

NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

As a manuscript

Maria Alekseevna Chernovskaya

**Intellectuals and intelligentsia: history of notions, social function and
systematization of interpretations**

Dissertation Summary
for the purpose of obtaining academic degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy

Academic supervisor:
PhD, Associate professor
Vitaly A. Kurennoy

Moscow
2022

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	3
Research relevance	3
Extent of prior research into problem	4
The object and topic of research	8
Theoretical and methodological basis of research.....	9
Scientific novelty of the research.....	13
Theses to be defended	14
Approbation of the research results	18
<i>Main contents of the work</i>	20
<i>Conclusion</i>	35

Introduction

Research relevance

There is an opinion that notions “intellectual” and “intelligentsia belong to the past and are no longer relevant while analysing modern society and political culture. Nevertheless in the XXI century we still can see that, while reacting to grand political events, journalists, philosophers time and time again return to these notions. Apart from having societal and political relevance (in the conditions of political disputes discussion about intelligentsia never ends), both notions become a part of the modern social theory due to conceptions of “knowledge society” and creative class. If we look at the works of the authors, who introduced the notion “knowledge society” and “postindustrial society” (Daniel Bell, Fritz Machlup, Robert Lane, Peter Drucker), we will see, that it is discussed in their works, whether “knowledge workers” can make up their own political class or they are just a part of the political elite. It is interesting that American and European thinkers, as well as the Russian ones, use a juxtaposition of the notions “intelligentsia” and “intellectual”, but with an opposite notion – intelligentsia are considered as experts, who do not overstep the boundaries of their own specialisation (mainly, “technocratic elite”), intellectuals are considered as educated people, who make statements about something that presents good for the whole society.

Besides, it is worth taking note that notions ‘intellectual’ and ‘intelligentsia’ are a topic of special inquiry In Russia –first of all, I am referring to collective monographs ‘History and theory of intelligentsia and intellectuals’¹ and ‘Mapping of modern intellectual tendencies’².

¹ Kurennoy V.A. (ed.) (2009) History and theory of intelligentsia and intellectuals (Thinking Russia). Moscow: Fond Nasledie Evrazii.

² Kurennoy V.A. (ed.) (2006) Mapping modern intellectual tendencies (Thinking Russia). Moscow: Fond Nasledie Evrazii.

Extent of prior research into problem

We highlight three types of literature that we work within the framework of our research. The first type are numerous works that we classify as primary sources of the research. These works give a certain meaning to the notions 'intellectual' and 'intelligentsia'. These notions appear in the first social theories. Phenomenon of intelligentsia became an object of reflection of early social historians and theoreticians already in the middle of the XIXth century – primarily, Lorenz von Stein and Otto Wilhelm Müller. Moreover, there are national traditions, within the frameworks of which discussions are conducted about the notions of 'intellectual' and 'intelligentsia'. In the Russian tradition an important figure was N.K. Mikhaylovsky, who gave a famous definition of 'intelligentsia'³. In the 1890-s Russian Marxists (mainly Plekhanov) criticized narodniks' understanding of intelligentsia⁴ (we discuss it later in the paragraph 'Genesis of notions 'intellectual' and 'intelligentsia'). In the 1900-s R.I. Ivanov-Razumnik systematizes modes of defining the notion 'intelligentsia' in Russia by highlighting socio-ethical and socio-economic approaches⁵. The issue of 'Vekhi'⁶ was followed by a great deal of publications in newspapers and magazines⁷ and two volumes from the parties of the Kadets and the SRs: a collection of articles 'Intelligentsia in Russia' and 'Vekhi' as a sign of time'⁸. Discussions about intelligentsia were continued in the

³ Mihajlovskij N.K. Zapiski sovremennika (in Russian) // Otechestvennye zapiski. Tom CCLIX. 1881. P. 201

⁴ Plehanov G.V. Our differences (In Russian) // Sochinenija. Vol. II. M., Petrograd, 1923.

⁵ Ivanov-Razumnik I.V. The History of Russian Social Thinking: Vol. 1 (In Russian) / Ed. by I. E. Zadorozhnyuk, E.G. Lavrik. Moscow, 1997.

⁶ Milestones (In Russian) // Manifests of Russian idealism / ed. by V.V. Sapov. Moscow: Astrel', 2009.

⁷ Discussions of 'Milestones' in the press in 1909-1910 are collected in the anthology ed. By V.V. Sapov (Milestones: pro et contra. Anthology (In Russian) / ed. By V.V. Sapov. Saint-Petersburg: RHGA, 1998).

⁸ Intelligentsia in Russia: a collection of articles (In Russian) . Saint-Petersburg: Zemlja, 1910; 'Vekhi' as a sign of time: a collection of articles (In Russian). Moscow: Zveno, 1910.

USSR and existed until 1924⁹, but were abruptly stopped after Stalin came to power, intensifying in the oral discourse.

In France discussion about the notion of ‘intellectual’ appears in the 1890-s during the Dreyfus case. Such prominent figures as Maurice Barrès, Charle Maurras, Ferdinand Brunetière¹⁰ criticized intellectuals, while Émile Durkheim and others praised them and identified with them¹¹.

In the XXth century the most outstanding and prominent statements on favour or against intellectuals were the work of Julien Benda¹² ‘The treason of intellectuals’, Jean-Paul Sartre¹³ and his opponent Raymond Aron¹⁴. As regards German tradition, besides the conceptualization of the notion in the middle of the XIXth century by Riehl, we should refer to the interpretation of the notion in Marxism, in the social theory of Joseph Schumpeter¹⁵ as well as the postwar criticism of the notion ‘intellectual’ conducted by conservative thinkers Arnold Gehlen and Helmut Schelsky¹⁶.

In the USA discussions about the role of the intellectual intensify in the postwar era. The first significant work in this case is the book of Richard Hofstadter ‘Anti-intellectualism in American life’¹⁷. One of the main topics of debate is the fall of the public intellectual, the most notorious work in this case is the book of Jacoby Russell ‘The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe’, written in 1987¹⁸. Debates about the revival of the public intellectual

⁹ Fates of Russian intelligentsia. Discussions. 1923-1925 (In Russian) / ed. by V.L. Soskin. Novosibirsk: Naka, 1991.

¹⁰ Maurras Ch. (2016) *The Future of the Intelligentsia & For a French Awakening* / tr. by A. Jacob. Budapest: Arktos Media Ltd.

¹¹ Durkheim E. *L'individualisme et les intellectuels* // *Revue bleue*. 4e série. T. X. 1898.

¹² Julien Benda, *La jeunesse d'un clerc*. Paris: Gallimard, 1968.

¹³ Sartre J.P. *A friend of the people* // *Between existentialism and Marxism*. Verso: London, New York, 1974. P. 286-298.

¹⁴ Aron R. *L'opium des intellectuels*. Paris: Gallimard, 1948.

¹⁵ Schumpeter J. (1942) *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

¹⁶ Gehlen A. *Gesamtausgabe*. Bd. 7 / Hrsgg. V. K.-S. Rehberg. Frankfurt a. M., 1978; Schelsky H. *Die Arbeit tun die Anderen: Klassenkampf und Priesterherrschaft der Intellektuellen*. 2. Aufl. Opladen, 1975.

¹⁷ Hofstadter R. *Anti-intellectualism in American life*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf: 1963.

¹⁸ Russell J. (2000) *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe*. New York: Basic Books.

continues in the 2000-s and in the present, as I demonstrate in the paragraph ‘Contemporary debates about intellectuals’.

Furthemore, there is a range of works, where the notion ‘intellectual’ becomes an essential component of social theory and philosophy. First of all, we talk about the works of Antonio Gramsci and Karl Mannheim, they are analysed in one of the chapters of the dissertation.

The second type of literature, that we work with, is research literature, where a political, social and philosophical context of debates surrounding notions ‘intellectuals’ and ‘intelligentsia’ is reconstructed. The list of these works is rather long. Considering debates in Russia on the collection ‘Milestones’, we can highlight the works of M.A. Kolerov¹⁹, articles of N.S. Plotnikov²⁰, Aileen Kelly²¹ and anthology, dedicated to reconstruction of social and political context around ‘Vekhi’, entitled «Landmarks Revisited: The Vekhi Symposium One Hundred Years On»²².

