

UDC 1(130.2:001.9)O. N. KUBALSKYI^{1*}

^{1*}Dobrov Institute for Scientific and Technological Potential and Science History Studies of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine), e-mail kubalsky@nas.gov.ua, ORCID 0000-0002-7956-3150

The Man of Science as an Intellectual: The Public Mission of Scientist

Purpose. The paper is aimed at identifying the ways of scientist's influence on the development of modern society as compared to those of intellectuals. **Theoretical basis.** The socio-anthropological approach to the role of scientists in post-industrial society shows the leading role of people of science as a social group in present-day society. However, philosophical axiology reveals that scientists in today's society do not have the appropriate social status: neither in state governance nor in the sphere of forming public opinion. The classical doctrine concerning intellectuals has suffered a crisis in recent decades, which is due to the growing gap between the group of intellectuals recognized by society and the sphere of science. A new theoretical approach to determining the role of present-day research scientists as intellectuals is necessary. **Originality.** Successful development of modern society in conditions of growing social turbulence necessitates the access of research scientists to the sphere of public communication. This is required both by the needs of science advancement itself – to receive its adequate funding and win wide public recognition, and by society's needs – as it is scientists who can provide reliable diagnostics of social problems and formulate well-grounded programs for overcoming them. **Conclusions.** For overcoming social barriers and getting access to public space, scientists themselves have to recognize themselves as a destitute social group – those who are unfairly deprived of making principal decisions in today's society. For that, scientists should become modern intellectuals. Unlike media intellectuals, scientists are to interact not with social masses but, first and foremost, with public elites. The scientist has to gain his/her independent status by achieving the recognition of his/her own ideas among social elites rather than by winning wide personal popularity. Hence, scientists must aim at obtaining the status of the elite for elites – this would reveal in scientists the deepest potential of a modern man.

Keywords: man; a man of science; intellectual; public sphere; social elites; social mass

Introduction

According to the prevailing ideas on the change of the type of intellectuals, which, in particular, can be found in the work by Leclerc (2003), in present-day society, representatives of the media sphere have ousted professorate, who were the core of the first wave of intellectuals, and the publishers of periodicals, who represented the second wave of the intellectual elite. However, back in the 1960-ies, musicians, and actors – "Beatles" members, Marlon Brando, Bob Dylan, Roger Waters, etc. – became the leaders of public opinion: they protested against the war in Vietnam, were participants and encouragers of other youth protest movements, i.e., they were doing what should have been done by intellectuals as carriers of social criticism ideas, be living moral authorities, "conscience of the nation". No doubt, people of science also remained intellectuals – Noam Chomsky, Jacques-Yves Cousteau, Pierre Bourdieu, Jean Baudrillard, and many others. In France, traditionally, among intellectuals were and are representatives of *belles-lettres* *Beaumont* – one should only mention those celebrities who were interviewed by Frédéric Beigbeder (2015). Besides, other artists are often, and with every right, considered intellectuals – one can mention Pablo Picasso, Andy Warhol, and Banksy. They are the people who were listened to, but also the people who were communicating certain senses and values to society.

Yet, now one can refer to sportsmen, journalists, talk show hosts, astronauts, chefs, and similar pop-culture stars, who filled the minds of the generations of 1980-2000-ies, as intellectuals only half-ironically, as "intellectuals". And if we go on to the generation of 2010-2020, whose idols were YouTube, Facebook, and TikTok stars, the word "intellectual" is absolutely irrelevant,

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

as the offbeat look and outrageous behavior often prove to be much more characteristic for them than the ideas which they could present (but, actually, still do not present in the great majority of cases).

Does that mean that intellectuals as a group have disappeared from modern society? Or, on the contrary, does it mean that the main task of intellectuals has changed and simply they are not recognized in the leaders of showbiz and idols of social networks? Or, possibly, the ways through which intellectuals influence modern society have changed? We rely on the idea that initially intellectuals were the people of science – from them, carriers of the knowledge inaccessible to every common man, a radical successful answer to acute social problems was expected (Frickel & Gross, 2005; Rolin, 2016; Schweber, 1981).

