsia. The author characterises its mentality as moralism, which reflects the nihilism of the intelligentsia. In turn, Frank (1980) interprets nihilism as a denial or non-recognition of absolute (objective) values. The author observes the formation and decomposition of the traditional intellectual spirit. Any historical changes in society lead to a reorientation of values and their transformation. Accordingly, the revolutionary events of 1905 in Russia entailed a rethinking of its values and the mastery of new ones. Frank (1980) emphasises that the closest and most important path to the national good comes from faith in struggle, the destruction of the enemy, and the violent and mechanical destruction of old social forms by themselves ensure the implementation of the social ideal. If we perceive the problem of human culture as mechanical, then only two tasks remain – the destruction of old harmful forms and the redistribution of elements, the establishment

of new, useful combinations of them. In general, the authors of *Vekhi/Landmarks* (Shatz & Zimmerman, 2015) investigated the worldview and social role of the Russian intelligentsia in a specific historical and revolutionary period. So, he points to a lack of spirituality, morality, civic position, a rejection of the absolute values of the Russian intelligentsia during the period of transformation of society. However, it is impossible to claim a definite failure of the intelligentsia in the Russian revolution of 1905.

At the turn of the 20th – 21st centuries intellectuals have an interest in power caused by democratic social changes. As a result, many political parties arise, where the same intellectual elite seeks to implement their ideas and beliefs. However, power and popularised in the 1990s of 20th century material wealth displaced the role of spirituality and national culture in social development into the background, and, consequently, the intelligentsia itself from political decision-making. The rethinking of values was significantly influenced by the development trends of the West. The liquidators of the remnants of the “perestroika” prioritised precisely material values. It is quite natural that, starting from the end of the 20th century and to date, scientific debates are underway to identify the intelligentsia as a real or already mythologised social phenomenon (Glazov, 1979).

In scientific circulation, there is no single and universally accepted definition of the concept of “intelligentsia”. Modern trends in the development of society have only deepened the sceptical perception of this social phenomenon. Rapid scientific and technological progress, the dynamic course of public and private life lead to social metamorphoses and changes in perception of the world, rethinking and reorientation of values. The intellectual elite and employees of the “mental” professions serve all spheres of society’s life. Often predicted by the intelligentsia the development trends of society, the harmonious coexistence and functioning of all its spheres are not perceived by the elite, which is critical of the national, spiritual, moral, ethical and similar ideas of the intelligentsia. However, it cannot be stated unequivocally that the intelligentsia has exhausted its historical and social purpose today. Each historical era leaves its mark on the definition of this social phenomenon, and the 21st century – all the more, when the self-awareness of humanity, its capabilities and its purpose in the world changes. Against the background of social transformations and changes in value guidelines, a kind of devaluation of the true essence and purpose of the intelligentsia takes place, which, in turn, does not feel its own demand.

2. Results and discussion

Having analysed the meaningful content of the concept of “intelligentsia”, one can single out priority, although not generally accepted, features of this social phenomenon. As noted earlier, each historical, cultural era affects both the definition of those who belong to the intelligentsia and the very definition of this concept. So, the content of the “intelligentsia” has a paradigmatic character, which gives the concept those features that characterise it in a particular historical and philosophical paradigm, disappearing with its change. The new paradigm formulates new features that characterise this concept, at the same time, partially changing its philosophical meaning. However, the concept used in several paradigms also

has constant characteristics – the basis of its content (Gaines, 1997). Thus, the traditional characteristics that are endowed with the intelligentsia include:

- Intellectuality, education and professionalism (conventionally there are three levels of intelligentsia, which serves all spheres of public life: the first – doctors, teachers, engineers, lawyers, officers, priests, some of the creative intelligentsia; the second level provides the needs, mainly of the intelligentsia itself – historians, philosophers, sociologists, literary critics and art historians, some writers, composers and artists, *etc.*; finally, the third level includes generators of fundamental ideas that determine actions of the entire intelligentsia as a whole);
- Conscience and enlightenment, nihilism and criticism with a focus on the common cause, the service of truth and justice;
- Moral courage as a single form of heroism that does not require any other victims. A high level of culture and conscience for its condition, the preservation of the intellectual forces of society with a view to the continuity of the development of the moral component in the historical chain of generations;
- Nobility and disinterestedness. After all, engagement creates the conditions for the transformation of the intelligentsia: it loses its meaning and identity, its freedom and purpose;
- The integrity of the person who produces the ideal of human dignity, introduces him into life and in his name performs a moral judgment on reality (Andruschenko, 2005).