As far as the Dreyfus case, we consider as the most significant works the book of Michel Winock ‘Nationalism, Anti-Semitism, and Fascism in France’, in which Winock follows the genesis of ideology of antidreyfusards and dreyfusards (as well as the differences of French nationalism during the French revolution and the Third Republic)²³. Besides that, we refer to the book of Christoph Charle ‘Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIXe siècle’, in which Charle follows origins of the social groups, who in the end of the 1890-s will name themselves ‘intellectuals’, as

¹⁹ Kolerov M. A. Not the peace, but the sword: Russian religious and philosophical press from the ‘Problems of idealism to ‘Milestones’. 1902-1909 (In Russian). Saint-Petersburg: Aletejja, 1996; Kolerov M.A. Manifests of Russian political idealism: ‘Problems of idealism’ (1902), ‘Milestones’ (1909), From Depth (1918) and their heirs (In Russian). Minsk: Limarius, 2020.

²⁰ Plotnikov N.S. Notes on ‘Milestones’ // Research on the history of the Russian thought: annual of 2003 (in Russian) / ed. by M.A. Kolerov, 2004. P. 562-571; Plotnikov N.S. On the question of relevance of the philosophy of ‘Milestones’: the collection ‘Russlands politische Seele // (Addition: Gurvich I. Introduction [to the collection] // Research on the history of the Russian thought: annual of 1997 (in Russian). SPb., Aletejja: 1997. P. 66–93.

²¹ Kelly A. Self-Censorship and the Russian Intelligentsia, 1905-1914 // Slavic Review, Vol. 46, No. 2 (Summer, 1987), pp. 193-213.

²² Landmarks Revisited: The Vekhi Symposium One Hundred Years On / ed. by R. Aizlewood, R. Coates. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2013.

²³ Winock M. Nationalism, Anti-Semitism, and Fascism in France / tr. by J.M. Todd. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

well as the principles of differentiation of dreyfusards and antidreyfusards in the academic, university, journalist environment and in the art sphere²⁴. Analysing the position of Julien Benda on intellectuals, we consider as important introduction to the Russian translation of the book by A.V. Mateshuk²⁵ and the chapter ‘Julien Benda and intellectual treason’ in Michael Walzer’s book ‘The Company Of Critics: Social Criticism And Political Commitment In The Twentieth Century’²⁶. Reconstruction of Sartre’s position relies on the works of David Drake²⁷.

For the analysis of Antonio Gramsci’s theory of intellectuals, we consider works of T.A. Dmitriev ‘Antonio Gramsci’²⁸ and N.A. Dmitrieva and E.S. Chichin ‘Intelligentsia or intellectuals? Systematic definition of the concept «gli intellettuali» in Antonio Gramsci’s philosophy’²⁹. For Karl Mannheim’s theory of intellectuals we use the article of V.A. Kurennoy³⁰, for the reconstruction of classical Marxism – the article of A.N. Dmitriev³¹, Parsons’ position – lectures of Craig Calhoun ‘Theories of modernization and globalization: Who and why invented them’³².

The third type of literature we work with is research on the history of concepts ‘intelligentsia’ and ‘intellectuals’. The authors of these research papers

²⁴ Charle Ch. *Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIXe siècle*, Le Seuil, 1996.

²⁵ Mateshuk A.V. *Julien Benda: eternal values of the intellectual // Treason of the intellectual/ Julien Benda (in Russian) / tr. from French by V.P. Gajdamaka, A. V. Mateshuk. Moscow, 2009.*

²⁶ Walzer M. (2002) *The Company Of Critics: Social Criticism And Political Commitment In The Twentieth Century*. New York: Basic Books.

²⁷ Drake D. *Intellectual of the Twentieth Century // Sartre Studies International*. Vol. 9, No. 2 (2003), pp. 29-39; Drake D. *Sartre and May 1968: The Intellectual in Crisis // Sartre Studies International*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1997), pp. 43-65.

²⁸ Dmitriev T.A. *Antonio Gramshi (In Russian) // History and theory of intelligentsia and intellectuals*. M.: Nasledie Evrazii, 2009. P. 207-228.

²⁹ Dmitrieva N.A., Chichin E.S. *Intelligentsia or intellectuals? Systematic definition of the concept «gli intellettuali» in Antonio Gramsci’s philosophy (In Russian) // Vestnik Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni A. S. Pushkina: nauchnyj zhurnal*. Vol. 2: *Filosofija*, 2013. № 2. P. 35-45.

³⁰ Kurennoy V.A. *Karl Mannheim (In Russian) // History and theory of intelligentsia and intellectuals*. Moscow: Nasledie Evrazii, 2009. P. 229-255.

³¹ Dmitriev A.N. *Marxism (In Russian) // History and theory of intelligentsia and intellectuals*. Moscow: Nasledie Evrazii, 2009. P. 163-187.

³² Calhoun Cr. *Theories of modernization and globalization: Who and why invented them (In Russian)*. Lecture. 17.01.2006. URL: <http://rudocs.exdat.com/docs/index-143310.html>.

work with a large amount of texts, which include not only theoretical works, but also fiction, correspondence, texts in the press et cetera. The most significant work, which has not yet been translated into Russian, is Otto Müller's book 'Intelligentsia'³³. Müller uses a large corpus of texts and analyses ways of using the word 'intelligentsia' and transformation of its meaning in Russian culture in the end of the XIX-th and the beginning of the XXth century. The most important conclusions of Müller for us are, firstly, that the concept 'intelligentsia' manifests itself in one period in Russia, Germany and France (hence, Müller does not confirm the idea of the uniqueness of the concept 'intelligentsia; in Russia). Besides that, Müller comes to the conclusion that in the end of XIX-th century a maximal range of definitions of the concept 'intelligentsia existed in Russia and it would be fiction to narrow it down to one definition³⁴. Besides that, the work of D.A. Sdvizkov 'Znayki and their friends: Comparative history of Russian intelligentsia'³⁵ and his chapter in the collective monograph 'Concept on Russia, entitled 'From society to intelligentsia: history of concepts as a history of self-consciousness'³⁶. Other important works in the research of the history of concepts 'intellectual' and 'intelligentsia' are two collective monographs, published in Russia – 'History and theory of intelligentsia and intellectuals'³⁷ and 'Mapping modern intellectual tendencies'³⁸.

The object and topic of research

³³ Müller O. W. (1971). *Intelligencija: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte eines politischen Schlagwortes*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum.

³⁴ Müller O. W. (1971) *Intelligencija. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte eines politischen Schlagwortes*. S. 251.

³⁵ Sdvizkov D.A. *Znayki and their friends: Comparative history of Russian intelligentsia* (In Russian). Moscow: New literary review, 2021.

³⁶ Sdvizkov D.A. *From society to intelligentsia: history of concepts as a history of self-consciousness* (In Russian) // 'Concepts on Russia': to the historical semantics of the period of Empire. Vol. 1. Moscow: New literary review, 2021.

³⁷ Kurennoy V.A. (ed.) (2009) *History and theory of intelligentsia and intellectuals* (Thinking Russia) (in Russian) . Moscow: Fond Nasledie Evrazii.

³⁸ Kurennoy V.A. (ed.) (2006) *Mapping modern intellectual tendencies* (Thinking Russia) (in Russian) . Moscow: Fond Nasledie Evrazii.

The object of this research is a wide body of texts, devoted to intellectuals and intelligentsia in numerous national traditions – Russian, French, German and American. The topic of research are theories of intellectuals and intelligentsia.

However, the research has certain limitations to it. Firstly, I do not aim to describe all vastly different theories of intelligentsia, but merely highlight the most typical theoretical models. Secondly, I do not aspire to analyse all existing national traditions of reflection of concept ‘intellectual’ and ‘intelligentsia’. The chosen traditions are distinguished by their interconnections and mutual interest – Izgoev analyses the Dreyfus case, Maurras refers to the usage of the concept ‘intelligentsia’ in Russia, Bell is interested on Machajski et cetera.

The aims and problems of research

The aim of the following research is to explain the explication of the main types of theories of intelligentsia and intellectuals.