The *methodology of research* is based on social anthropology and philosophical axiology. Social anthropology enables us to reveal the personal characteristics of a personality as a representative of a certain social group, i.e., it provides the social and anthropological rationale for the identity of a human as a personality. While philosophical anthropology focuses on those values that determine the behavior of certain social groups with regard to fixing and retaining certain characteristics as the basis of their identity.

Purpose

Today's scientists as intellectuals aim at the influence of social elites rather than social mass. The social mass is influenced due to the popularization of scientific ideas, but science popularizers cannot be called intellectuals since they themselves understand the ideas but do not know the prospects actually opened up by those ideas – profound specialized knowledge is needed for it. This generates the current social public request for scientists as intellectuals (Orzel, 2018). The purpose of this paper is to determine the ways of scientist's influence on the development of today's society as compared to the influence of those of intellectuals.

Statement of basic materials

Classical features of intellectuals

Intellectuals have been given their name not merely as scientists or professorate but rather as people who appeal to intellect in making important political decisions. Besides, intellectuals are considered as a nation's conscience, as moral authorities who take care of avoiding moral mistakes, especially moral crimes, in making such decisions. Intellectuals also protect those who cannot protect themselves – various social groups that are socially humiliated or marginal: the poor, various religious, ethnic, gender, etc. minorities, emigres, unjustly convicted, etc. Besides, intellectuals differ in the selflessness of their political activities – they carry it out for the sake of truth and justice but not for profit, power, or other gratification. For that reason, true intellectuals deserve to be called magnanimous, spiritually noble, and socially trustworthy. Sometimes, intellectuals may look somewhat naïve – especially for educated people. However, to resemble Don Quixote for them is rather an honor, while for an intellectual to be suspected of cynicism is a deadly sin.

As regards a scientist, s/he may only look naïve and even strange to an outsider, but actually, s/he has a high degree of confidence in his actions and views – due to the scientific knowledge s/he possesses. A scientist, as a rule, does not have time to be an intellectual, i.e., to be engaged in public affairs – s/he has a lot of scientific work which quite often absorbs him/her entirely (Lamberts, 2017).

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Steven Pinker, the adherent of continuing the Enlightenment project deployment in modern society, and the American science popularizer, also speaks in favor of rational argumentation predominance in adopting socially important decisions. But, at the same time, Pinker (2018) believes that scientists should not let the spirit of "intellectual wars" into science since "it's wreaking havoc in universities and jeopardizing the progress of research". If being an intellectual is harmful to a scientist, then it is understandable why he avoids publicity (Montefiore, 1998). But, still, society needs true intellectuals, therefore scientists will have to leave their "ivory tower" and take part in public discussions. Since current social changes are becoming more and more turbulent and unpredictable.

So, when an unconventional and dangerous situation emerges, and there is a civic task to dissolve it in principle rather than be satisfied with temporary and palliative solutions, the time is coming for scientists to become an intellectual. Then deep human features are revealed in scientists, which gives reasons to speak about the ability of a human as a special creature to survive: scientists and their actions can characterize man as a species – from the anthropological point of view.

In the analysis that follows a comparison of classical intellectuals with today's ones will be made by individual positions, which will enable us to draw well-grounded conclusions concerning the specificity of the socio-anthropological characteristics of modern intellectuals as a particular social group.

Do modern intellectuals appeal to reason?

At first glance, it seems that modern intellectuals appeal more to emotions than to reason. Indeed, to persuade a person with rational arguments is not as easy as it may seem, as quite often it is necessary to make people change their beliefs and that, as a rule, is rather difficult. Instead, by appealing to emotions, one can, as it seems, influence a person much faster. However, there is an essential limitation in appealing to emotions: it is possible to exploit the beliefs already existing in people – all emotions that confirm them receive immediate support. Yet, if one tries emotionally deny a person's beliefs, then it can lead to the opposite effect – a sharp rejection of all proposals of such an "intellectual" who would be introducing them on the emotional wave. Thus, the people who want to look as intellectuals due to their rather strong emotional influence on social masses are, in fact, dependent on the beliefs of this mass: it is not them who directs the mass, rather, the mass gives them an unambiguous sign that it is ready to listen. So, it is not correct to refer to such "influencers" as intellectuals.