Consequently, the intelligentsia is mainly distinguished by high intellectual and spiritual and moral qualities, which allows interpreting this social phenomenon, respectively, in social and moral and ethical aspects. As already noted, it is difficult to determine the place and functions of the intelligentsia in the social structure of society, because it is interpreted from different approaches (Kijima, 2001). However, based on the distinguished features characteristic of the intelligentsia, one can try to determine the place of the intelligentsia in the social structure of society. If to take into account intelligence, as the foremost sign of the intelligentsia, its education, professionalism and service, thus, of all segments of the population, then it can be distinguished into a social group. The Latin correspondences of “intelligentsia” – *intelligentia*, *intellegentia* – are interpreted as understanding, cognitive power, knowledge. So, the mentioned German philosophers about the 18th – the beginning of the 19th century characterised the intelligentsia as capable of perceiving, revealing, understanding the essence of things and being. What is meant here is not only knowledge, but the highest form of thinking and understanding, the spiritual and rational ability to cognise and interpret the surrounding reality.

From the 19th century the concept of “intelligentsia” is spread in sociology and is deprived of the educational idealism of German philosophy. The division of labour caused an increase in the number of intelligentsia; it became a mass phenomenon in the areas of industry and management (Horujy, 2018). At that time, the intelligentsia formed a social group of representatives of various mental professions. So, in the *Philosophical Dictionary* (Frolov, 2001) the following definition is given:

“Intelligentsia is a social group consisting of people professionally engaged in mental work (scientists, engineers, technicians, teachers, doctors, employees of the state apparatus, artists)”.

In the *Sociological Encyclopaedic Dictionary* (Osipov, 2000) several meanings of the concept are given: the totality of people engaged in mental work; the social layer of people professionally engaged in skilled mental work who have the necessary special education for this (depending on the social functions that they perform and the type of education they distinguish: scientific, technical, engineering, humanitarian, medical, military, artistic, pedagogical intelligentsia etc.); the totality of people with higher education; intellectual. So, a community of signs (education, getting a profession, professional and creative activity, and the like) unites intellectuals in a social group with established internal social relations and roles.

Significant automation and mechanisation of modern life, the use of scientific, technical and innovative achievements, the development of the media and communication have led to significant changes in the professional structure, in particular. There is a “fragmentation” of specialisation, thus increasing the number of employees at different levels of the professional structure. In addition, a significant part of the work performed is automated, reducing the direct participation of a person in the labour process. Labour becomes mechanical, potential and individual manifestation accumulate. Therefore, the definition of intelligentsia is narrowed, concretised, priority is given to creative professions (Oushakine, 2009).

So, along with the definition of the intelligentsia as a social group, others are also cited: this is the social layer of society, a conglomeration of people professionally engaged in mental (mainly complex, highly skilled, creative) work, the development and dissemination of culture in society. In addition, other characteristic features of the intelligentsia stand out:

- Intragroup heterogeneity;
- Tendency to antagonism;
- Individualism, the manifestation of one’s own individuality within a group;
- Self-manifestation, craving for independence (Kotchetkova, 2004).

The *Sociological Encyclopaedic Dictionary* (Osipov, 2000) offers similar interpretations of the concept of “intelligentsia”: the social layer of people who are professionally engaged in mental (mostly complex) labour and who, as a rule, have higher education. It also highlights the social functions of the intelligentsia, which consist in the generation and dissemination of knowledge and culture. In the *Cultural Encyclopaedia* (Milskaya, 1998), the following definition of the intelligentsia is proposed: the social layer of educated people who are professionally engaged in complex mental (mainly intellectual) work. It is added that this is a circle of people of culture, that is, those whose knowledge and efforts create and support the values, norms and traditions of culture. So, in addition to education, professionalism, intellectual activity, the intelligentsia is endowed with an active civic position, social competence, which is able to create, disseminate and preserve national cultural values and traditions. However, these basic characteristics are too general; therefore, they do not allow to determine the place of the intelligentsia in the social structure of society (Loogma et al., 2019).