In order to attain the set aim, the dissertation will sequentially solve the following series of problems. Firstly, I will analyse the history of concepts ‘intelligentsia’ and ‘intellectuals’. Secondly, I will analyse social history of intelligentsia. Thirdly, the types of theories of intelligentsia will be structured. Lastly, the description of these types or models will be demonstrated with the help of examples of Russian, French, German, American traditions.

Theoretical and methodological basis of research

One of the main thesis of the dissertation is that in the end of the XIXth century in a number of countries the concepts ‘intellectual’ and ‘intelligentsia’ transit to the category of concept – not a neutral expression, but a value loaded and one and not constrained to one definition. Since we offer a semantic analysis of the concepts ‘intellectual’ and ‘intelligentsia’, this essentially constrains the area of our analysis. We analyse texts, where we use the word ‘intellectual’, but we do not take into account the retrospective history of this concept, when people who did not call themselves intellectuals, but belonged to the educated class for example, in the Middle Ages, consequently become the object of analysis and are identified as intellectuals. The classic example of such inquiry is the book of Jacques Le Goff

‘Intellectuals in the Middle Ages’³⁹. Besides that, such a retrospective history is constructed by numerous members of discussion about intelligentsia – for example, Struve declares that intelligentsia as an heir to kazaks in ‘Vekhi’.

We consider the historico-semantic approach of Reinhart Koselleck as the most suitable one for working with the concept. Koselleck considers that the most important thing is the difference between the word and the concept: ‘Word becomes concept, when this semantic connection, in which and for which the word is used, becomes embedded in the word. The concept exists in the word, but at the same time it is bigger than the word’⁴⁰. In Koselleck’s opinion, if the words’ meanings are precisely defined, the concepts can be merely interpreted. The main criteria for defining the concept is its polysemy: ‘Nevertheless this distinction between the word and the concept relies on the obviousness of empirical examples. Whereas words and concepts should be differentiated by their definition’⁴¹. The transition from the word to the concept is, in Bödeker’s opinion, is not quite clear, however, this transition is ‘the fundamental condition that concepts become the main historical factors’⁴².

Koselleck highlights several types of concepts, the main of which are the fundamental ones. In the fundamental concepts experience and expectation are jointed, they are always arguable and they preserve their historical meaning during the long period. Concepts are not merely constructed by the social reality, they influence it themselves: ‘in the historical and political perspective the main social concepts are used exactly for those thoughts, that in the process of usage gradually condense. Each repetitive usage makes them more alive, and therefore these thoughts are implicitly used for usage’⁴³. Koselleck juxtaposes the history of concepts to the history of ideas (in Germany this methodology was developed by

³⁹ Goff le J. Intellectuals in the Middle Ages. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

⁴⁰ Bödeker H.E. Reflections on the method of history of concepts (in Russian) // History of concepts, history of discourse, history of mentality / ed, by H.E. Bödeker / tr. from German. Moscow, 2010. P. 42.

⁴¹ Op. cit. P. 43.

⁴² Op. cit.

⁴³ Op. cit. P. 47.

Friedrich Meinecke). – history of ideas studies ideas that are isolated from each other, whereas history of concepts is ‘aimed at the precise usage of language on social, political or legal life’⁴⁴. Nevertheless, in Bödeker’s opinion, authors of numerous articles in the book ‘Basic Concepts in History: A Historical Dictionary of Political and Social Language in Germany’ presented ‘concepts and ‘meaning’ as more or less static ‘ideas’⁴⁵.

History of concepts also opposes itself to linguistic analysis, because it uses a wide historical context, ‘and its conception is based on socio-political, but not linguistic concepts’⁴⁶. The main epistemological problem of historiographic history of concepts is the relation between the word, the concept and reality. As Bödeker claims, ‘numerous attempts of Koselleck to define this relation remained unsuccessful’⁴⁷.

A comparative history of concepts plays a crucial role for our research. Concepts depend on their repetition in language, and repetition constitutes ‘big longitude of language’⁴⁸. The semantics is in essence a possibility of repetition, and at the same time it is connected to each language separately. Koselleck also claims that two methodological approaches are interconnected – history of concepts and history of discourse (however, he opposes to eternal externalization of the context in the research, because the last one ‘is, in a certain way, a look through the lens of the camera’⁴⁹).

Dutch researcher Martin von Gelderen compares the relation of this methodology to ‘the problem of chicken or egg’: ‘Where understanding of concepts demands reconstruction of discourse particularities of their usage, the reconstruction of political language and political vocabulary should be based on understanding such constitutive components, as concepts. History of concepts and

⁴⁴ Op. cit. P. 63.

⁴⁵ Op. cit. P. 52.

⁴⁶ Op. cit. P. 55.

⁴⁷ Op. cit.

⁴⁸ Koselleck R. On the question of temporal structures in the historical development of concepts (In Russian) // History of concepts, history of discourse, history of mentality / ed. by. H.E. Bödeker / tr. from German. Moscow, 2010. P. 27.

⁴⁹ Op. cit. P. 22.

history of political language can meet each other on methodological ‘middle ground’, in terms of convenience of the semantic field’⁵⁰.

As V.A. Kurennoj notes, the main problem of the research program of history of concepts is the question, how it is connected with social history. This question is the case of the ‘complex problem’ of the classical New European philosophy of consciousness: ‘if all our knowledge of the world is mediated by our ideas, how do we know, what they refer to?’⁵¹ Besides that, Kurennoj points to the downsides of Koselleck’s theory, which concern his distinction between the concept and the word. The definition given by Koselleck (the concept, unlike the word, includes all the fullness of socio-political context of meanings) is not satisfactory, because such an approach (apart from being archaic) is possible only for the historian who looks into the past. For the contemporaries who are included in the socio-political context, the concepts, per contra, have a precise meaning.

German philosopher Hermann Lübbe offers another criterion of distinction, which can transfer the word to the concept. Firstly, he notes that the aim of the history of concepts cannot be an attempt to give a formal definition of the concept. History of concepts can just make the obligation of a factual definition of the concept relative and historicized⁵². The concepts are ‘schemes of orientation and action for practice and theory’⁵³, they can be compared to the maps that allow the person to orientate even when they are not precise. The concept is formulated not in the result of a rational consensus and is characterized by the aspiration to ‘collect souls’ around it⁵⁴, the concept becomes the watchword. If Koselleck is oriented at the ‘fullness of socio-political context of meanings’ while defining the concept, for Lübbe the primary importance is given to the situation of semantic debate of conflict. In this case, the concept is used as the watchword for various

⁵⁰ Gelderen M. v. *Between Cambridge and Heidelberg. Concepts, Languages and Images in Intellectual History // History of concepts: comparative perspectives / ed. by I. Hampsher-Monk et al. Amsterdam, 1998. P. 234.*

⁵¹ Kurennoj V.A. *History of philosophical history of concepts: introduction to H. Lübbe’s translation (In Russian) // Sociology of knowledge. Vol. 29. № 4. P. 198.*

⁵² *Op. cit.* P. 220.

⁵³ *Op. cit.* P. 221.

⁵⁴ *Op. cit.* P. 223.

ideo-political fronts. The struggle for defining the concept usually begins to unravel in narrow intellectual circles, however it can then have colossal political consequences, as we are talking about the power and domination of ideas. At the same time there is no established right naming, and the appeal to the independent third instance, that could define precisely the meaning of this concept, is impossible. All the agents included into the debate about naming (definition of the naming of the concept) are included into the political struggle, 'distinguished political struggle for naming, as any political struggle, is led not by the condemnation of moral or legal instances and not by the conclusion of linguistic experts on the question of semantics'⁵⁵. While we successfully change the meaning of the concept, the social reality also changes as well as the factual significant systems of differentiation.

The method of the history of concepts requires a detailed analysis of the narrowly defined body of sources and is a historiography of a certain type. Nevertheless any fullness of the spectre has its downside in the narrowing of the topic of research. In the present research we rely on the existing works on the history of concepts of 'intelligentsia' and 'intellectual', that show that these words are used as the watchwords which allow people to join under their signs; the cause political debates as well. We aim to explain this phenomenon with other methodological ways and articulate its specifics; the research does not have a limited body of research for analysis. Therefore, our research is not the history on concepts per se; the aim of the research is a conceptual analysis, analysis and explication of theories.

