social holism and social realism, many social theorists question the very concept of “society” as existing in reality. The concept of social structure is also called into question. Instead of the term “society”, such concepts as “structuration”, “social networks”, “communities of individuals” are used increasingly often. It can be assumed that modern social and socio-political practices, methods underlying the world order, and mechanisms cannot reproduce the value identity of societies any longer. It could be related to the destruction of “superdoctrines” and “worldviews”, which for many centuries maintained social identity around the common substantial nucleus: national, religious, or political ideology (PAVLOV et al., 2019).

AT PRESENT, UNDER THE PRETEXT OF OVERCOMING social holism and social realism, many social theorists question the very concept of “society” as existing in reality. The concept of social structure is also called into question. Instead of the term “society”, such concepts as “structuration”, “social networks”, “communities of individuals” are used increasingly often. It can be assumed that modern social and socio-political practices, methods underlying the world order, and mechanisms cannot reproduce the value identity of societies any longer. It could be related to the destruction of “superdoctrines” and “worldviews”, which for many centuries maintained social identity around the common substantial nucleus: national, religious, or political ideology (PAVLOV et al., 2019).

THE THEORY DEVELOPED BY R. COLLINS, WHICH USES THE CONCEPT OF INTELLECTUAL NETWORKS, DESCRIBES THE PROCESSES OF GENERATION AND APPLICATION OF IDEAS IN SOCIETY QUITE EFFECTIVELY. R. COLLINS defines intellectual networks as “chains of personal contacts between intellectuals connected not only by professional but rather by personal relations” (KRASIKOV, 2010). Intellectual networks are interpreted by the writer as a system of interaction between scientists within the framework of which intellectual ideas emerge, take shape, and crystallize, representing conceptual foundations and the essence of all possible results of human activities.

Many scientists, including R. Collins, as well as researchers and critics of his theory, argue that there are a lot of forms of interactions between intellectuals that allow them to produce intellectual ideas to a greater or lesser degree. According to their views, both professional and personal contacts turn into important foundations of intellectual history in a given region, country, and in the world as a whole.
An individual does not disappear as a social subject and is not dissolved in society – rather, he/she becomes its agent. It is most expressively manifested in rational bureaucracies, mass culture, and various estrangement practices. A person living in an industrial society is personified and individualized. However, such personification and individualization originate not from the person but rather from society and the social system as a whole (PAVLOV, YATSENKO et al., 2020).

The methodological foundation of this research is a synthetic framework, which allows us to take into consideration the changes in the subject matter of analysis. Apart from general scientific methods and critical analysis, we use the provisions of comparative conceptual analysis, social realism, theoretical reconstruction, materialistic positions, and interdisciplinary and civilization approaches.

**DISCUSSION AND RESULTS**

It can be stated that professional contacts influence the generation, development, and formation of intellectual ideas strongly. For instance, the very theory of intellectual networks supported by several scientists as intellectuals includes a few important elements that determine the activity of creating the conceptual foundations of human existence. One of such components is the human ability to engage in the procedure of abstraction, both on the level of collective consciousness and individual scientists. It should be noted that this refers not only to the ability of intellectuals to engage in the procedure of abstraction but also to a similar ability used by people in their everyday life as participants of social relations. As shown by V.I. Krasikov, this process takes place within mass consciousness, only later followed by intellectuals. The difference lies in the performed functions, the essence of which involves scientists pursuing the goal of formation of a new social unity in the shape of emblems and symbols in the context of a changing world. Therefore, the external manifestation of producing intellectual ideas is expressed in the formation of universal foundations for the conceptual unity of world perception.