Today, we can state a change in the nature of the work of the intelligentsia. The number of artisans who work alone is diminishing. They are being replaced by an increase in the number of workers employed in industrial work and in large enterprises. The specialization of knowledge workers is also narrowing. Such tendencies lead to an increase in the number of middle and lower-level specialists. The number of technicians, laboratory assistants, nurses and some others, whose work takes place according to given programs and is rather routine

in nature, is increasing. In this regard, many researchers are increasingly referring the concept of “intelligentsia” to the stratum of society engaged in creative work.

It is important to note that the idea of introducing the concept of a creative class is not new in itself. Creativity is the driving force behind economic development, the creative class has now dominated the society. If before people were united by the framework of public institutions, forming a group identity, an essential feature of modern life has become the creation of an individual identity. Similar self-reinvention is the most important feature of the creative class. Only by understanding the growth phenomenon of this new class and its characteristic values will it be possible to understand the nature of large-scale and seemingly isolated changes in our society and more rationally plan the future.

The intelligentsia is distinguished from the general mass of the people by high spiritual and moral values they profess. The characteristic features of the intelligentsia highlighted above give reason to define it as a social phenomenon. It is difficult to explain the activation of the social activities of the intelligentsia during the period of transformation of society and its fulfilment of the main sociocultural function, the messianic role of preserving and transmitting national values, and ensuring the stability of the people’s historical memory. So, Nikoláevich Miljúkóv in his work “The Intelligentsia and Historical Tradition” (2013) emphasised the importance of not only habits and mental skills learned from the past, but also certain ideas.

Creativity is a personal quality, not a group one. People are creative, not structures. Creativity as the main stratification principle changes a socio-professional stratification system into a cultural-symbolic one, in which the main criterion that determines a person’s position in society is

“unequal access to socially significant information, unequal opportunities to filter and interpret this information, the ability to be a carrier of sacred knowledge (mystical or scientific)” (Anisimov, 2020, pp. 10–11).

Representatives of the school of phenomenalisation of the intelligentsia, in an attempt to existential analysis, also call the intelligentsia the determining spiritual factor in the formation and development of the people’s self-consciousness. Scientists have made an attempt to fundamentally study the history of the origin, formation of the intelligentsia, its social functions and the phenomenological role, starting from the 10th century. Researchers argue that the formation of a national character has a socio-historical basis, due to long-term residence with hostile neighbours. Thus, a national spirit, mentality (existentially individualistic, pluralistic vision of the world, anteism and cordocentrism, tolerance towards other points of view and religions, openness to the whole world, *etc.*) was formed.

Social transformations defined the significance of the spirit as a driver for the intelligentsia in defence of national consciousness, which was especially acute in the 1920s of the 20th century. The older generation of intellectuals faced a social task: to prepare the intellectual youth of Soviet Russia for the implementation of the plan to build an economically powerful country. Thus, the role of the traditional intelligentsia was temporary and boiled down to the transfer of knowledge and experience to their successors (Martin, 2014). Radically-minded intelligentsia, opposing party ideology, was subjected to repression by the authorities. However, not excluding the possibility of personal liquidation, the older generation of the intelligentsia, along with the party task, also carried out another mission – the preservation

and transfer of national values to their successors. Consequently, it is possible to speak of the intelligentsia as a phenomenological social phenomenon, noble and selflessly advocating for national interests, formulating social guidelines, preserving national historical memory.

The following points are worth highlighting here. It is possible to have adequate knowledge about the content of the concept of intelligentsia only when a specific person, who considers himself/herself an intellectual, combines a free subjective concept of an individual self, which, at the same time, not only possesses it as a personality, but is such in his/her practical direction of comprehension of universality outside of self, in other people as their own inner essence, without which one's own self does not exist. It can be stated that this is about a significant expansion of the understanding of the concept of intelligentsia to the understanding of an absolute idea, which is the identity of a theoretical and practical idea, where each of them is a synthesis of aspirations for interaction, and not just for a purely external, alienated from the process of self-improvement.