Has the social mass become different in nearly a century and a half since the appearance of intellectuals as a socio-political phenomenon? Some changes have happened, yet the average intellectual level could rise rather than drop, if the account is taken of a significant increase in the part of those society members who get higher education, as well as other symptoms that once permitted Daniel Bell (1973), an American social theorist, to speak about the post-industrial society as the information society and knowledge economy. American social theorist Victor Ferkiss resumed Bell's definition of the main features of post-industrial society in such a way:

A post-industrial society has several major characteristics of which the most significant are (1) the increasing importance of "service" industries

(as opposed to primary production) in the economic order; (2) the increasing substitution of "knowledge" – especially "theoretical" knowledge – for the property as the basis of the social order; (3) a resulting increasing reliance in the political order on technical expertise for the definition of, if not the actual resolution of, social and political problems; and (4) a consequent increase in the rationalization of social and political life, embodied most clearly in social planning of various kinds. (Ferkiss, 1979, p. 66)

As can be seen, the role of a scientist as a producer of new knowledge and new technologies developed on its basis increases to the leading one in present-day society (Gleiser, 2021; Teixeira & Silva, 2013). Of special importance is the mission of scientists in establishing appropriate and honest communication in society (Kubalskyi, 2022), although here scientists should not go beyond their competence frame. As although scientists are called to "build bridges" for mutual understanding in modern society, yet, however annoying it may be, scientists are significantly limited by the specialization of their research (Harvard, Werker, & Silva, 2020; Loeb, 2020), so they cannot claim the role of all-knowing and omnipotent sages (Gupta, 2021). However, this actual, leading role does not mean that scientist in such a role is appreciated in the public space of modern society: scientists seldom become intellectuals because they, as a rule, are not public people.

It is evident that the circle of people who rationally influence important state decision-making has become significantly larger in more than a century. It is worth talking about rather numerous groups of experts in some issues or others. But are all those people intellectuals? Obviously not. Because intellectuals do not influence decision-making in the current mode, that is rather done by political technocrats: employees of scientific research institutes, specialized analytical centers, and staff of the higher state power bodies. All of them are the employees of these institutions and organizations, so they receive salaries there, so they lose their neutrality, and unbiased approach in terms of some private interest. They represent not so much their own attitude as the attitude of their organization, of the social group whose representatives they are. This limits the freedom of their expertise, and makes it biased – in both good and bad sense. Therefore, they cannot be impartial arbiters, which is certainly expected of intellectuals as the carriers of universal reason.

If modern intellectuals are to be found, this will not be among emotionally dependent "masters of ideas" of social networks, nor among the representatives of various analytical centers, who are limited by their professional interests.

But still, a modern intellectual is to be the carrier and representative of reason. Can he, alone, resist the authority of the analytical center's expertise?

Today's intellectuals as moral authorities

In modern society there exist specific organizations uniting people whose actions are directed primarily by moral motivation – those are volunteer organizations. They do not merely declare their interest in only the moral side of the activities they are engaged in but clearly demonstrate their position through everyday efforts. But, are their activities based on rational decisions? Not infrequently those are spontaneous and badly organized, they are an aggregate of separate actions, which although merging into a permanent stream of volunteer work, still do not implement a certain plan. For example, as opposed to secular volunteers, religious charitable organizations always pursue the purpose of involving those who receive their aid, to the parishioners of their church.

Among inherently volunteer organizations, special attention is attracted by PEN clubs, which unite writers, human rights activists, scientists, publishers, journalists, translators, and other people who usually are considered intellectuals (*PEN International*, n.d.). However, this organization still looks more like a corporation of the so-called liberal professions than an association of intellectuals. Besides, however liberal the charter of this organization may be, its members are to adhere to that statute, which somewhat limits their freedom of expression.