Scientific novelty of the research

The scientific novelty of the research consists, firstly, of the fact that a complex research of the problems of defining the concepts 'intellectuals' and 'intelligentsia' while using the whole group of methods – the history of concepts,

⁵⁵ Lübbe H. Be and be named. The history of meaning as the field of political linguistic action / tr. from German by O. Kildushov. *Sociology of Power*. Vol. 20. № 17, 2007. P. 245.

social history, conceptual explication of the main theories. Secondly, for the first time the problem of intelligentsia is researched on such a wide material. Thirdly, theories of intelligentsia are highlighted in numerous national traditions. Fourthly, for the first time a systematic typology of these theories is presented and they are explained on a significant material of the existing works, which are devoted to the problems of intelligentsia and intellectuals. Lastly, for the first time in national literature detailed explanations of theories of intelligentsia of Jan Waclaw Machajski and A.S. Izgoev are given.

Theses to be defended

1) Despite the fact that during the last decades there is a discussion about the fall and disappearance of the figure of public intellectual, the concept 'intellectual' remains significant for modern society, as it is shown in the dissertation on the example of the debates on the figure of public intellectual in the USA in the 2000-s. Modern authors who discuss problems of intellectuals consider the same questions as the authors of the XIX-XX centuries: the possible decline of the public opinion and risks of its manipulation. The critical position towards intellectuals remains the same: they are condemned as not taking responsibility for their words (analogous critical invectives towards intellectuals declared the French philosopher Raymond Aron in the book 'Opium of intellectuals' of 1955 and German sociologist Helmut Schelsky in the book 'Work is done by others', published in 1975).

2) Within the frameworks of social history of modern society the concepts 'intellectual' and 'intelligentsia' begin to be used from the middle of the XIX century alongside other main concepts of class and group stratification. The structural element of proletariat – 'working proletariat' – is defined as the group, who are employees, but who gain funds by intellectual labor (bureaucrats of middle and low level, teacher, literators, journalists et cetera). The defining influence on the social contents of the concepts 'intellectuals' and 'intelligentsia' was the work 'History of social

movements in France from 1789 till our days' by Lorenz von Stein, published in 1850, and the book 'Civil society' by Willhelm Henrich Riehl. Therefore, the concepts 'intelligentsia', 'proletariat of intellectual labour' et cetera begin to be used in modern social or protosocial theory from the beginning of its formation;

3) Within the frameworks of authoritative discourse the question about intellectuals and intelligentsia appears in the context of the risk of destruction of established estate and stratified structure of society. Nicholas I in 1827, Prussian minister of education Gustav von Goßler in 1889 as well as the advisor of New York University A.M. Carter in 1970 in different forms warned about unsuitable education for the grand amount of students and noticed the risks of overproduction of such an amount of graduates. Historians consider the phenomenon of overproduction of graduates as one of the sources of social tensions during the Revolutions of 1848, the Dreyfus case, Russian revolution of 1917 and the wave of student protests of 1968.

4) Although the concept 'intellectual' and 'intelligentsia' became widespread only in the end of the XIX century, the functional role of this group, as we can define retrospectively, is discussed in the early period of the forming of the society, beginning from the XVIII century, in the context of the problem of the 'public' and 'public opinion'. Particularly, in the works of Immanuel Kant the 'scientist' or the 'philosopher' are obligated to speak in the interest of the public good from a strictly rational position. The social and discursive paradox, however, is that the concepts 'intellectual' and 'intelligentsia' begin to be actively used in the period, when a 'public sphere' falls into crisis and begins to decline. (J. Habermas).

5) Phenomena of intellectuals and intelligentsia begin to be actively discussed in the context of the development of numerous versions of 'philosophy of suspicion', primarily of the Marxist type. In this case any position that aspires to take into consideration the public good is considered

as impossible and obviously engaged by someone's particular (class or party) interest.

6) The basic binary difference of various theories and interpretation of phenomena of intellectuals and intelligentsia can be reduced to the difference between representation of particular (class) and general (rational, universal, 'non-party') interest. The latter is regularly reproduced by modern theoreticians, for example, in the texts of the late Bourdieu the concept of 'internationale of intellectuals', who act in universal rational horizon, is developed. The specifics of Marxist position is that the intellectual who speaks in defence of the proletariat speaks from one group, however, he takes into account the interests of the entire mankind (because it is the proletariat that has the destiny to destroy the class structure of the society).

7) In the present work we use a four-type typology of conceptualizations of phenomena of intellectuals and intelligentsia, which was proposed in one of the works of V.A. Kurennoj, although we expanded in a substantial way the empirical base of this typology. These conceptualizations consider the phenomena of intellectuals and intelligentsia as: 1) the group that functionally defines itself through a specific kind of occupation ('intellectual labour'), access to which is provided by the level of education; 2) the group that functionally defines itself in the categories of value, ideology and morality; 3) the independent socio-economic group (class), that follows its own, specific interests of dominance; 4) specific representatives of any social group, that indirectly insure its interests of dominance;

8) The group of sources that are the object of inquiry in the present research have a different level of theorization. It extends from texts-manifests (for example, 'Vekhi') to the texts of socio-theoretical character, for example, theories of intellectuals of Karl Mannheim and Antonio Gramsci. Nevertheless, in all these works the concepts 'intellectual' and

‘intelligentsia’ are presented as the ‘main’ or ‘arguable’ concepts and have a distinctive critical or apologetic tendency to give this concept a certain value-loaded semantics. Within the frameworks of the dissertation we regard a range of theories of intelligentsia that are not poorly known in the Russian and in the world research literature (specifically, the theory of Jan Waclaw Machajski).

9) Although there is an opinion, that the collection of essays ‘Vekhi’ is devoted only to the Russian phenomenon of intelligentsia and its role in the 1905 Revolution, one of the authors of the collection – A.S. Izgoev – designed his theory of intelligentsia under the influence of the Dreyfus Case in France in 1898, and his understanding of the role of intelligentsia was formed entirely before the 1905 revolution. Although Izgoev’s position differs significantly from the main ‘idealistic’ position of other ‘Vekhi’ authors, he also thought that intelligentsia is capable of playing the crucial role in the political life of the country and lead it to gaining political freedom;

10) The theory of intelligentsia of Jan Waclaw Machajski had a direct impact on the forming of a range of Western social conceptions in the second half of the XX century: ‘new class’ theories and theories of post-industrial society. In Russia Machajski’s theory was excluded from the horizon of modern historical research, that can be followed up from the period of the 1930-s, when in the USSR under the initiative of Stalin the campaign for the battle with ‘Machaevshina’ was lost. However, its role in the international context is extremely high. Thanks to Max Nomad, it was transferred to the Western (English-speaking) context, where the ideas of Machajski became known and were perceived by a range of grand social theoreticians of the middle of the XXth century, particularly, Daniel Bell and Alvin Gouldner, and can be perceived as one of the sources of various theories of ‘knowledge society’.

11) Machaski's ideas, who considered the access to knowledge and education as a certain type of capital, can be systematically recognized in later theories, particularly, in the theories of cultural capital of Pierre Bourdieu and the concept of the society of singularities of Andreas Reckwitz, although they were not based directly on the influence of these ideas;

12) On the example of academical biography of Walter Benjamin and the reception of his ideas and his figure in the USA it is demonstrated, how the type of intellectual, which was marginal in Germany of the 1920-1930-s became in demand in the American culture of the last quarter of the XX century. The history of the American reception of the heritage and role of Benjamin can be interpreted as a part of the larger trend to overcome American 'anti-intellectualism' and popularization of the figure of the intellectual beyond institutions.

