

INTERPRETATION: BETWEEN TRUTH AND THE THIRST FOR POWER

^aNATALIA ANATOLIEVNA TERESCHENKO,

^bEKATERINA VALERIEVNA SNARSKAYA

^a*Kazan Federal University, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, 420008, Russian Federation, Kazan, Kremlevskaya st., 18, Russia.*

^b*Kazan Federal University, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, 420008, Russian Federation, Kazan, Kremlevskaya st., 18, Kazan Federal University, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Russia.*

email: ^atereshenko_tata@mail.ru, ^bkaterina.snarskaya@yandex.ru

Abstract: The article concerns the understanding of the forms of dependence of ideological constructions on the place of the intelligentsia in the system of spiritual production. The methodological principles used in this study are based on the analysis of intellectual history (R. Rorty) and the phenomenon of the "organic intelligentsia" (A. Gramsci). The intelligentsia today turns out to increase the tendency to transforming the information which it owns into the form of property, which represents the function of an agent of spiritual production in a new way and demonstrates its direct relation to the political and economic spheres of society.

Keywords: the intelligentsia, "the organic intellectuals", intellectual production, interpretation.

1 Introduction

The question of interpretation inevitably raises the question of interpreters. Who is he, a man, who risks to confide his understanding of some eventivity of life to the world? What motivates his desire to voice his thoughts and aspirations? The answer seems to be obvious at first glance. We have got into the habit of saying "about" and even thinking (which does not always coincide) of a person participating in speaking about the objective reality, a being endowed with a special ability to understand, a special optics that allows us to see the world on the horizon of truth, and a special, almost prophetic inability to remain silent about the suffering of the world and in the world. But, admit, this is also just one of the interpretations of the role of the representative of a certain community, who has taken the liberty of speaking on behalf of being and who is called in different ways: a representative of the intelligentsia, an intellectual, a creative person, an artist, a theorist, and to better and sharply say - the agent of intellectual production.

We were prompted to the writing of this article by mass discussions about the interpretation of the phenomenon of social revolution and, specifically, the October revolution, which we can safely call the Great and without reserve (centenary of which is marked in 2017).

2 Methods

The methodological foundations of this investigation are built in the logic of compositionality, which implies the possibility of constructing the object under study within the context of different angles. The method, proposed by V.E. Kemerov, supposes "movement around an object", as a result of which each reconstructed methodological set recreates a certain composite unity of the phenomenon (Kemerov, 2003).

The method of intellectual history proposed by R. Rorty is used as forming, which implies studying the reflections, purposes and activities of people of "high culture" - the intellectuals (Rorty, 1979). The analysis of the development of ideas of the intellectual elite in the context of our research allows us not only to trace the forms and ways of active influence of the elite on the cultural environment, but, following Gramsci's logic, to find out the reverse effect of the cultural environment on the intellectual way of thinking, i.e., the paper uses the provisions of Marxist methodology.

3 Discussion

We will try to express the general pathos of very different and very interesting statements somewhat deliberately straightforward, perhaps grotesquely, although in many respects emotionally: we agree with the authors in assessing the attitude of the intelligentsia towards the revolution. But let us note that when assessing the role of the intelligentsia, we often forget about the socio-economic grounds that determine its position in society, not its unique nature and the trail of not only positive, but also negative consequences of its activities. And it is the ambiguity of the role of the agent of intellectual production that will be the subject of our speculation. So, the subject of speaking (and he is always the subject of interpretation) "without giving up himself / his own, lets life unfold in its entirety. Moreover, he designates life, its events", - writes O.D. Agapov (Agapov, 2016). We add: the ability to let life unfold in its entirety is precisely due to the fact that the subject "designates the events of life". In fact, one can say that in this way the classical "reducing being to being" is realized. A cultivated person (an intellectual) can do this by virtue of the fact that, due to his particular nature (or due to a combination of circumstances), he can turn out to be "in the bright spot of being" and transpose his social subjectness into existential subjectness (see (Fatenkov, 2016)). It is this ability that makes it possible to experience events and realize oneself in the co-being of oneself and the world.