PEN International is a collective moral authority on a permanent basis, and although it often does implement the function of social criticism, yet, it does not always express the attitude of society but, rather, shows the opinion of creative professions representatives who are involved in modern mass communication.

If it is not evident that today's intellectual is a moral authority for society, then, perhaps, he should not be that? Perhaps, modern society should not be assessed from moral positions now? Perhaps, those positions should be functional expediencies – for example, the issues of survival? It seems that Jurgen Habermas (2022), a well-known modern German philosopher, thinks so since last year he began to recommend that Ukraine should capitulate and stop resisting Russian aggression – only for Europe and the world were not at risk of a nuclear war. Thus, if earlier an intellectual not infrequently was a political dissident, that was for protecting the truth and good – as a moral authority (Gattone, 2012). Meanwhile, ever more frequently modern intellectuals, or rather, those who present themselves as such, more confidently go against morality – and, in general, position themselves beyond life values and as though above them (Hillgardt, 2022). In general, this looks as the depreciation of not a certain variety of morals or rejecting the moral attitude of one social group in favor of another – but as discarding the possibility of any moral attitude in present-day society.

This attitude was once analyzed in detail as a symptom characteristic of not just several modern intellectuals but of the entire modern society by Peter Sloterdijk (1983) in his work "Kritik der zynischen Vernunft".

Yet, it seems that the intellectual's exact task is to provide guidelines for society to develop and become better than it is and not to help it lull itself in self-justification. Therefore, despite a large number of aspirants for being intellectuals, not all of them can be recognized as sincere intellectuals, and it is not worthwhile to strive for increasing their number in society. The social situation has not changed radically since the time of the Dreyfus affair – there should not be many intellectuals but they should be true people of principle, truly morally uncompromising in their judgments. It is relying on this criterion that, quite rightly, intellectuals at certain moments of their lives were named among the people who were not professional scientists and professors but at a critical moment stood up for the idea that was of extreme significance for certain society.

The Modern intellectual as an advocate of the destitute

At first glance, the answer to the question of intellectual protecting the destitute is very clear: he not only can but also is obliged to! But if one looks at the sociology of modern intellectuals, the majority of them, if not almost all of them, do not belong to the destitute at all. And if some persons of science or culture are political dissidents and even are exiled from their countries, they look like seekers of social fame and political career rather than carriers of ideas or moral examples. Possibly, the system of mass media presents them that way, but in actual fact, modern intellectual either does not look like a true representative of the destitute or does not get into media space so has very limited opportunities to influence the situation.

This problem has two sides: the efficiency of representing the interests of social groups in media space under conditions of liberal democracy and the ability of intellectuals themselves to implement such representation. The first side of the problem is more of a technical nature since in a democratic country the destitute social group can voice their protest or request for help themselves – if not at regular elections, then at any other moment through realizing their right to freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. This social group can advance its own intellectual and then the other side of the problem will only be how bright and educated personality this intellectual is. But if the destitute prove to be incapable of such self-organization (which is not strange for the destitute), then the other side of the problem will be the readiness of an outsider with the reputation of an intellectual to receive all pains and misfortunes of people in his charge. It is always difficult, but if that is achieved then it may happen that an outsider, in order to prove his devotion to the social group, despite his secondary engagement with it, gives twice as much effort, and that ensures an even greater result than in the case when that is done by someone from the group.

However, scientist as an intellectual also belongs to the destitute: their influence in today's society is recognized to a much lesser extent than the influence of social network stars. Besides, as a rule, scientist gets much smaller material reward than their worth due to their achievements in science; finally, state governance is carried out much more by politicians than by scientists, who determine the priorities of social development on a scientific basis. All that requires that modern scientists should come out into the public space on their own, rather than entrust this mission to various popularizers of science. And that requires broadening scientist's epistemological horizons, going beyond the borders of narrow scientific specializations (Toole, 2022) – at least, in the practical dimension of determining the principal directions of the application of scientific discoveries.