Approbation of the research results

The results of the research were approbated in the following reports on scientific conferences and seminars of the laboratories:

1) International conference of students, PhD candidates and young scientists 'Lomonosov' (MSU). Report; 'History of reception of Walter Benjamin in the USA', 12 April 2018;

2) International Laboratory for the Study of Russian and European Intellectual Dialogue (Moscow, Higher school of economics), seminar 'The dialogue of Russia and Europe: the regard of young researchers'. Report: 'Uprooted' and 'old believers': critics of intellectuals and intelligentsia in the Dreyfus case and 'Vekhi' (comparative analysis)', 23 September 2020;

3) International conference 'Ways of thinking, modes of speaking. Philosophy, its past and future' (Moscow, Higher school of economics). Report: 'Uprooted' and 'old believers': critics of intellectuals and

intelligentsia in the Dreyfus case and ‘Vekhi’ (comparative analysis)’, 7 October 2021;

4) The Institute for cultural studies (Moscow, Higher school of economics). Report ‘The cultural function of intellectuals: philosophical analysis’, 23 June 2021;

5) Centre of fundamental sociology, conference ‘Political theology of Soviet modernity: from revolutionary doctrines of salvation to cultural practices of socialistic building (Moscow, Higher school of economics). Report ‘Anarchist criticism of socialism as a quasireligious system at the end of the XIX-beginning of the XX century’, 19 March 2022;

The key points of the PhD thesis were presented in the following publications:

1) Chernovskaya M. Walter Benjamin as the ‘last European’: the transfer of Walter Benjamin’s ideas to American cultural studies // Russian Sociological Review. Vol. 20. No. 4, 2020. P. 137-151.

2) Chernovskaya M. Criticism of Marxism as a Proto-theory of Cultural Capital and the “New Class”: J. W. Machajski’s Theory of Intelligentsia // Russian Sociological Review. Vol. 21. № 1, 2022. P. 235-263.

3) Chernovskaya M. A.S. Izgoev’s vision of intelligentsia // Philosophy journal. Vol. 15. № 2, 2022. P. 17–30.

Main contents of the work

In the first chapter 'History of concepts and social history' in the first paragraph we show on the example of discussions of the figure of public intellectual in the USA in the 2000-s that the concept 'intellectual' remains crucial for sociologists, philosophers and specialists in cultural studies. Although the idea of the decline of the public intellectual was influential in the USA in the second half of the XX century, this concept has not ceased to be the object of reflection, analysis and debates in the beginning of the XX century in this country. We have highlighted the key point for our research: firstly, the significant part of the debates about intellectuals is an attempt to define this concept in a precise way, which authors have difficulties with every time. Hence comes the acceptance of a certain arbitrariness of the criteria of belonging to intellectuals in the research of Richard Posner; Goldfarb notes that uncertainty in the identity of intellectuals is an important sociological fact.

Besides that, the brief review of the present scientific papers has demonstrated that contemporary thinkers adhere to the same topics as the researchers at the end of the XIX century and in the XX century. In the paragraph 'Problematics of private and public in the society of modernity' we will demonstrate the role of the concept 'public', which originated in the era of Enlightenment, in the discussion about intellectuals. Modern researchers pay attention to transformation of the public in the society of modernity. Some, like Christopher Hitchens, think that the opinion of the public should not be taken into account, because it is a product of manipulation of different corporations. Others, like Goldfarb, insist that the transformation of public that began in the XIX century and continued in the XX century, did not lead to its decline and impossibility of free rational discussion of important topics in society. The accusation of intellectuals in the fact that they do not carry any responsibility for their words, addressed to the general public, that Posner suggested, is also neither new nor original. Raymond Aron vocalized similar reproaches to intellectuals in his book

‘Opium of intellectuals’, published in 1955 and German sociologist Helmut Schelsky did the same in the book ‘Work is done by the others’ published in 1975.

In the paragraph ‘Genesis of the concepts ‘intellectuals’ and ‘intelligentsia; the transfer from the abstract to collective noun is analysed – the transfer happened around 1830 in France and England, after 1848 in Germany and after 1860 in Russia⁵⁶. The concept ‘intelligentsia’ does not mean the quality of a person’s reason, but also defines the part of the population that is a bearer of such reason that could govern the country. In France after 1830 for the conservative-monarchist party the bearer of such reason becomes the monarch and the aristocracy, in its turn, the revolutionary-democratic party requires universal suffrage, because every citizen is capable of judging the state affairs⁵⁷.

In German language the concept ‘Intelligenz’ is used similarly to the French analogue. The book ‘History of the French Social Movements from 1789 to the Present’, published in 1850, is, in Müller’s opinion, the first work that had a decisive effect on the definition of the concepts ‘intelligentsia’ and ‘intellectuals’ in the following social theory. Stein considers ‘educated intelligentsia’ as part of the ‘third estate’ that along with owners of capital and the people deprived of property and education rose to fight the absolutist government. He also pays attention to the connection between the possession of power and the level of education of the social class. Simultaneously with Stein’s work the book ‘Civil society’ by Willhelm Henrich Riehl is published, where Riehl introduces the concept ‘proletariat of spiritual labour’, that includes a vast amount of bureaucrats, people connected with the sphere of education and church, artists and journalists. Together with ‘proletariat of material labour’ and ‘aristocratic proletariat’ this group constitutes the ‘fourth estate’. According to Riehl, the ‘proletariat of spiritual labour’ represents the ‘authentic ecclesia militans of the fourth estate’⁵⁸. Therefore, already in the middle of the XIX century the concepts ‘intelligentsia’, ‘proletariat

⁵⁶ Müller O. W. *Intelligencija. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte eines politischen Schlagwortes.* Frankfurt a. M., 2002. P. 50.

⁵⁷ *Op. cit.* P. 61.

⁵⁸ *Riehl W. H. Die bürgerliche Gesellschaft.* Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1851. P. 299.

of the spiritual labour' et cetera have their place in the social history of its time. As established characteristics of a certain social group they are actively taken over by social-democrats and Marxists: a vast amount of polemical notes and works of August Bebel, Karl Kautsky, Rosa Luxemburg are dedicated to intelligentsia. From here the concept penetrates the circle of problems discussed by the Russian social-democrats.

In the paragraph 'Intelligentsia and intellectuals as a social reality: prerequisites and main factors of emergence' we discuss the objectified aspect of the social history of intelligentsia and intellectuals, social prerequisites of forming of the social groups that will later call themselves 'intelligentsia' or 'intellectuals' or will be called so. I do not aim at tracking the complete history of intellectuals (especially since it seems arguable). Nevertheless, it is worth understanding that during the formation of the modern social theory or protosocial theory the topic of intelligentsia or intellectuals emerges from the very beginning. In this paragraph we viewed the social history of intellectuals on the example of two national histories – German and French.

We consider as the main social premises of the genesis of the concepts 'intellectuals' and 'intelligentsia' the following. Firstly, the social reality in the XIX century transformed significantly in comparison to the XVIII century, since certain social groups (proletariat) begin to claim both the defence of their labour rights and their representation in public administration. Concurrently the concept 'intellectual proletariat' emerges, which is designed to define people who earn their living by intellectual labour (bureaucrats, teachers, literators, and journalists). It is the representatives of the intellectual labour who become the leaders of the working movement (the main problem of which in the 1848 revolutions is the lack of decent self-management). At the same time, fairly early contemporaries start to suspect that those who name themselves 'intellectual proletariat', tend not to liberate the working men, but to follow their own interests. One of the first conceptualizations of this kind is presented in the book 'Civil society' by Wilhelm Henrich Riehl.

The 1848 Revolutions ended with the defeat of those who wanted to radically change the social order, however, they made the political elites come to terms with the fact that from now on they should enlist the approval of the people in their governing. Socialistic movements in the second half of the XIX century gained strength and the attempt to forbid them (as in case of Bismarck and SDPG) just contributed to their rising popularity. At the charge of such movements were not people from the working environment – the founder of the first mass party organization of German work movement Ferdinand Lassalle was born in the family of a rich merchandiser of silk, the founder of the French socialistic party Jules Guesde was the son of the professor, Paul Lafargue – the son of the owner of coffee plantations in Cuba. Thus many well-educated natives of bourgeois families found their calling in the leadership of work movements at that time they did not have another opportunity to influence the politics, as the access to the political elites was extremely difficult for outsiders). On the reasons of the radicalization of the part of educated people in Russian is their impossibility to influence the political process by agitation among workers and peasants, not to mention the participation in the political process.