"We are certain, - writes O.D. Agapov, - that the richness of the interpretations of historical formation of mankind is connected with the fact that transcendental events are *designated*, depending on which subject / subjects are aroused, what are his sociocultural - explicit and implicit - preferences, attitudes, values, meanings and senses are objectified" (Agapov, 2016). Of course! But since we are talking about denomination, then these subjects are the subjects of spiritual production. So, we must understand that not only the subjects are different, roughly speaking, bad and good, talented and middling. Their position in the system of intellectual production, which determines their perspective of judgment of the phenomenon and the nature of their illusions, changing, will entail a change in the very perceptions.

"A question of the questions what to do with revelation, how to live with it, *how they will live*. B. Pasternak / Zhivago chose life-evidence. In a broad sense, he chose a *synergistic life*, where a person does not give up himself / his own, lets life unfold in its entirety. Moreover, he denominates life, its events" (Agapov, 2016).

It is all very beautiful, which means we'd love it to be true. But let's trace how this procedure of denominating is carried out, giving a name to the phenomenon. Realizing that "a thing that does not have a name does not exist", let's try to figure out what influences the character of image formation. Although, of course, it will be only the hypothesis. And, it being "one of". It's not about the cultural context that sets the semantic connotations, but what in the classical tradition is called the place of the subject in the system of intellectual production. We make one more remark. While on the subject of the intelligentsia, we are talking about us, about ourselves, not taking ourselves out of this community at all and assuming the need to divide responsibility for what has been said.

Realization of this or that historical tendency is possible in actual situations only with inevitable pronouncing it by one or another historical subject. Beginning with the era of the New Time, the intelligentsia has taken this function. Indeed, because of the instability of its social position, the intelligentsia is much more sensitive and even painfully sensitive to all contradictory aspects of the historical events. And, crystallizing the phenomenon in its perception (namely, this ability of crystallization is essentially rightly fixed by O. D. Agapov), this painful sensitivity is also led on the horizon of speaking. It

means that the event being crystallized in the word has already been a double subjectivation, or interpretation (let us say, we understand that subjectivization, of course, is not identical to interpretation).

So, let's ask the question differently, sharply, roughly: is the ability to "get into the bright spot of being" (let us not forget that you can just *find yourself*, and quite accidentally, in this bright spot) to be a sufficient ground to speak on behalf of being? Does it give a revelation of being? And one more question is rightly asked (though in a slightly different tone) by O.D. Agapov: "How to live with this revelation?" How can one live with it?" (Agapov, 2016), thereby implying a gap between the cultivated person / the intellectual and the very being.

Let us recall some of the writings from the field of social theory. In the pre-capitalist society, a theorist is, as a rule, a representative of the ruling class. Creating a theoretical model of society, he depicts this society through the prism of the ideas of this very class or estate. Plato's ideal state continued to be a slave-owning polis, Augustine's hail of the earth was a criticism of imperfect forms of communication from the point of view of a religious newly-converted who devoted himself to God, and who at the same time has the opportunity to theorize, but not to worry literally about daily bread. This position gave an amazing strength and confidence to the theorist that he speaks on behalf of the Absolute, being his conductor, medium, bearer of the truth of being, and not his subjective opinion. In fact, in the role of the prototype of being there was one or another social stratum to which the theorist belonged. Probably, it was this position that gave rise to the phenomenon that Gramsci called "the organic intelligentsia" (Gramsci, 1971) and to the conception of which Z. Bauman turns, which we will talk about a little later.

In modern times, the position of the theorist, scientist, artist (in general, the intellectual, and we will speak roughly - the agent of spiritual production) is changing dramatically. First, as a rule, he has not belonged to the ruling class and he expresses his interests not as his own, but ones as of a wage worker, creating a certain product in the form of an idea. He has been no longer "an organic intellectual". However, "the memory of the form" continues to work. He keeps thinking that it is he who is able to make being say with his own voice (the duality of the expression "his own" begins already to flicker). It is the vision of society in the optics of the intellectual that is deemed adequate to his vision. "A good society, - writes Bauman, - ... is the projection of the way of life of intellectuals on society as a whole; or, in other words, it is a model that, as the intellectuals hope, will provide the optimal conditions for the dissemination of such [their own. - Auth.] way of life" (Bauman, 1992). In principle, there is nothing new. The world is written from itself. Xenophanes also said that if cows and horses invented gods for themselves, their gods would be like cows and horses. And this universality of the nature of the idea is also important for comprehending the problem.