Looking for common grounds for human existence as well as the existence of the whole world can be considered one of the forms of manifestation of the abstraction process carried out by intellectuals. Thus, within the theory developed by R. Collins, it is argued that philosophy as a field of knowledge and philosophers as intellectuals share common grounds with other forms of culture. R. Collins and V.I. Krasikov, a researcher of his works, consider such to be general social grounds in the form of going beyond the object-centered worldview and usage of the abstraction procedure. The response to the social demand for finding a solution to the issue of arche (“first principle”) as the essential question of pre-Socratic philosophy can be considered a form of manifestation of such grounds. At the same time, the philosophical debates that took place over ancient history and the well-known solutions to the problem of arche suggested a discussion about the issue and crystallization of arguments offered by each representative of philosophical schools. Such discussions can be viewed as intersubjective grounds for the philosophical quest. Intellectuals of different eras used the resources of the dialog form of searching for the truth to create various intellectual ideas. Therefore, it can be argued that dialog as a form of intersubjective foundations of intellectual interaction and the ability of intellectuals to engage in abstraction are basic elements of generating ideas.

The genesis of intellectual ideas is possible due to the actualization of the intersubjective foundations of scientific search expressed in a diversity of forms of interaction between intellectuals. Some researchers believe that such processes include a set of interaction types, one of which is acquiring knowledge and technical means as a result of using the resources of interdisciplinary communications of exchange of information between the participants of the scientific search (SHILKOV, 2009). The point is that when science is self-absorbed, it faces increasing difficulties and sometimes ceases to be at its most effective in modern networking society. For this reason, the ongoing process involving the formation of areas of interdisciplinary research and experience exchange between scientists at conferences and symposiums of different levels seems effective. From now on, the results of scientific activities belong not only to an individual scientist and a small group of intellectuals but to the whole social network, which produces an increasing number of intellectual ideas.
The usage of the information and communication network, the Internet, for spreading knowledge among scientists and intellectuals all over the world proves to be effective. Network society becomes a continuation of the intellectual potential of each scientist, while social intelligence, according to some research, allows intellectuals to “join their abilities with the abilities of other people, thus multiplying the available intellectual resources” (NESTIK, 2016). Therefore, the network society is becoming a foundation for the development of collective intelligence allowing people to generate intellectual ideas anywhere in the world. It represents one of the conditions for intersubjective interactions between intellectuals, allowing them to create completely new intellectual ideas as a result of interactions carried out via technical communication means.

The advances and leadership of certain sciences in the scientific community are considered to be another reason for interaction between intellectuals. A certain branch of knowledge accumulates methodological foundations of scientific search, practical usage of which allows scientists from other areas to fulfill their own intellectual potential (VAINDORF-SYSOEVA et al., 2011). This way, the dominance of one science promotes the ability of intellectuals in the whole community to generate ideas.

It can be argued that the development of the methods of scientific cognition represents one of the foundations for the formation and development of ideas. Therefore, it seems logical to represent the process of scientific development as a transition from the collision between personal knowledge and ignorance to the collision between universal knowledge and ignorance. Researchers associate this process with a transition from personal craving for knowledge to collective and intersubjective grounds for a scientific search. The work and debates on the effective and sufficient method of scientific search have been central in the process of scientific development since the 17th century. In the long run, famous debates about the most effective way of human cognitive activity (which can also be viewed as intersubjective foundations for the growth of scientific knowledge) led to the generation of different intellectual ideas and new scientific discoveries. Moreover, it is a known fact that it was in the 17th century when the social contract theory of the origin of state was developed, which represented a completely new approach to the explanation of social phenomena using the methodology of natural sciences.

For this reason, the genesis and spread of ideas can be narrowed down to looking for the most effective techniques for the conceptualization of the accumulated intellectual experience. From the end of the 19th century to the middle of the 20th century such search was conceptualized in the form of theories explaining the growth of scientific knowledge. Th. Kuhn, I. Lakatos, K. Popper, P. Feyerabend, and many other scientists aimed for the conceptualization of intellectual experience, so they developed systems of philosophy of science and offered arguments that allowed to discuss the basis for scientific development. Each thinker’s theory claimed to be universal since it appealed to a certain group of rationally selected arguments.

