

Review of: "Intellectualism without Humanism is more Dangerous than Illiteracy"

Valeriu Frunzaru

Potential competing interests: I do not have a conflict of interest.

The topic of the paper is very actual, even if, as the authors underlines, the relationship between knowledge and humanism (good behaviour) was approached by classical philosophers. The paper is very clear and well argued. Nevertheless, I am a sociologist, so I read this article from a different perspective. Richard Hofsteder in his famous book *Anti-intellectualism in American Life* (1963) defined intellectualism as the value of learning for its own sake. Accordingly, antiintellectualism is "against intellectuals and universities" and is a believe that there is a "gap between the American intellectuals and the people". It is true that many intellectuals in their books talked about love, solidarity, equality, but in their real life they were cynical and more than that (see Paul Johnson, *Intellectuals*). Nevertheless, I do not agree with you that "scholars today are **unfortunately** more logical and critical than human." The logic, the critical thinking, and the rationality are part of the desacralized nowadays society, as Max Weber mentioned. But this characteristic of the modern society has not made as more anti-humanistic. There is plenty to talk on this issue, so thank you for challenging us.