However, there is another interesting point: the ontological rootedness outside (in the power of the class that it represents, not having in this society its right, legitimized property) still gave a sense of voting right as a mission in expressing the Absolute. This sense was supported by the specifics of the relationship between the intellectual and the authorities, which is described by Bauman, interestingly (albeit somewhat unambiguously).

He quite rightly points to one historical point - the Enlightenment. This is the time when the ambitions of the intellectual (we add - not proletarianized yet, but already lost the patrimonial connection with the ruling class) coincided with the needs of the young bourgeois state, when the young bourgeoisie, which had no experience of participation in governing the state, needed the intellectual. This increases the self-awareness of yourself as a teacher of life, who also has the ability to pronounce the Absolute. However, the bourgeoisie having grown stronger begins to infringe on the theorist's ambitions more and

more. However, Bauman still depicts an idyllic picture: after having removed the intellectual from political power, ceasing to consider him as a teacher, the state left him the freedom to convert intellectual products, in fact having given the right of ownership of information (Bauman does not write so, but it does so). However, this is not quite true. First, the teacher of life cannot get used to his marginal position so easily. Second, the manifestation of freedom of speech in itself means that it is necessary if not to win, then to defend, therefore, it is not a transparent social state, and that indigenously. This is already evident from the offense of layman Socrates to Aristophanes being if not aristocratic, then wealthy, from the fate of "The Letters of Dark Men", etc. Beginning with the end of the 19th century, writers of freedom have always written with "tears and blood" and therefore needed not understanding, as Nietzsche said, but the fact that they were "memorized". Manifestation without the requirement of understanding, invocation of a full paranoid acceptance. In a situation when you no longer express the organic aspirations of another person, this desire becomes intensified. It is no wonder that Blok writes about the rupture of relations between the people and the intelligentsia and about the alleged optimism of the theorists and writers who do not notice this (See: Blok, 2006, p. 274-276). Indeed, were these relations of a zemsky doctor, a teacher and a Russian peasant idyllic? Did Populism really express the aspirations of the very people? But the appeal to reason is becoming less audible. Chekhov's irony, Platonov's detachment are needed to describe the vainness of these claims without sarcasm, and without tearful emotion.

Having lost confidence in organic existence, the intellectual searches for support in himself, hypertrophying his distancing from social forms and making a dangerous substitution: now he is no longer the conductor of the Absolute. The Absolute is himself, his own voice is the voice of being itself. And again, the "memory of the form" responds, but inverted: the feeling that his voice is the voice of the very Absolute is growing. And he can and must be a teacher of life for the world!

The intellectual, as they say, "loves not art in himself, but himself in art". He probably does not lay claims to authorship, but still lays claims to power. Including to the power over the Absolute. The intellectual confused the roles. He thinks that his version of the world is being, truth, etc., indeed, and he is ready to defend his version of the world quite aggressively. Given that philosophy is engaged in the legitimization of discourses (Lyotard) (See: Lyotard, 1979, p. 79-91) that namely it "is guilty" of penetrating this or that "intellectual contagion" into the layers of public consciousness, one can assume that the self-consciousness of philosophy (and the philosopher) must be sufficiently developed, that he must somehow justify (although would be for himself) his claims to the world and the right to have the image of his thought in this world materialized (or, to put it differently, embodied).

It should be admitted that the thinkers who turned their eyes to society always differed more or less boldly in search for the means to realize their utopian dream. You can appeal to the tyrant of the Syracuse (although you can later be sold into slavery). You can try to implement the Hellenic project through your pupil, and then be disappointed. You can rely on the sovereign, albeit a stranger. It would be nice if a woman, a northerner or a Russian woman. Someone appeals to the superman, someone to a strong hand and totalitarian power. In all cases - the search for means in the desire to realize the project. And, as a total one. However, the nature of these attempts is changing and takes the form of a keen contest in the 19th century. Speaking about the relationship of Socrates and the Sophists, for example, it does not occur to talk about the "struggle" of opinions. The very term of ideological struggle, which arose in the 19th century, marks the time when this flip-flop was implemented and had been implemented. And, as is clear, "ideological" is the struggle of ideas alone. That is, the interpretations. Of course, the struggle of ideas proceeds from the moment of isolation of spiritual production, but only within this period it is included in the arsenal of political and socio-

economic means of struggle for power. The struggle of ideas becomes an ideological struggle.