An important reason for the intersubjective forms of interaction between individuals is arguably the enhancement of the effectiveness of their existence through the improvement of their technological and cognitive experience in a given area. In scientific literature devoted to psychological foundations of human cognitive abilities, it is pointed out that there are natural biological conditions for the functioning of the brain, which have a great influence on human cognitive abilities, including the principles of cognitive activity of an intellectual (BOLBAKOV, 2014). On the one hand, studies of human cognitive abilities in the framework of cognitive psychology have led to the logical statement that there are limitations to such abilities, i.e. to understanding that in normal conditions a person is unable to process an excessive amount of information. On the other hand, such studies have shown the necessity to look for more effective techniques and methods of acquiring, processing, and sharing information. For us, it means that in the course of generating ideas, an intellectual can look for the most useful directions of processing information to increase the effectiveness of this process.

The same problems are connected not only with the actual generation of ideas but also with creating conditions for this process. This refers to the system of education, which shapes an intellectual in a person. At the same time, it is important to remember the specific features of intellectuals, the sphere of their professional interests, and the techniques used in their
professional practices. For this reason, it is argued that one of the methods that promote the development of cognitive abilities of an intellectual is a training session (Berezina, 2009), the resources of which allow us to provide an intellectual not only with a body of knowledge as information underlying generation of intellectual ideas but also with the ability to process information and produce one’s own unique intellectual ideas.

Therefore, educational activity represents one of the foundations for intersubjective interactions between intellectuals, in the course of which they develop the ability to create intellectual ideas. Effective pedagogical methods are an important prerequisite for the formation of the ability to create new intellectual ideas in an intellectual.

According to Yu.M. Shilkov, the problem associated with intersubjectivity of scientific discourse and potential generation of intellectual ideas lies in the fact that any idea, framework, or theory become valid and true only when the accuracy of one’s personal experience and theory is confirmed and proved by other scientists and intellectuals. This refers to the practical application of the phenomenological approach “I vs Other”, within which an individual (in this case, an intellectual) has to objectify personal scientific experience in the form of intellectual ideas so that they are accepted, used, and justified by Others (both by ordinary members of society and scientists producing theories). For this reason, intellectual ideas most effectively originate in the process of their promotion – in the first place, at scientific symposiums and conferences, and in the course of publishing the results of the scientific search in various forms (scientific articles, monographs, thesis research, etc.).

At the same time, external procedural factors also play an important role; their essence can be described as an adaptation of intellectual ideas to socially accepted norms, i.e. the result of scientific activity as a social institution. According to M.E. Kosobuko, “the process of formation and development of science conditioned upon creation of a specialized body of knowledge, i.e. knowledge suitable for codification and storage in a written form, initiated continuous and stable scientific activity within a certain institutionalized “scientific job” – “micro-communities” (KOSOBUKO, 2012). Interaction between several intellectuals in general and scientific communities in particular leads to the emergence of new intellectual ideas.

Therefore, based on intersubjective forms of interaction intellectual networks are formed, the foundation and key units of which are represented by intellectuals. The connections developing between them allow participants of intellectual activity to interact with each other, which results in the formation of new ideas. However, it should be noted that the generation of intellectual ideas is far from being a smooth process and includes many different types of opposition between the participants of this process.

On the one hand, the transfer of results of intellectual activity is possible thanks to the formation of a common cognitive level shared by scientists and intellectuals based on informed mutual understanding achieved by an organized intellectual group. The formation of a common cognitive level involves clashes between the interests of different scientists, which leads to conflicts between intellectuals. Such conflicts enable us to form new intellectual ideas as conceptual theoretical foundations for the intellectual activities carried out by researchers. On the other hand, the research and scientific activity conducted by scientists and intellectuals can be viewed from the perspective of conflicts as a collision of different interests and a diversity of concessions intellectuals can make in the process of interaction with their colleagues and rivals.

In scientific literature, it is argued that there are a few reasons behind scientific (or, more broadly speaking, intellectual) conflicts, including cognitive, cognitive-psychological, social, psychological, ethical, and other reasons. Regardless of the level of conflicts between intellectuals, they lead to shifts in the intellectual life of society and scientists. N.G. Baranets, A.B. Verevkin, and L.G. Savinova (2012) classify conflicts into conceptual, status, and personal, each of these groups expressing different forms of opposition between intellectuals.