Having such a level of self-awareness, purely conceptual knowledge acquires the status of an objective spirit, because its meaning is universal, historical, finally, popular and universal. That is, self-awareness is impossible without such criteria of the spirit to define it as one's own, as familiar, universal, and not alien, not hostile. In the absence of such a level, the combination of subjective and objective motivation for self-awareness is wilful, erroneous. But, unfortunately, it is not temporary for the overwhelming majority of mankind, which, without rising to the level of understanding the objective content of the concept of intelligentsia, acts arbitrarily on the basis of only a subconscious definition of the differences between people with polar, and not dialectical, oppositions of "friends and foes". In the history of mankind, this is used by people who have an education, but direct the knowledge gained against other people as strangers, as polar opposite to themselves. Finally, those who should be destroyed, although they need to destroy themselves as not involved in the objective essence of education as the objective light of knowledge, the light of the intelligentsia, the light of the absolute idea embodied in the image of one's own life, which is constantly approaching the understanding of the content of these concepts, understanding that they are embodied in the objective spirit of the history of knowledge, and not in the body of an individual person, which may not be liked from purely external signs. For which, of course, there are objective reasons, but purely material, not essential.

Of course, only philosophy gives such a level of understanding, using the method of intellectual apperception as the maximum possible concentration of cognitive attention on the essential dimensions of a person's being, not clouded by the appearance of the imagination, for which the appearance, image is primary. It is necessary to define what the intelligentsia is as a social layer. This is a category of people whose lifestyle is determined by the harmonious unity of personal and social, due to the high level of self-identity, identical to the objective laws of the existence of social being, starting from the popular and ending with the universal. This level of self-awareness is ensured by a high-quality social and humanitarian education, which is based on the understanding of a person as a natural and social, and as a social and natural being. It should be borne in mind that education is also qualitative, which gives a person an understanding, on the one hand, of an innate natural-biological potential, and on the other, that this potential should be actualised in those forms of sociality that actualise

and develop sufficiency criteria, since they, as the laws of being of a particular person, have a universal status, that is, they reflect a public order as a certain social and spiritual integrity.

Of course, this is a perfect understanding. But we should not forget that all the concepts of science are ideal types, according to Weber (2015). To what extent natural and social features affect the life of each individual, deviations from the ideal are observed to the same extent (Dmitriev, 2017). This is perfectly evidenced by the content of the teachings and studies of representatives of philosophical anthropology, which defines a person as *homo sapiens est homo demens* – an intelligent madman (Edgar Moren). Therefore, one can suggest the following regularity: the more a person's life is subordinated to the implementation of objectively scientific research, the more reason to attribute him/her to the intelligentsia as a social layer of society. After all, no one person can act one hundred percent in the way the concept defines.

Taking into account the above, we can cite some mental signs/properties of that layer of society, which can be conditionally attributed to the intelligentsia:

1. These are, first of all, representatives of the socio-spiritual humanitarian sphere of society. It is hardly worthwhile to put the representatives of the material-production sphere ahead, because, as we saw in Fichte's (2012) works, their life activity is subordinated to objects of nature, and not to human as primarily a social and spiritual being;
2. Among them, poets and writers, composers and performers of their songwriting are the bearers of the actual national identity/intelligence. This is determined by the fact that they adequately reflect the objective historical spirit of the people, the material carrier of which is the language and its melody. After all, speech, this is the house of human existence, this is the spiritual space of the national soul, its voice and at the same time the logo. Moreover, not only sound speech, but also the language of those physical fields, colours, smells, tastes that unite people in certain communities in certain biogeocenology;
3. Since a person, according to the definition of Aristotle (1994–2009), is a political being, he finds his perfect completion in the creation of the state. And therefore, the first who organised state communication provided mankind with the great benefit of living within the framework of law and right, since law, which serves as a measure of justice, is the regulating norm of political communication.