By the way, the reason for the intelligentsia's interest in the revolution, the interest of the most close, sincere and at the same time ... self-serving may be concealed here. The breakdown of old social forms / cells, structures makes any person homelessness, "beats up" into strange communities of different people. In this situation, the voice of the prophet-intellectual can become more audible and interesting for many who has lost their roots, faced with the complexity of the identification process, etc. The intellectual is in demand in this period. If he is not needed by the official structures in his radicalism, then an opposition needs him. And the more radical his ideas are, the more popular the actor will be. Therefore, it is so sincere: "Listen with all your heart to the revolution!".

Agapov quotes the article "The Religious Meaning of the Revolution" by F.A. Stepun who notes that in the October Revolution as an event that took place, it is possible to single out three points that give it a non-uniform character. The first moment is a biological, associated with the energy of young people, the second is a criminal, and, finally, the third - fantastic and werewolf. In the scheme of things, we can say that this heterogeneity is a fertile soil for dissemination (and deformation!) of ideas arising within the period of revolutionary upheavals, and the uncertainty of the position of the agent of intellectual production, who seeks for support for ensuring the organic nature of his existence, makes him the hostage of his own concepts. To call the logic of one's own thought into question is not an easy task. Not every theorist is aimed at (and is capable of) solving it. It is no coincidence that precisely this ability that was defined by J. Derrida as one of the features of genius K. Marx (Derrida, 1994). Although, for the sake of justice, it must be said that Marx himself could not fully trace back the possible interpretations of his ideas. Nobody can do this! And, of course, he was also a hostage of cultural and historical realities.

4 Conclusions

The analysis of the place of the theorist in the system of spiritual production today is one of the most important and difficult tasks. Its decision is complicated by the fact that the information, owned by the agent of intellectual production, has today a tendency to become a property. The intelligentsia traverses the same path that the bureaucracy did, making the state machine its ownership. And this means that a classical question: "Whose interests are represented in this or that ideological construction? Whom is this profitable to?" - becomes even more interesting and complicated today. U. Eco's ironical remark that today the order of words has ceased to correspond to the order of things (Eco, 1962). acquires an additional political and economic meaning. Which, of course, does not remove the existential and anthropological dimension of the problem and should be expressed in the intelligentsia's understanding of responsibility for the word as a matter.

Acknowledgement

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

1. Agapov O.D. *The Philosophy of Co-Being [Electronic Resource]* / A.N. Fatenkov. – Mode of Access: <http://kpfu.ru/isfnmk/nachinaetsya-podgotovka-k-tradicionnym-245944.html>, free. (Access Date : 15.10.2016)
2. Bauman Z. *Legislators and Interpreters: Culture as the Ideology of Intellectuals* // Bauman Z. *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London: Routledge, 1992.
3. Blok A. *Poems and Culture.* / A. Blok // *Collected Works in 6 Volumes.* – V. 5. – P. 274-283.

4. Derrida J. *Specters of Marx, the state of the debt, the Work of Mourning, & the New International*, translated by Peggy Kamuf, Routledge 1994.
5. Eco U. *Opera aperta* (1962, rev. 1976 – English translation: *The Open Work* (1989).
6. Fatenkov A.N. *Social Revolution as an Epiphenomenon of Existential Being [Electronic Resource]* / A.N. Fatenkov. – Mode of Access: <http://kpfu.ru/isfnmk/nachinaetsya-podgotovka-k-tradicionnym-245944.html>, free. (Access Date: 15.10.2016).
7. Gramsci A. *Selections from the prison notebooks*. Transcribed from the edition published by Lawrence & Wishart. London 1971.
8. Kemerov V. E. *Connectivity of Public Studies and the Problems of Daily Routine* / V. E. Kemerov // *Socioemes: The Journal on Social Philosophy and Methods of Social Studies.* – 2003. – № 9. – P. 12–15.
9. Lyotard J.-F. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984 [La Condition postmoderne: Rapport sur le savoir. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1979].
10. Rorty R. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.