Researchers divide conceptual conflicts into theoretical, arising from conceptual disagreements within a single conceptual matrix, doctrinal, reflecting controversies between doctrines within a certain scientific or intellectual community, and ideological, lying in an ideological opposition between intellectuals in a certain community.
Theoretical conflicts are common in the scientific community. Such type of conflicts can be most clearly observed in the case of the debate over the non-Euclidean geometry created by N.I. Lobachevsky started by V.Ya. Bunyakovsky on the subject of provability of the parallel postulate. In the end, this debate led to an additional rethinking of the conceptual foundations of Euclidean geometry and practical application of non-Euclidean geometries to the analysis of physics tasks and explanation of curvatures of spatio-temporal structures in A. Einstein’s general and special theories of relativity (KUROCHKIN, 2016). Practice has shown that usage of the resources of new geometry had significant heuristic potential and allowed scientists to resolve some of the contradictions between the general and special theories of relativity and quantum mechanics. Thus we see that conceptual conflicts make it possible to resolve contradictions between different theories developed by intellectuals and create common principles of scientific search thanks to the vigorousness of promotion of certain methodological foundations.

N.G. Baranets, A.B. Verevkin, and L.G. Savinova associate ideological conflicts with ideological opposition within a disciplinary community. For illustrative purposes, the researchers refer to the opposition between S.N. Bernstein and M.Kh. Orlov in 1930 on the subject of the connection between the ideologically accepted dialectical materialistic methodology of scientific search and mathematics. Both sides provided rational arguments to do with the status of mathematical knowledge and its applicability in the social environment.

As far as status conflicts are concerned, N.G. Baranets, A.B. Verevkin, and L.G. Savinova associate them with the struggle for resources, prestige, and social standing. These conflicts are frequently common in the political sphere when political elites and intellectuals are trying to get certain preferences. The results of political conflicts are perceived as “a collision, confrontation between political actors conditioned upon contradictions between their political interests, values, and views” (BLOKHINA, 2014). According to O.V. Blokhina, participants of political conflicts engage in confrontation to protect their interests. The researcher also notes that in some cases a participant of a conflict performs the defining role in such confrontations to ignite a conflict “at the right time and place”. O.V. Blokhina believes that examples of such “provocations” include “color revolutions” in Yugoslavia, Ukraine, and Georgia organized by the US special services to pursue the interests of their own country.

Another example of status conflicts is a confrontation between political parties that protect the interests of various social groups concerning many socially, politically, and economically significant matters. For instance, the current experience of Western European political parties shows that the issues of migration are extremely important in this region and require solutions developed not only by political but also by intellectual elites. One of the most famous political intellectuals is Marine Le Pen, the leader of the French party “The National Front”, who, together with her colleagues, calls for ending immigration to the European Union from non-European countries, toughening the requirements for obtaining French citizenship, return to traditional French values, etc.

We can see that conceptualization of political requirements in the sphere of the migration policy of France leads to the formation of intellectual ideas embedded in the program strategies of “The National Front”. Intersubjective interactions within the political organization led by M. Le Pen determine its political status and require constant conceptualization and additional specification of the ideas created by the French political activist. Networking between the political entities in France leads to attempts to find compromises and solutions to the most challenging issues in the life of the state. It is intellectuals who suggest intellectual ideas explicitly, and it is due to active interaction (sometimes in the form of a conflict) between the participants of intersubjective relations that makes the generation, formation, and specification of intellectual ideas possible.

Apart from that, there are personal conflicts based on a certain degree of hostility between its participants. Some scientists assume that personal conflicts sometimes propel conceptual and doctrinal conflicts; however, this fact does not change the nature of intellectual interaction.