This is not a defining criterion for affiliation of a person to the layer of the intelligentsia, if to take modern society. It should be remembered that statehood as a political community is built precisely on the precepts of the philosopher. And he warned that a person living outside the law and right is the worst of all, for the injustice that wields arms is the hardest thing; nature gave man arms – mental and moral strength, and they can be used in the opposite direction. Thus, the problem of the people is that, on the one hand, having existed as a socio-spiritual phenomenon for more than a millennium, on the other hand, without its own statehood and living under the duress of state ideologies that do not reflect its inner essence, it has lost its own spiritual intelligence. Therefore, the layer of the intelligentsia as a definite social structure is very insignificant, and therefore its voice is in many respects the voice of “crying in the wilderness”. That, finally, manifested throughout the entire time of modern state independence.

Of course, in our time, developed states are not exclusively mono-ethnic, monocultural. Intelligentsia, as well as ordinary citizens, is not peculiar to the division of people into “friends” and “strangers”. Therefore, it is necessary to highlight the criteria of the intelligentsia – their attitude to their own state as a necessary political institution, taking into account and providing opportunities for the comprehensive development of their specific spirit in their harmonious combination. The task is extremely complex, but without its solution it is hardly possible to hope for such a unity. And this task should be undertaken precisely by representatives of the intelligentsia, for whom unity is a unity of opposites, and not their opposition. Then a single political nation will be formed, and not a statement that it already exists.

It should be noted that if power is the right and the opportunity to dispose, manage someone, something; and the intelligentsia is a social group consisting of educated people who have a great internal culture, professionally engaged in mental work, development and dissemination of culture, and given the fact that a person is designed to, knowing himself and the environment, perform precisely the functions of disposition and managing something and someone, from here we can conclude that the concept of “intelligentsia” and “power” are combined with the concept of “knowledge” as a philosophical category, which is accepted to define dividing the result of cognition ordered into a system and confirmed by practice. And knowledge, like everything in nature, has its own, only inherent circulation. That is, as in the material world there is a circulation of matter, so in the spiritual world there is a circulation of knowledge, the essence of which is that the supporting moments, or the elements of its circulation, are:

1. Science as a branch of human activity to obtain new knowledge;
2. Production as a branch of human activity for obtaining material and spiritual wealth, the laws of development of society, the laws of its leadership, that is, the laws by which power operates. That is, production in the broad sense of the word is a sphere of human activity in which the spiritual and material world are combined. It follows that the results of production, both its material and spiritual components, completely depend on the level and quality of knowledge that graduates of our educational institutions possess, that is, on the level of knowledge of our intelligentsia, our power;
3. Education as a branch of human activity in transferring knowledge to the young generation.

Indeed, one round of new knowledge that has passed practical confirmation through production and systematised material in a particular speciality is the module that makes up that part of the discipline course, which has independent significance and can be considered as a module in training or social interaction. That is, the laws of the knowledge cycle are considered by us as the laws of the accumulation, use and transfer of knowledge to new generations of society, which makes it possible to accumulate knowledge, use it for the benefit of people and systematically transfer it to new generations of society.

Let us dwell on the question of the methodology of transferring the accumulation of knowledge that would ensure their use in a reasonable ratio of positive and negative. Therefore, if the methodology of the knowledge cycle meets the criteria of the theory of knowledge, then it will be fair and necessary to pose the question of organising the process of knowledge transfer, which should also comply with the laws of the theory of knowledge, that is, the

methodology for organising the process of knowledge transfer should be a methodology in the process of learning new things. But in the theory of knowledge only reflection functions take place:

- A lively perception of the experience of previous generations;
- Abstraction thinking within the framework of each curriculum;
- A return to practice, that is, a lively perception of the experience of previous generations, at a certain level, and such levels are certainly:
 1. The level of abstract thinking;
 2. The level of innovative thinking;
 3. The level of the unsolved scientific problem;
 4. The level of the unresolved scientific problem.

This raises the question of the methodology of organising the process of knowledge transfer. If to organise the process of transferring knowledge according to the laws of living perception of experience in a particular speciality, then we will get the organisation of the process of transferring knowledge to train a specialist in a too narrow profile. If to organise the process of transferring knowledge in the second stage of reflection, that is, in studying the main theoretical disciplines in a particular speciality, then we can get a specialist in the corresponding program, which fully reflects the possibility of creating an intellectual person in the learning process. This, in turn, requires a qualitatively new search for the model of applying the skills of the intelligentsia already in the course of scientific research in the context of the development of socio-economic transformation of society.