The second important social process was the expansion of the higher education in Europe. It happened with different levels of intensity throughout the XIX and the XX centuries. Between 1870 and 1913 in Germany the number of the students tripled, in France quadrupled. The second half of the XX century became the stage of the radical expansion of the higher education – just in France in 1950 students' share in the population was 4 percent, in 1970 – already 15,5 percent. Simultaneously with the process of expansion bureaucrats and governors start raising concerns that the overproduction of people with higher education is happening, the ambitions of whom after the graduation from the educational institution cannot be satisfied by the existing positions in the public administration, entrepreneurs and educational institutions. Besides that, such graduates can aspire to be included in the political elite of the country, the access to which is still defined by the person's origin or financial capital (that was similar to each other in

the case of the grand bourgeoisie), but not his cultural capital or education diploma. Discrepancies between ambitions of young graduates and their professional self-realization were one of the significant sources of social tensions – from the 1848 Revolutions, the 1917 Russian revolution to the waves of student protests of 1968.

The last thing to consider is the rising intellectualization of labour that took place in the second half of the XX century. This process was analysed by numerous theoreticians. The concept of knowledge society was developed by such researchers as Peter Drucker, Fritz Machlup, Robert Lane, Daniel Bell. In 1959 Peter Drucker (one of the most influential theoreticians of management in the XX century) expressed the ideas that knowledge in the modern world is the main type of capital and well-educated people are the central resource of the society⁵⁹. Drucker also noted that the work connected with the production of knowledge, vision and concepts became the most fruitful type of enterprise even in the field of goods and service⁶⁰, and the class of knowledge workers are the authentic capitalists in the modern society⁶¹. The radical expansion of mass education in the second half of the XX century was the direct result of the rising need in ‘knowledge workers’.

In the paragraph ‘Problematics of public and private in the modern society’ we show that although the concept ‘intellectual’ became widely used only at the end of the XIX century, prerequisites for its forming existed already in the XVIII century and appeared due to the emergence of the concept ‘public’. De facto in Kant’s exposition the scientist or philosopher who performs before the reading public is an intellectual (in the interpretation of dreyfusards or Jean-Paul Sartre), because he speaks in the interests of the people (common good) and does not follow his own interests. Nevertheless the concept ‘intellectual’ emerges, when the

⁵⁹ Drucker P.F. The Age of discontinuity: guidelines to our changing society. London, 1969. P. 259.

⁶⁰ Op. cit. P. 119-120.

⁶¹ Op. cit. P. 259.

concepts ‘public’ and ‘public opinion’ were completely discredited. On the one hand, the movement of historicism rendered the unitary state of rationality questionable (therefore, casting doubt on the ability of the public to reach a rational consensus), on the other hand, thanks to Marxism and the development of parliamentary culture, the very possibility of not belonging to any party became questionable (let us remind ourselves that, according to Kant, one can make public statements in the interests of the people or the nation only from such a position).

In our opinion, apology or criticism of the position of intellectuals that is outlined in the texts of thinkers in the XX century, is deeply connected to the model of the ‘public’, presented in the works of the philosopher in the era of Enlightenment. Thinkers who speak in support of such a model (for example, late Bourdieu who invented the concept of ‘Internationale of intellectuals’), have the assumption that the position of the universal horizon (unitary standard of rationality) can be preserved in the modern world, and the intellectual can act within its frameworks. On the other hand, in the Marxism the intellectual who defends proletariat, acts as the voice of one group and simultaneously the entire mankind (since it is the proletariat who is bound to launch the world revolution). Nevertheless, the universal horizon, that is a part of the Marxist ideology, finally disappears from left-wing thinkers in the second half of the XX century due to the loss of faith in the world revolution and disenchantment in the countries of the socialistic bloc.

In Karl Mannheim’s theory of intellectuals, which we define as apologetic, the intellectual can join any class and defend its interests however there is a ‘free-floating intelligentsia’, which preserves the universal horizon of understanding and does not join any other group or class.

On the other hand, the critics of intellectuals point to the fact that the intellectual cannot present the interests of all the people – if he aspires to be non-party, he actually represents one of the groups or parties of the society. Besides that, the position that aspires for unitary rationality was, for the critics of intellectuals, finally discredited by the movement of historicism and is no longer

possible in the modern world – the critic point to the incompatibility between the pretence of the intellectuals and the actual social role that they have.

In the second chapter we turn to theories that define intellectuals or intelligentsia as a group that defines itself through the special kind of work ('intellectual labour'), the access to which is provided by a certain level of education'. In our opinion, such theories are presented in the official Soviet discourse from the beginning of the 1930-s and in the theory of American sociologist Tolcott Parsons. The Marxist theoreticians (including Lenin, Trotsky, Lunacharsky) define intelligentsia as workers of 'intellectual labour' that make up only the intermediate layer between classes and are able to join both the class of bourgeoisie and the class of proletariat. Nevertheless the narrow group of intelligentsia that joined proletariat is defined by Marxists as 'a bunch of righteous'. If Marx and Engels thought that proletariat can come to a revolutionary consciousness on its own and make a revolution by destroying the dominance of the capitalists, the representatives of the Russian Marxism made certain corrections to this idea. A.N. Dmitriev notes that in the 1890-s 'due to the weakness of the Russian capitalism and work movement the invention of the social-democratic party by the forces of the radical Marxist intelligentsia was far ahead of the rise of the trade-union engagement and the forming of the proletariat class self-consciousness'⁶². By saying 'intelligentsia', Lenin usually meant 'bourgeois, pre-revolutionary intelligentsia', and not 'the workers of intellectual labour'. However, Lenin's attitude to intelligentsia was polysemantical: he could consider intelligentsia as a group of 'intellectual workers' (including party workers) or only those who followed the interests of bourgeoisie.

For the USSR government officials the question about defining the concept 'intelligentsia' became a political question that exceeded the frameworks of linguistics, It was connected to vital problems that stemmed from the existence of 'bourgeois' specialists and specialists from the environment of workers and

⁶² Dmitriev A.N. *Marxism (In Russia). Thinking Russia. History and theory of intelligentsia and intellectuals.* Moscow, 2009. P. 169.

peasants. Intellectual workers were necessary for the new power, but specialists of high qualification and the families of workers and peasants had not existed by the 1920-s. It was necessary to invite to certain vacancies ‘the old guard’ of intelligentsia, with the vast amount of it not being loyal to the new government. As for the detachment of intelligentsia from the environment of workers and peasants, it carried the dangers of the forming of a separate social group or class⁶³. As Kustarev notes, ‘it is not difficult to notice that the topic of the debates about intelligentsia that were about to start, was politically more dangerous than the discussion of dangers, that were the topic of discussion’⁶⁴. The suggestion that VKP(b) expresses the interests not of the proletariat, but of the separate class of intelligentsia put under the blow the entire Soviet ideology of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

I.V. Stalin put an end to the debates about this concept in the ‘authoritative Soviet discourse’ (A. Urchak) by repeating the Marxist thesis that intelligentsia is a group between the classes, but not the class. In the speech of 23 June 1931 Stalin formulated the objective of inventing the intelligentsia of ‘productive and technical skills’ and declared the turn of ‘old technical intelligentsia’ to the side of the Soviet power after its ‘defeat’: If during the peak of sabotage [vreditelstvo] our attitude to the old technical intelligentsia was expressed mainly in the politics of defear, now, in the period of the turn of this intelligentsia to the Soviet power, our attitude to it should be expressed in the politics of attraction and care of it’⁶⁵.

American sociologist Tolcott Parsons also tackled the problem of intellectuals, his view on the role of intellectuals in the modern society is expressed in the essay ‘The intellectual’: a social role category’⁶⁶. Parsons defines intellectual as one who invents and spreads cultural values and as a person who puts cultural

⁶³ Kustarev A. Soviet Russia: the self-defining practices of Soviet intelligentsia // Thinking Russia. History and theory of intelligentsia and intellectuals. Moscow, 2009. P. 54-55.

⁶⁴ Op. cit. P. 59.