Originality

Modern society is more and more characterized by increasing quantity and quality of unexpected changes, which are characterized as rising turbulence. So, for it to develop successfully, there is a greater need to involve research scientists in determining not only the agenda of public communication but also the principal argumentation in open discussions concerning its consideration. Such argumentation should be based on reason but not on changeable emotions and casual affections of social masses. There are necessary prerequisites for it: for the third century, the global society has been moving towards implementing the Enlightenment project, which has not lost its significance but has acquired new scientific relevance and social demand. Science needs greater spreading of scientific knowledge in society – for its needs to be better understood by social masses, for receiving appropriate funding of scientific research, in particular. Society needs responses to new and increasingly threatening challenges, which generates a corresponding demand, and people

of science, on their part, can satisfy that demand by providing reliable diagnostics of social problems and by developing scientifically grounded strategies for dealing with those challenges.

Conclusions

For scientists to win an appropriately influential social status, they have to realize their social mission and their inadequately low level of current support in society. Thus, to help other social groups to solve their problems, scientists themselves first have to overcome social barriers around science – to make science more understandable and attractive to other social groups. To do that, scientists, first and foremost, must enter the public space rather than the sphere of media, i.e., the space of wide communication with social elites. Scientists must realize their inadequate status as a social group of destitute people limited in their rights, in particular those of participation in making principal solutions in modern society. To exit the state of social oppression, scientists, besides their main work of scientific research, should also engage in the work of modern intellectuals, i.e., win elite recognition. If media intellectuals struggle for popularity among wide social masses, scientists as intellectuals should intensively interact with all social elites. Scientists should strive not for loud personal popularity, as science popularizers do, but work for the recognition of new scientific ideas and new scientific discoveries among representatives of modern social elites. Therefore, for scientists, the condition of scientific success in today's socially turbulent space is the combination of scientific research with intensive communication with the representatives of other social elites. To become an elite for the elites is the task for scientists that is significant not only for science but which opens up in man of science the deepest potential of modern people.

REFERENCES

- Beigbeder, F. (2015). *Conversations d'un enfant du siècle*. Paris: Grasset & Fasquelle. (in French)
- Bell, D. (1973). *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books. (in English)
- Ferkiss, V. (1979). Daniel Bell's Concept of Post-Industrial Society: Theory, Myth, and Ideology. *The Political Science Reviewer*, 9, 61-102. (in English)
- Frickel, S., & Gross, N. (2005). A General Theory of Scientific/Intellectual Movements. *American Sociological Review*, 70(2), 204-232. (in English)
- Gattone, C. F. (2012). The Social Scientist as Public Intellectual in an Age of Mass Media. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 25(4), 175-186. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-012-9128-1> (in English)
- Gleiser, M. (2021, December 1). Opinion: Bridging the Intellectual Divide. *The Scientist*. Retrieved from <https://www.the-scientist.com/reading-frames/opinion-bridging-the-intellectual-divide-69434> (in English)
- Gupta, S. (2021, October 28). Scientists should report results with intellectual humility. Here's how. *Science News*. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencenews.org/article/intellectual-humility-science-research-results-psychology> (in English)
- Habermas, J. (2022, April 28). Krieg und Empörung. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved from <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/projekte/artikel/kultur/das-dilemma-des-westens-juergen-habermas-zum-krieg-in-der-ukraine-e068321/?reduced=true> (in German)
- Harvard, S., Werker, G. R., & Silva, D. S. (2020). Social, ethical, and other value judgments in health economics modelling. *Social Science & Medicine*, 253. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.112975> (in English)
- Hillgardt, H. (2022). Looking beyond values: The legitimacy of social perspectives, opinions and interests in science. *European Journal for Philosophy of Science*, 12(4). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13194-022-00490-w> (in English)
- Kubalskyi, O. N. (2022). Communicative Approach to Determining the Role of Personality in Science. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (22), 36-48. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271325> (in English)