If the first task we identified in the problem under consideration is improving the quality of education, then the second task in solving the existing problems in the triad “society – intelligentsia – education” is the task of building a knowledge society. The knowledge society determines the type of economy in which knowledge plays a decisive role, and their (that is, knowledge) production becomes a source of development. The intensive post-industrial development of society and the economy as a knowledge society requires the creation of the necessary institutional prerequisites or the activation of resources for the modernisation of the scientific, technical, innovative system and the development of intellectual potential. That is, if the state will have such a society, then only then can we talk about a certain, and possibly complete harmony of the concepts of society – the intelligentsia – the intellectual potential of the intelligentsia and society – power, both in direct and in reverse links of these concepts, their interconnections, mutual understanding of the subjects representing these concepts.

By that time, we have and will have what we have, with the exception of a partial improvement in this ratio through the improvement of the quality of education, through the formation of the elite of society, through the improvement of election laws, public control of activities, self-government and the like. In addition, both on the way to the formation of a knowledge society, and during the period of activity of such a society, in our opinion, it is necessary to take into account the operation of the laws of philosophy and, first of all, the law of unity and struggle of opposites.

The need to take this law into account is due to the fact that modern capitalist production leads to the blocking of individual freedom and causes an unprecedented crisis of Western civilisation, its spiritual and personal value base through the fact that such a quantity of

production of goods and services is achieved that, through a large amount of consumption, suppresses spiritual individual freedom. And that is not all.

Everyone knows that the technical revolution has increased human capabilities by a thousand times, computer technology gives the possibility of these increases hundreds of thousands of times, and what then can be expected with the wide and full use of information and communication technologies, which make it possible to increase human capabilities by a million times? In this case mankind can expect a crisis of spirituality? To prevent this from happening, it is necessary that today the formation of a knowledge society be accompanied by the creation of an information society based on information technology, taking into account the concepts and principles of sustainable development, which leads to a process of change in which the exploitation of resources, the direction of investments, the orientation of scientific and technological development and institutional changes coordinated with each other, which leads to such material security, which is necessary for the existence of human freedom and human state.

Conclusions

Thus, in our opinion, it is most appropriate to define the intelligentsia as a social phenomenon in the structure of society. Intellectuals do not have a sign of mass character; therefore, it cannot be unambiguously distinguished as a social group or layer. However, we can distinguish the intelligentsia in a social group or layer, because it is characterised by education, professionalism, social competence, an active civic position, the dissemination of national cultural values and traditions like that. But in this case, the intelligentsia is deprived of exclusivity and uniqueness as a social phenomenon. The inherent features of a high level of culture and responsibility for its condition, the preservation of national spiritual, moral, cultural values and historical memory of the people characterise the intelligentsia as a social phenomenon. A harmonious combination of the rational and the sensual allows it to act as a “conductor” of the national tradition between generations, during periods of social transformation. Further research on the topic, in our opinion, should be conducted in the context of the study of modern intelligentsia, its social functions and place in the structure of society.

The means of ensuring sustainable development should first be the concept of “decent work – decent pay” with the subsequent achievement of the main goal – the happiness of work and a constant focus on social development. For all this to become realities of lives of people, it is necessary that the current scheme of interaction in the form of: a person – a community – Intelligentsia and education, as a manifestation of the state of society, be replaced by a scheme in the form of: personality – a knowledge society of an intelligent type – the intellect of a nation and education, as manifestation of the intellectual potential of the nation.

This is precisely what follows from the knowledge circulation model in a society where production is regarded as a branch of human activity for obtaining material goods that fully correspond to the level of knowledge of the intelligentsia and the authorities. That is, from the level of creativity of thinking of representatives of the intelligentsia engaged in the production process and representatives of the authorities who are trained in such thinking in educational institutions. Creativity or creative thinking is the ability to create something unique and

unconventional. With the help of creativity, a person has new ideas and plans. Creativity can contribute to finding solutions in non-standard and difficult situations. It follows that the idea of creativity, the idea of learning, thinking should unite and permeate all curricula from preschool age, from programs in high school, from higher education programs to education throughout a person's life. This is our view, and it should be the main idea of the reform of education.