⁶⁵ Stalin I.V. New environment – new objectives of organization buiding: Speech on the conference of administrative workers, 23 June 1931 (In Russian) // Stalin I.V. Works. Vol. 13. Moscow, 1951. P. 72.

⁶⁶ Parsons T. ‘The intellectual’: a social role category // On intellectuals: theoretical studies, case studies (ed. by Ph. Rieff). Garden City, New York, 1969 P.3-52.

concerns above social ones. However, intellectuals do not obtain neither the political power nor the economic resources; the influence of the intellectual is executed through individual, institutional, disciplinary and other sources of 'reputation'⁶⁷.

As we analyse the approach of Tolcott Parsons to the social role of intellectual in the society of the modernity, we should take into account his theory in general. Parsons was one of the inventors of theories of modernization according to which the main cause of the political development is the functional differentiation within the social system as a whole and the political system in particular'⁶⁸. The theories of modernization were emerged in the USA in the 1950-s as a response to the 'need of American government in new theoretical models that strengthen the USA position in the ideological combat with the Soviet Union'⁶⁹.

Theories of modernization as progressist social theories competed primarily with Marxism. Within the frameworks of these theories socialistic states were merely a deviation from the proper evolutionary development. As Craig Calhoun remarks, theories of modernization suggested that there is only one contemporaneity (acquired by the countries with the level of developed capitalism): 'a very important interconnection between liberalism, personal individualism, secularism and free markets was made'⁷⁰. As Parsons defines intellectual as one who invents and spreads cultural values and the cultural system as something that legitimates the social normative order, therefore, in his system intellectuals can work only in support of the existing model, but do not challenge it. However, even if intellectuals want to change systems of values in the society, they do not have the resources for it, as their main type of capital is their reputation. Within the frameworks of Parsons' theory it is impossible to explain, how Lenin

⁶⁷ Op. cit. P. 22.

⁶⁸ Efremenko D.V, Meleshkina E.U. Theory of modernization about the ways of socio-economic development (In Russian) // Sociological studies. № 6 (362). 2014. P. 8.

⁶⁹ Op. cit. P. 4.

⁷⁰ Calhoun Cr. Theories of modernization and globalization: Who and why invented them (In Russian). Lecture. 17.01.2006. URL: <http://rudocs.exdat.com/docs/index-143310.html>.

without any amount of political power or finances in the beginning of his career, came to power in 1917.

The third chapter is dedicated to the interpretation of intellectuals as a group that defines itself in the categories of value, ideology and morality. Such an interpretation is the mostly characteristic for the Russian context. In this case, intellectual (or intelligentsia) is interpreted not only as a bearer of certain ideological or moral values, but also certain behaviour and way of life. The tradition of interpreting intellectual as a carrier of certain moral values can be traced from Dreyfusards in the European context, the views of whom are examined in the paragraph 'Genesis of the concepts 'intellectual' and 'intelligentsia'.

In the Russian context, regardless of the fact whether 'intelligentsia' is defined positively (Ivanov-Razumnik) or negatively (in the case of 'Vekhi'), the tendency of this concept's interpretation stays the same. Despite the fact, that in the official Soviet discourse an attempt was made to return to the classical Marxist doctrine of intelligentsia as people who engage in intellectual labour, in the Soviet folklore tradition the opinion about intelligentsia as bearers of a certain morale just became stronger. Besides that, due to certain material difficulties specific for both specialists in humanities and technical sciences, the belonging to the group of intelligentsia had both compensatory functions and required the certain status confirmation. In the 1990-s in the period of perestroika the concept 'intelligentsia' kept its meaning in the new conditions,

Concerning the concept 'intellectual' in the West European and American context, the interpretation analysed in this chapter is particularly strong in France, because in this case there is a powerful tradition that stems from the era of the Dreyfus case. We see that Julien Benda in his work 'The treason of intellectuals'. Written in 1927, states that intellectual should serve the abstract justice.

The concept 'intellectual', suggested by Jean-Paul Sartre meant, primarily, that intellectual should fight the hegemony of bourgeoisie, although his social role was the outcome of the bourgeois society itself (the feeling of being 'torn apart' is connected to this). Although Sartre after 1968 transfers from the concept of

‘classical’ to the concept of ‘revolutionary’ intellectual, these concepts differ from one another just by the choice of means of fighting with the hegemony of bourgeoisie and with the idea of contesting this hegemony. Nevertheless, even with the development of the concept of ‘revolutionary intellectual’ Sartre, in our opinion, was far from the postulates of the classical Marxism that intellectuals just join the proletariat in its fight with the dominating class. When Sartre gives the example of the young generation of students who quit their studies and start working at the factory, he explains their motivation with the fact that they do not want to be defined by their function (researcher, bureaucrat et cetera) and their salary (higher than the workers’ one). Thus, we consider this concept of revolutionary intellectual as the protest from the ‘knowledge society’, where people who engage in intellectual labour start gaining more privileges than factory workers. The way to challenge bourgeoisie approved by Sartre (to quit one’s intellectual activities and work in the factory) cardinally differs from what Lenin offered in his paper ‘What is to be done?’ of 1902⁷¹: intelligentsia in the Lenin’s concept should have been in the lead of the working movement and use its skills to guide it, as without the help of the intelligentsia the workers can just have the consciousness of trade-unionists that does not accelerate the proletarian revolution.

Despite the fact that Edward Shils was one of the founders of the school of structural functionalism alongside Tolcott Parsons, his interpretation of intellectuals differs from what Parsons suggested. If Parsons considered intellectuals as workers of intellectual labour, who cannot challenge the system due to the lack of political power or economic resources, Shils noted that intellectuals in the modern history often became members of the revolutionary movements, Nevertheless Shils thought that intellectuals are not capable of forming the separate political class, His characteristics of intellectuals as the people who, on the one hand, are sensible to the field of the sacred and, on the other hand, inclined to

⁷¹ You can see the more detailed analysis of Lenin’s view of intelligentsia in the chapter ‘Intellectuals as the group that functionally defines itself through the special type of occupation ‘intellectual labour’), the access to which is provided by the certain level of education.

deny the existing system of values, points to the fact that Shils defines intellectuals as carriers of ideological and moral values.

In the fourth chapter we analyse a range of theories of intellectuals that interpreted intellectuals as the separate political class that can be destined to political domination. The most detailed and substantive research in this paragraph is the analysis of Machajski's theory and its reception that can be traced up to the modern theories of the new class. Such attention can be explained by the fact that Machajski was the first to offer the complete theory of intelligentsia as a separate class. As for the modern theories of the same type we analyse both their critical (Schelsky, Helen, Schumpeter) and apologetic variants (Goudner, Bourdieu).

Jan Waclaw Machajski's theory was historically formulated in the Russian context as a critical theory directed against social-democratic and Marxist intelligentsia that wanted to transform the structure of the society by the means of the revolution. Machajski, unlike classical Marxists, thought that intelligentsia is a separate class that is formed by virtue of possessing certain non-material values – knowledge. According to Machajski, the proletarian revolution should have finally lead to the fact that this class would dominate in the society. This theory was well-known to the main leaders of the Bolsheviks revolution. It starts to be criticized in the USSR right after Machajski's death in 1926 in the period when in the USSR the public discussion, where the nature if the new established power was defined in the terms of the domination of the intelligentsia, had been stopped. At the end of the 1930-s this theory was criticized by Stalin himself with the outcome of the vanishing of Machajski's ideas from the Soviet intellectual field. The main accusation in the address of 'machaevshina' (the expression that became appellative at the end of the 1930-s) was the critical position of Machajski's followers to the powerful ambitions of intelligentsia, they were accused in the aspiration to 'turn stranded, deviant elements of society against Soviet

intelligentsia' and in the lack of desire to 'culturally rise, study, move forward to the heights of the knowledge with the entire Soviet nation'⁷².