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Lamberts, R. (2017). Science communication: frequently public, occasionally intellectual. *Journal of Science Communication*, 16(01). DOI : <https://doi.org/10.22323/2.16010301> (in English)
- Leclerc, G. (2003). *Sociologie des intellectuels*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (in French)
- Loeb, A. (2020, August 31). The Dangers of Intellectual Territorialism. *Scientific American*. Retrieved from <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-dangers-of-intellectual-territorialism/> (in English)
- Montefiore, A. (1998). Responsibilities of scientists and intellectuals. In *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Taylor and Francis. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780415249126-L086-1> (in English)
- Orzel, C. (2018, January 23). We Need More Scientists As Public Intellectuals. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/chadorzel/2018/01/23/we-need-more-scientists-as-public-intellectuals/?sh=5f759485401d> (in English)
- PEN International. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.pen-international.org/> (in English)
- Pinker, S. (2018, February 13). The Intellectual War on Science. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-intellectual-war-on-science/> (in English)
- Rolin, K. (2016). Values, standpoints, and scientific/intellectual movements. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 56, 11-19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2015.10.008> (in English)
- Schweber, S. S. (1981). Scientists As Intellectuals: The Early Victorians. In J. Paradis & T. Postlewait (Eds.), *Victorian Science and Victorian Values: Literary Perspectives* (pp. 1-37). New York: The New York Academy of Sciences. (in English)
- Sloterdijk, P. (1983). *Kritik der zynischen Vernunft* (Vol. 1). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. (in German)
- Teixeira, A. A. C., & Silva, J. M. (2013). The intellectual and scientific basis of science, technology and innovation research. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 26(4), 472-490. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2013.786910> (in English)
- Toole, B. (2022). Demarginalizing Standpoint Epistemology. *Episteme*, 19(1), 47-65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/epi.2020.8> (in English)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Beigbeder F. *Conversations d'un enfant du siècle*. Paris : Grasset & Fasquelle, 2015. 368 p.
- Bell D. *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York : Basic Books, 1973. 507 p.
- Ferkiss V. Daniel Bell's Concept of Post-Industrial Society: Theory, Myth, and Ideology. *The Political Science Reviewer*. 1979. Vol. 9. P. 61–102.
- Frickel S., Gross N. A General Theory of Scientific/Intellectual Movements. *American Sociological Review*. 2005. Vol. 70, No. 2. P. 204–232.
- Gattone C. F. The Social Scientist as Public Intellectual in an Age of Mass Media. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*. 2012. Vol. 25, Iss. 4. P. 175–186. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-012-9128-1>
- Gleiser M. Opinion: Bridging the Intellectual Divide. *The Scientist*. 2021. December 1. URL: <https://www.the-scientist.com/reading-frames/opinion-bridging-the-intellectual-divide-69434>
- Gupta S. Scientists should report results with intellectual humility. Here's how. *Science News*. 2021. October 28. URL: <https://www.sciencenews.org/article/intellectual-humility-science-research-results-psychology>
- Habermas J. Krieg und Empörung. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. 2022. April 28. URL: <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/projekte/artikel/kultur/das-dilemma-des-westens-juergen-habermas-zum-krieg-in-der-ukraine-e068321/?reduced=true>
- Harvard S., Werker G. R., Silva D. S. Social, ethical, and other value judgments in health economics modelling. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2020. Vol. 253. 9 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.112975>
- Hillgardt H. Looking beyond values: The legitimacy of social perspectives, opinions and interests in science. *European Journal for Philosophy of Science*. 2022. Vol. 12, Iss. 4. 20 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13194-022-00490-w>
- Kubalskyi O. N. Communicative Approach to Determining the Role of Personality in Science. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2022. No. 22. P. 36–48. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271325>
- Lamberts R. Science communication: frequently public, occasionally intellectual. *Journal of Science Communication*. 2017. Vol. 16, Iss. 01. 9 p. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.22323/2.16010301>
- Leclerc G. *Sociologie des intellectuels*. Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, 2003. 128 p.