References

- Abramov, R. (2016). Understanding professionalism in the Soviet Union and Post-Soviet Russia: an analytical review. *The American Sociologist*, 47, 81–101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-015-9294-5>
- Andruschenko, V. P. (Ed.). (2005). *Inteligenciya*. In *Filosofskiy slovnnyk sociologichnykh terminiv* (pp. 337–339). “R. I. F.”
- Anisimov, R. I. (2020). *Vliyanie tsifrovoykh tekhnologiy na sotsial'nyuyu strukturu obshchestva (posledstviya i problemy)*. https://grant.rscf.ru/file/pubs/file/000000000000000003152505_/file.pdf
- Aristotle. (1994–2009). *Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oseo/instance.00258611>
- Berdiaev, N. (2015). Philosophical verity and intelligentsia truth. In M. S. Shatz & J. E. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Vekhi/Landmarks* (pp. 1–16). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315287058>
- Berryman, J. (2019). A comparison of the German and Russian literary intelligentsia in Arnold Hauser's *social history of art*. *Studies in East European Thought*, 71, 141–155. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11212-019-09327-4>
- Boborykin, P. D. (2003). *Za polveka: vospominaniya*. Zakharov.
- Bryson, J. J. (2018). Patience is not a virtue: the design of intelligent systems and systems of ethics. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 2, 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-018-9448-6>
- Bulgakov, S. P. (2005). *Ot marksizma k idealizmu: stat'i i recenzii*. Astrel.
- Bulgakov, S. (2015). Heroism and asceticism: reflections on the religious nature of the Russian intelligentsia. In M. S. Shatz & J. E. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Vekhi/Landmarks* (pp. 17–50). Routledge.
- Bychko, A., & Bychko, I. (1995). Ponyattya “intelihtentsiya” u predmetnomu poli sotsial'noyi filosofiyi. *Slovo i Chas*, 9(10), 39–50.
- Dmitriev, T. (2017). Max Weber and Peter Struve on the Russian revolution. *Studies in East European Thought*, 69, 305–328. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11212-017-9294-9>
- Dobruskin, M. (2005). Pro genezu termina ta filosofskogo ponyatiya “intelligentsiya”. *Filosofskaya dumka*, 5, 28–36.
- Epstein, A., & Kheimets, N. (2000). Immigrant Intelligentsia and its second generation: cultural segregation as a road to social integration? *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 1, 461–476. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-000-1025-1>
- Fichte, J. G. (2012). *The science of knowledge*. Forgotten Books.
- Frank, S. L. (1980). *Etika nigilizma*. Prideaux Press.
- Frolov, I. T. (Ed.). (2001). *Filosofskiy slovar'*. Respublika.
- Gaines, B. R. (1997). Knowledge management in societies of intelligent adaptive agents. *Journal of Intelligent Information Systems*, 9, 277–298. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008658220563>
- Glazov, Y. (1979). The Soviet intelligentsia, dissidents and the West. *Studies in Soviet Thought*, 19(4), 321–344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00832020>
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2010). *Science of logic*. Series: The Cambridge Hegel Translations. Cambridge University Press.

