# Review of: "Does Philosophy Matter? The Urgent Need for a Philosophical Revolution"

Maria Jakubik[1]

1 University of Pecs

Potential competing interests:  No potential competing interests to declare.

## Review

Since the 1970s, Maxwell has demanded changes in higher education and universities. He is convinced that universities have betrayed reason and humanity. He is a persistent advocate of the need for more wisdom in higher education for creating a wiser world by moving towards the 'Wisdom University'. He strongly believes that having knowledge is not enough. The aim should be using that knowledge wisely for the benefit of all.

In this paper, Maxwell argues for the need of a different, better, revolutionized philosophy. Especially, in times of current crises of the world, philosophy matters. He has collected quotations from scientists arguing the insignificant role of philosophy in our times.

He emphasizes that 'bad philosophy', 'bad philosophy of inquiry' is when knowledge-inquiry dominates. According to him knowledge-inquiry is irrational. I am not a philosopher and this statement is not clear to me. I do not understand how knowledge-inquiry could be irrational. He writes: "The pursuit of knowledge would be important, but a secondary matter. The central concern would be to help humanity acquire the capacity to resolve the conflicts and problems of living, local and global, that beset us" (p. 3). In my view, knowledge-inquiry is important. However, I agree with Maxwell that the focus, and priority should be on the goals and purposes, on *why* knowledge-inquiry is conducted. Indeed, higher education and universities focus too much on *knowing-that* (propositional knowledge, *episteme*) and on knowing-how (practical knowledge, *techne*) and they are forgetting about the*knowing-why* dimension of knowledge creation and acquisition.

In this paper, and in all of his papers and books during the last 50 years, Maxwell has a very negative view about the state and focus of universities. He claims that universities focus primarily on knowledge-inquiry and not enough on 'wisdom-inquiry', i.e., on a purpose-driven acquisition and use of knowledge. This is of course an exaggeration and generalization. There are different types of universities in different countries with different missions, visions, and values. I am not sure if this generalization is supported by enough facts.

I would suggest the author create a table where characteristics of bad philosophy and good philosophy could be compared. This could help the readers to see the main differences between them, and it could help the author to avoid

repetitions. I felt that Maxwell is personally hurt because he feels that his works, claims, and ideas are ignored by the mainstream academic philosophers. I think that his argument that a good philosophy could have changed the world and could have led us towards a different, a better world is too naive, and his argumentation is not well enough developed. We need more than just a good philosophy to have a better world. University has its ecosystem. It is connected with several parties which have their own specific missions, goals, and interests. The university is formed by its ecosystem and it could have impacts on its ecosystem. Maxwell, in my view, focuses mainly on how the university can form and influence the world and not enough on how the world (i.e., ecosystem) influences the university as an institution. However, in section '*Implications and Action*' he underlines the need for universities to engage and listen to the public.

I do not agree with Maxwell that knowledge-inquiry is bad *per se* (p. 6). Why cannot wisdom-inquiry and knowledge-inquiry exist side by side supporting each other? This should not be an *either or* but rather an *and* relationship.

**Suggestions** to author for improvements:

- Quotations need authors and page numbers.
- In reading the article I find many repetitions (e.g., on p. 4). The author could probably be more focused.
- Creating a comparison table for bad and good philosophy.
- Minor editing issues: badphilosophy (p. 3); todiscuss (p. 5)
- Section '*Gross and Damaging Defects of the Philosophy of Knowledge-Inquiry*' could be deleted. I think it is too personal.
- References: I would suggest to avoid dominating self-referencing.

Maria Jakubik (maria.jakubik@ronininstitute.org)

Finland, 16 April, 2023