

Social interaction of modern Ukrainian intelligentsia and government / Суспільні науки: сучасні тенденції та фактори розвитку: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції (м. Одеса, Україна, 23–24 січня 2015 року). – Одеса: ГО «Причорноморський центр досліджень проблем суспільства», 2015. – С. 75–76.

Social interaction of modern Ukrainian intelligentsia and government

The end of 20th and early 21th centuries was marked by significant changes in all spheres of society. Independence, democracy opened the new possibilities of social development but at the same time required saving of national consciousness. However, at the late 20th century the popularization of Western wealth, increasing the number of political parties led to the crisis situation of intelligentsia. Socially and historically formed feeling of inferiority and capture was escalating over the centuries. So, naturally, that the ruling elite and part of the «intelligentsia», leading the authorities, aspire to protect the personal territorial and material autonomy, creating a prosperity rather bureaucratic and oligarchic system than democratic culture.

Thus, the elite, which served all segments of Ukrainian population, displaced true intelligentsia. In turn, intelligentsia didn't feel the necessity of the population in results of its activities. Elite clique formulated wealth and one-way direction of further «development» of the Ukrainian society. Spirituality, following the high moral values; disinterestedness and conscience; conscious, initiative activity to national prosperity; generosity and rejection of violent means to achieve the goal; formulation, saving, transfer the national culture and traditions from one generation to another are the defining features of intelligentsia. The critical attitude and the rejection of the ruling elite spiritual, moral, national, cultural ideas, projected by intelligentsia led to opposition of political elite, which centered around the largest power, and intelligentsia which strove for saving the Ukrainian national consciousness and identity, the best cultural traditions, high moral values.

By definition of H. P. Hrebennyk, the problem is that the member of intelligentsia positions himself in politics as a moralist, who interested in one aspect of social life – human rights, which he claims to accept as absolute. Accordingly, the government should be humane, respects human rights and serves the people, realize its duty to them [2, p. 272-273]. Thus, the social order of the member of intelligentsia in policy is making it moral as the main criteria of its democracy.

The masses evaluate the activity of government first of all from the position of general morality, but they are incapable to formulate their claims to state power. Therefore, intelligentsia is a kind of mediator between the political elite and people [1, p. 20-21] that thinking and analyses critically, identifies and formulates indistinct outlined events, increases the hidden processes in society. The power generates impetuses for operational performance for its saving, uses intelligentsia for communication and networking, understanding the people and so on. O. M. Kindratets` identified the following groups of intelligentsia relatively state power: active and search position of intelligentsia concerning power; the usual serve to instructions of political power; exclusion of intelligentsia from social, political and government problems; «inside» opposition intelligentsia [3, p. 39]. Intelligentsia with the largest values – generosity, conscience, honor, responsibility – was almost incapable at the consumer society with prior material goods.

Tendencies of the public development deepened the sceptical perception of intelligentsia as a social phenomenon. They have led to social metamorphoses and changes of the worldview, rethinking and reorientation of values. As a result, intelligentsia loses its true nature and purpose. The specific position of exclusion from policy – apathy – comes into being as a result of the domination of policy subject – «the power elite». The stage of exclusion may be different, but in any case it describes the weakness of democracy [4, p. 4-5]. Moreover, the construction of the democratic state and the project of country modernization were utopian for patriotic intelligentsia.

Literature:

1. Vyerkina T. B. *Intelligentsia as power «ally»* / T. B. Vyerkina // *Intelihentsiya ta vlada: materialy VI Mizhnarodnoyi naukovo-praktychnoyi konferentsiyi-seminaru kerivnykiv vyshchych navchal'nykh zakladiv, uchenykh-doslidnykiv i predstavnykiv vladnykh struktur iz problem suchasnoyi intelihentsiyi*, 14 bereznya 2008 r. / Vidp. red. V. I. Astakhova. – Kh.: Vyd-vo NUA, 2008. – P. 20 – 21.
2. Hrebennyk H. P. *Intelligentsia as the political activist* / *Intelligentsiya i politika: sb. statey.* – O.: Feniks, 2009. – P. 260 – 273.
3. Kindratets` O. *Intelligentsia and the political elite of Ukraine* / O. Kindratets` // *Svitohlyad.* – 2009. – № 6. – P. 38 – 41.
4. Fedotova V. H. *Apathy in the West and in Russia* / Fedotova V. H. // *Voprosy filosofii.* – 2005. – № 3. – P. 3 – 19.