- Horujy, S. S. (2018). The ethical catastrophe of Contemporary Russia and its foresights in Russian thought. *Studies in East European Thought*, 70, 221–234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11212-018-9311-7>
- Kaľnoj, I. I. (2008). Esche raz o ponjatii “intelligencija”. *Kul'tura narodov Prichernomorja*, 134, 12–13.
- Kennedy, D. (2014). The hermeneutic of suspicion in contemporary american legal thought. *Law and Critique*, 25, 91–139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10978-014-9136-6>
- Kennedy, M. D. (1992). The intelligentsia in the constitution of civil societies and Post-Communist regimes in Hungary and Poland. *Theory and Society*, 21, 29–76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00993462>
- Kijima, K. (2001). Why stratification of networks emerges in innovative society: intelligent poly-agent systems approach. *Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory*, 7, 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011377532016>
- Kistyakovskij, B. A. (1991). V zashchite prava (intelligentsiya i pravosoznaniye). In *Vekhi: sbornik gosudarstvennoy o russkoy intelligentsia* (pp. 97–126). Molodaya gvardiya.
- Kotchekova, I. (2004). Dead or alive: the discursive massacre or the mass-suicide of Post-Soviet intelligentsia? *Sociological Research Online*, 9(4), 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.951>
- Likhachev, D. S. (1994). On the Russian intelligentsia. *Russian Studies in Literature*, 31(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.2753/RSL1061-1975310119>
- Loogma, K., Ümarik, M., Sirk, M., & Liivik, R. (2019). How history matters. The emergence and persistence of structural conflict between academic and vocational education: the case of Post-Soviet Estonia. *Journal of Educational Change*, 20, 105–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-018-09336-w>
- Losev, A. F. (1989). Ob intellektual'nosti. In A. F. Losev, *Derzanie dukkha* (pp. 314–322). Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury.
- Malyankar, R. M., & Findler, N. V. (1998). A methodology for modeling coordination in intelligent agent societies. *Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory*, 4, 317–345. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009634413228>
- Milskaya, L. T. (Ed.). (1998). *Kul'turologiya: XX vek. entsiklopediya*. Aleteya.
- Martin, D. (2014). Secularization: an international debate from a British perspective. *Society*, 51, 464–471. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-014-9812-z>
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1981). *Trudy*. Tom 40. Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury.
- Miljukov, P. N. (2013). *Intelligentsiya i istoricheskaya traditsiya*. http://russianway.rhga.ru/upload/main/88_Milyukov.pdf
- Montaño Hirose, L. (1995). Organisational spaces and intelligent machines: a metaphorical approach to ethics. *AI and Society: Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Communication*, 9, 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01174478>
- Ossinsky, I. I. (Managing Ed.). (2012). *Sovremennaya intelligentsiya: problemy sotsial'noy identifikatsii: sbornik nauchnykh trudov*. Tom 1. Materialy IX Mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferentsii 18–21 iyunya 2012 g. Izdatel'stvo Buryatskogo gosuniversiteta.
- Osipov, G. V. (Ed.). (2000). *Sotsiologicheskij entsiklopedicheskiy slovar'*. Norma-Infra-M.
- Ostrovsky, M. A. (2017). It is time to think “physiologically”. *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, 87, 93–99. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1019331617010105>
- Oushakine, S. A. (2009). Introduction. Wither the intelligentsia: the end of the moral elite in Eastern Europe. *Studies in East European Thought*, 61, 243. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11212-009-9093-z>
- Saukh, P. (2018). Intelihentsiya: problema sotsial'noyi identyfikatsiyi, *Lider. Elita. Suspilstvo*, 1, 46–59.
- Schelling, F. W. J. (1997). *System of Transcendental Idealism (1800)*. University Press of Virginia.
- Shalin, D. N. (2017). Extended mind and embodied social psychology: contemporary perspectives. *Society*, 54, 279–290. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-017-0135-8>
- Shatz, M. S., & Zimmerman, J. E. (Eds.). (2015). *Vekhi/Landmarks*. Routledge.

- Struve, P. B. (1980). *Intelligentsiya i revolyutsiya*. Series: Russian Titles for the Specialist. Vol. 223. Pridaux Press.
- Uvarov, P. B. (2005). *Deti khaosa: istoricheskiy fenomen intelligentsii*. Seriya: AIRO–Monografiya. AIRO–XX.
- Vinogradova, V. A. (2009). Intellectuals and intelligentsia in the pages of library periodicals. *Scientific and Technical Information Processing*, 36(4), 234–238. <https://doi.org/10.3103/S0147688209040078>
- Weber, M. (2015). Politics as vocation. In T. Waters & D. Waters (Eds.), *Weber's rationalism and modern society: new translations on politics, bureaucracy, and social stratification* (pp. 135–136). Palgrave MacMillan.
- Zysiak, A. (2019). Hysteresis, academic biography, and political field in the People's Republic of Poland. *Theory and Society*, 48, 483–508. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-019-09349-1>