In the course of the current process of interaction between intellectuals, it is important to apply the scientific ethos, which represents “a set of values and norms shared by scientists manifested in the form of instructions, prohibitions, preferences, and permissions at the institutional level”
(YAKOVLEVA, 2017). As shown by A.F. Yakovleva, the ethos of science is created by several institutional imperatives, such as universalism, communalism, disinterestedness, and organized skepticism. All these imperatives govern the actions of intellectuals, principles of their relations, norms of their existence, roles and associated living values as well as objective structures in which intellectuals are involved (MIRSKAYA, 2010). Violation of at least one of the above-mentioned imperatives results in the emergence of markedly different forms and ways of organization of intellectual activity.

For instance, the imperative of universalism suggests the necessity of using a unified approach to gaining access to the results of intellectual activity. The availability of access to the results of scientific activity has been expanding recently, which causes some mutual misunderstandings between scientists from different countries. While some countries implement the policy of prevention of free access to the results of scientists’ intellectual activity, others pursue a diametrically opposite approach. As a result, lately, a discussion has started about the commercialization of scientific activity. Therefore, it can be concluded that personal conflicts institutionalized in the form of scientific ethos allow us to transform the attitude to scientific activity and form new approaches and ideas determining the vectors of interaction between intellectuals.

CONCLUSION
To sum up, we see that intersubjective interactions between intellectuals in different forms make it possible to create ideas as results of their activities. Such ideas are formed both in the course of regardful interactions at various forums, conferences, scientific and educational events, during practical activities carried out by intellectuals, and in the process of conflicts. Regardful forms of interaction suggest an opportunity to use the resources of scientific debates in the form of scientific and educational activities, in the course of which methods and rational arguments are employed to convince the opponents of the fairness and acceptability of the scientific system of ideas. Such interactions allow participants of certain communities to produce intellectual ideas.

The conflict forms of interaction between intellectuals allow them to generate ideas beyond the boundaries of the academic community and can encourage working out effective solutions to political, social, economic, ideological, and any other problems. As leaders of social and political institutions of different levels, intellectuals possess intellectual resources for the generation of ideas with the help of which it is possible not only to transform scientific results but also change the image of countries and socio-political layout of the whole world. In general, it can be argued that the genesis of intellectual ideas is determined by the system of intersubjective interactions, which allow us to identify the vector of further existence of intellectuals and the world as a whole.
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Genesis of ideas in the course of intersubjective interactions between intellectuals

Resumo
Os autores deste artigo examinam a questão da gênese das ideias geradas no curso das interações intersubjetivas entre intelectuais. Ressalta-se que as ideias, como construções mentais, têm ido além da área de metafilosofia, em particular, caindo na dimensão praxeológica, transformando-se em fatores independentes explicando as transformações da realidade social. A teoria das redes intelectuais de Randall Collins foi usada pelos autores do artigo como metodologia. O papel dos contatos profissionais no processo de geração de ideias é mostrado. O artigo também destaca a importância das tecnologias modernas, que servem como ferramentas que incentivam a criação de construções intelectuais e proporcionam transfronteiriça, uma de suas características básicas. Outro foco do artigo é a contribuição que os postpositivistas têm feito para a dinâmica geral das ideias. Além disso, a intersubjetividade do discurso intelectual é considerada e são analisados fatores geradores de conflitos de ideias. Na conclusão, os resultados do trabalho e seus principais achados são resumidos.
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Abstract
The authors of this article examine the issue of the genesis of ideas generated in the course of intersubjective interactions between intellectuals. It is pointed out that ideas, as mental constructs, ideas have gone beyond the subject area of metaphilosophy, in particular, falling into the praxeological dimension, thus turning into independent factors explaining the transformations of social reality. Randall Collins’s theory of intellectual networks was used by the authors of the article as methodology. The role of professional contacts in the process of generating ideas is shown. The article also highlights the importance of modern technologies, which serve as tools that encourage the creation of intellectual constructs and provide transboundariness, one of their basic characteristics. Another focus of the article is the contribution postpositivists have made to the general dynamics of ideas. Apart from that, intersubjectivity of intellectuals’ discourse is considered and conflict-generating factors of producing ideas are analyzed. In the conclusion, the results of the work and its main findings are summarized.
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