Machajski's theory, however, was transferred to the English-speaking environment thanks to the works and translations of Max Nomad who knew Machajski personally and considered his ideas significant. Machajski's influence on the Western social and political theory can be traced since the 1930-s, his ideas influenced in a significant way on the early theory of post-industrial society (Daniel Bell knew them and highly evaluated them), and also – in a direct or mediated way – on the vast array of the theories of the 'new class' and 'the knowledge society' in the second half of the XX century. We do not observe the direct appeal to Machajski's theories in later and contemporary socio-theoretical conceptions, however, as it is shown on the example of the theory of cultural capital of Pierre Bourdieu and the theory of society of singularities of Andreas Reckwitz, a number of key points of this conception with certain modifications continue to retain theoretical relevance. Therefore, we should state that the theory that emerged within the frameworks of the debates about intelligentsia and its essence in the Russian empire, was not only 'prophetic' (as Daniel Bell once noted) in relation to the socio-political nature of the Soviet government, but also, as admitted by various Western social scientists (D. Bell, A. Gouldner) had a large impact on the forming of the vast array of contemporary Western social theories.

In Germany one of the most famous critics of the 'new class' in the second half of the XX century was German right-liberal sociologist Helmut Schelsky, whose book 'Work is done by the others' (1975) is devoted to the criticism of intellectuals. As A.F. Filippov notes, Schelsky's conception stems from the conception of Arnold Helen, which, in its turn, is influenced by the thory of intellectuals of Joseph Schumpeter. According to Schumpeter, capitalism can lead to the rise of the class of intellectuals, because it encouraged critical thinking. If before the period of modernity intellectuals depended in their patrons, then their

⁷² What is 'machaevshina'? (1938) (In Russian) // Truth. № 318. 18 November. P. 2.

collective patron is the bourgeois public⁷³. The cheapening of books, newspapers, pamphlets and the expansion of the reading audience contributed to the rise of the group of intellectuals. Since the end of the XVIII century intellectuals obtain the power of the publicists who use their public opinion. The impulse of hostility, directed primarily against the institutions of the church and feudals and profitable to the bourgeoisie becomes the constant element of the spiritual life of the intellectuals. Eventually they become hostile to the capitalist system and turn into the political power with their group interests (for example, while performing as the ideologues of the working movement). The capitalist system does not wish and is not capable of controlling the intellectual sector, because in this case it would be obliged to use non-bourgeois methods of struggle – restriction of the freedom of speech.

In the fifth chapter we analyse the theories, in which intelligentsia or intellectuals are considered as the representatives of any social groups that help it come to power. This interpretation was formulated in its classical way in the Marxist theory. If we talk about the critical potential of such an approach, we can talk about the theory of intelligentsia of Antonio Gramsci – within its frameworks he distinguishes the traditional intelligentsia that supports the social groups losing their dominance and the organic intelligentsia that supports rising social groups and is capable of undermining the hegemony of the existing social order. Besides that, an evolution of the concept of intelligentsia within Marxism is observed. We consider Karl theory of intellectuals as an apologetic concept in this chapter.

In all the mentioned theories intelligentsia (or intellectuals) can join any social groups or classes and express their interests, Nevertheless, such functional position has certain difficulties and is transformed during its conceptualization. Although Antonio Gramsci demonstrates the necessity of traditional intellectuals in the society, he is in agreement with the revolutionary (organic) intellectuals, who want to undermine the hegemony of the existing society. In Marxism intelligentsia

⁷³ Schumpeter J. Capitalism, socialism and democracy (In Russian) / tr. from German by V.S. Avtonomov, U.V. Avtonomov, L.A. Gromova et al. Moscow, 2008. P. 532.

is defined not as the separate class, but as a social group that is capable of joining bourgeoisie and proletariat. Nevertheless V.I. Lenin in the beginning of the XX century declared that intelligentsia due to its nature is capable of joining the bourgeoisie and those capable of defending the interests of proletariat were defined as ‘a bunch of saints’⁷⁴. Such definition implies in a direct manner high moral standards of revolutionary intelligentsia. The transfer of socio-economic definition of intelligentsia to the socio-ethical one was noted by R.V. Ivanov-Razumnik in the 1900-s.

If Gramsci considered important the social relations of the intellectual, Karl Mannheim discussed intellectuals from the point of view of sociology of knowledge (for Gramsci intellectual labour is not the defining function of the intellectual). Besides that, Mannheim thinks that on this stage of historical development intellectuals cannot be a group on their own, but can only join the other groups and express their interests. Nevertheless, they have the freedom of choice and in short periods of history are capable of acting as an independent force. Being alien to any dogmatism and capable of changing landmarks and views (even when they act on behalf of other social groups) makes intellectuals a unique element in the history of mankind.

⁷⁴ Lunacharsky A.V. Intelligentsia in its past, present and future (in Russian). Moscow, 1924. P. 58.

Conclusion

In the present thesis we explored the concepts ‘intelligentsia’ and ‘intellectuals’ on three different levels. Firstly, we reconstructed the history of the origin of these concepts and the transfer from the abstract meaning of the concepts to the collective one, which happened around 1830 in France and England, after 1848 in Germany and after 1860 in Russia.

Secondly, while understanding that the concepts ‘intellectual’ and ‘intelligentsia’ were reflected in the certain social reality, that was itself subject to transformations, we turned to the social history and highlighted three main social prerequisites for the formation of these concepts. The first one is the increasing complexity of societal stratification and the appearance of the social groups that demand to be represented in power. It already entails not only spontaneous peasant rebels that always lacked self-organization, but already organized movements of workers who demand to be represented in power and fight for it with the help of strikes and revolutionary action or – later and not in all countries – with the help of party struggles. Along with the proletariat of physical labour ‘intellectual proletariat’ appears, the representatives of which are ready to take the lead of the working movement and be its ‘natural leaders’. Simultaneously critical invectives toward the new ‘fourth estate’. Which is capable of ruining the historically established structure of the society and other estates. The second prerequisite is the expansion of higher education that contributed to the rise of numbers of qualified specialists and, in the certain historical periods, their overproduction (it was of the source of the social tensions and radicalization of those, whose ambitions were not satisfied professionally).

The third tendency is the rising intellectualization of labour, in the result of which the state and private corporations spend big amounts of money to educate and hire the workers of ‘intellectual labour’. Higher education stops being elite and its expansion in the second half of the XX century accelerates even more, the amount of people, engaged in intellectual labour, begins to

accelerate with a quick pace. Consequently, knowledge begins to be perceived as another type of capital, and the claim of those, who possesses it and wants to have the right to speak in the interests of the good of the whole society, requires new reactualization of the concepts ‘intellectual’ and ‘intelligentsia’. On the third level of research we divided the concepts ‘intellectual’ and ‘intelligentsia’ on four different types. With the understanding that the social, cultural and political context, in which the debates were conducted and the theories of intellectuals were formed, is highly significant, we attempted to give it the attention it deserved and each time tried to reconstruct it.

However, in our opinion, only by systematically typologizing the theories of intellectuals, we can deduce the general structural tendencies in the society of modernity when we turn our attention to the theories that praise or criticize those who call themselves intellectuals. These structural tendencies in the society of modernity can be traced up to the era of Enlightenment, when the concepts ‘intellectuals’ and ‘intelligentsia’ did not exist in the modern sense of the word.

Besides that, the optics that we chose, helped us to find the moments of interference and cultural transfer while we reconstructed the genesis of the theories of intellectuals and intelligentsia among various thinkers, The polemics that makes these concepts relevant, often appears in the acute historical moments – as it happened in the moment of ‘Vekhi’ publication in March 1909, when the consequences of the 1905 Revolution became fully tangible. In these moments the participants of the debates focus on the current political events and seem to forget that hardly any historical event is completely unique. Nevertheless, the research shows that more often than not the understanding of the roles of intellectuals and intelligentsia was formed on the foreign material and prior to the historical situation that caused the debates (it is shown on the example of the theory of intelligentsia of A.S. Izgoev).

Even when the thinkers themselves talk about the fact, that they were influenced by the debates that happened in the other culture and in the other

historical period, this influence often stays out of the focus of modern researchers. For example, the role of 'knowledge worker' in Daniel Bell's theory of post-industrial society and the question whether 'knowledge workers' are part of the political elite or a separate political class, were formulated by Bell under the influence of the debates between social-democrats (Lenin, Trotsky) and anarchists (Machajski) about the privileged position of the educated revolutionary intelligentsia in the relation to the worker engaged in physical labour in the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party in the 1900-s.