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Loeb A. The Dangers of Intellectual Territorialism. *Scientific American*. 2020. August 31. URL: <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-dangers-of-intellectual-territorialism/>
- Montefiore A. Responsibilities of scientists and intellectuals. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Taylor and Francis, 1998. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780415249126-L086-1>
- Orzel C. We Need More Scientists As Public Intellectuals. *Forbes*. 2018. January 23. URL: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/chadorzel/2018/01/23/we-need-more-scientists-as-public-intellectuals/?sh=5f759485401d>
- PEN International. URL: <https://www.pen-international.org/>
- Pinker S. The Intellectual War on Science. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 2018. February 13. URL: <https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-intellectual-war-on-science/>
- Rolin K. Values, standpoints, and scientific/intellectual movements. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*. 2016. Vol. 56. P. 11–19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2015.10.008>
- Schweber S. S. Scientists As Intellectuals: The Early Victorians. *Victorian Science and Victorian Values: Literary Perspectives* / ed. by J. Paradis, T. Postlewait. New York : The New York Academy of Sciences, 1981. P. 1–37.
- Sloterdijk P. *Kritik der zynischen Vernunft*. Frankfurt am Main : Suhrkamp, 1983. Bd. 1. 960 s.
- Teixeira A. A. C., Silva J. M. The intellectual and scientific basis of science, technology and innovation research. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*. 2013. Vol. 26, Iss. 4. P. 472–490. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2013.786910>
- Toole B. Demarginalizing Standpoint Epistemology. *Episteme*. 2022. Vol. 19, Iss. 1. P. 47–65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/epi.2020.8>

О. Н. КУБАЛЬСЬКИЙ^{1*}

^{1*}ДУ "Інститут досліджень науково-технічного потенціалу та історії науки імені Г. М. Доброва НАН України" (Київ, Україна), ел. пошта kubalsky@nas.gov.ua, ORCID 0000-0002-7956-3150

Людина науки як інтелектуал: публічна місія вченого

Мета. У цій статті основною метою є виявлення шляхів впливу вченого на розвиток сучасного суспільства порівняно зі шляхами впливу інтелектуалів. **Теоретичний базис.** Соціально-антропологічний підхід до ролі вченого в постіндустріальному суспільстві дає можливість виявити провідну роль людей науки як соціальної групи в сучасному суспільстві. Утім, філософська аксіологія виявляє, що в сучасному суспільстві науковці не мають належного соціального статусу – ані в управлінні державою, ані у сфері формування громадської думки. Класичне вчення про інтелектуалів зазнало кризи в останні десятиліття, що зумовлено зростанням розриву між групою визнаних суспільством інтелектуалів та сферою науки. Необхідний новий теоретичний підхід до визначення ролі сучасних науковців-дослідників як інтелектуалів. **Наукова новизна.** Для успішного розвитку сучасного суспільства в умовах зростання соціальної турбулентності постає необхідність науковцям-дослідникам виходити в простір публічної комунікації. Це зумовлено як потребами розвитку самої науки – для отримання належного її фінансування та широкого суспільного визнання, так і потребами суспільства – адже саме науковці можуть давати точну діагностику суспільних проблем і формулювати обґрунтовані програми їх вирішення. **Висновки.** Щоб подолати соціальні бар'єри й вийти в публічний простір, науковці самі мають усвідомити себе як соціальну групу знедолених – тих, хто є несправедливо усунутий від прийняття основних рішень у сучасному суспільстві. Для цього їм слід ставати сучасними інтелектуалами. На відміну від медійних інтелектуалів, науковці мають взаємодіяти передусім не з соціальними масами, а із суспільними елітами. Науковець має здобувати свій належний статус, отримуючи не широку особисту популярність, а досягаючи визнання власних ідей серед представників суспільних еліт. Таким чином, науковець повинен прагнути здобути статус еліти для еліт – саме це розкриває в науковцеві найглибший потенціал сучасної людини.

Ключові слова: людина; людина науки; інтелектуал; публічна сфера; суспільні еліти; соціальна маса

Received: 20.01.2023

Accepted: 24.05.2023