

THE TRIBE OF THE INTELLECTUALS

Vasile BURLUI¹

¹Prof. PhD, „Apollonia” University of Iași, Romania
Corresponding author: Vasile Burlui; e-mail: domfra@hotmail.com

Abstract

“The tribe of the intellectuals” is a metaphor which holds many facets. One can say that it represents a place where we can find the most brilliant minds of all times. These people convinced us that the progress of humanity can only be based on their extraordinary achievements, in fields such as: history, literature, science, politics, economics, and others. The aim of this article is to define intellectuality, discover its origins and identify the reasons why young people nowadays may want to be a part of this group. The university is one of the primary sources of intellectuals and the number of intellectuals increased considerably in the last decades. A comprehensive classification of intellectuals is hard to achieve since there are numerous options available. However, this article analyses the various types of intellectuals which I find the most significant, offering examples both from the past and from the present.

Keywords: *intellectuals, tribe of intellectuals, education, society.*

Once I made up my mind regarding the field, I decided to avoid the glorious boundaries of the subject and to approach a few more delicate aspects.

I have been fascinated about the problem of the intellectuals for many years, regarding their origin, their purpose in the society, their relationships among the group, etc. It wasn't difficult to notice that here is the place where we can find the most brilliant minds of all times and that the progress of humanity is based on the achievements of this high society. At the same time, one can notice, in the last decades, an unexpected turn of the interest developed in the social sphere in the sense of defending justice and democracy and fighting authoritarianism, towards a decrease and even a passing-by of this social attachment of intellectuals.

On the other hand, the group represents a non-homogenous structure, haunted by short-term interests, generating very powerful conflicts, some having primitive accents, independent of the opponents' level of training.

Let's analyse the birth and evolution of this group which, for reasons easy to guess, I named “the tribe of the intellectuals,” as much as this limited space allows, with the mention that some people tried to look for explanations in works of thousands of pages and still didn't succeed. We also haven't got higher ambitions.

A. THE ORIGINS OF THE CONCEPT

The origins of the concept of intellectual are closely related to George Clemenceau, a well-known French politician of the 19th century, who came up with this concept. In fact, Clemenceau has taken it from the ancient philosophers, offering it the meaning that we know today.

Dictionaries suggest that the concept comes from Latin under the form “*intellectus*,” when in fact we can trace it back to Aristotle under a similar form “*entelechia*,” but more precisely we can find it at this author under its vegetative and sensorial form, both active and passive, defining the principle of life, the reason and the conscience.

The concept was promoted and analysed in Latin by the Arab philosopher Averroes, and also by the Christians who have taken it from him in Latin, with much respect for Aristotle. Averroes describes Aristotle saying that: “Aristotle is the most important sample of humanity.” Other authors added that “no period of time can come up with another man that could match him.”

B. DEFINING THE CONCEPTS

We agree with Stephen Hawking, who uses the term 100% European, but with the following explanations: its ancient origin is Greek-Latin, and the meaning belongs to the 16th-17th-18th-19th centuries.

The new universal dictionary of the Romanian language, as well as other dictionaries, says that:

- **Intellect** = latin *intellectus* = fr. *Intellect*: mind, the ability to think and to know, a characteristic of the human being

A small family of words was created around the notion of "intellect." We shall only take into consideration the following:

- **Intellectual** = noun, describing a person with higher education, working in the fields of teaching, science, technic, culture, etc.

I found in other texts ideas that reconstitute the dictionary definition, as this proves to be insufficient. Therefore, an individual is named intellectual "according to the impact of rational thinking in his profession," "according to the rational manner of perceiving the world," or "according to the rational manner of relationships at the workplace."

All these are in fact incomplete definitions, but they assure the intellectual with an almost ubiquitous spread in the contemporary society.

Paul Johnson, in his book entitled "The intellectuals," avoids offering a definition, preferring a description of the activities of some emblematic characters for the group of intellectuals.

- **Intellectuality** = social category which performs intellectual work, forming a group, a community of intellectuals.
- **Intellectualism** = intellectual orientation characteristic to the group and sometimes in favour of the tribe.

C. HOW COULD WE EXPLAIN THE INTEREST FOR THIS TOPIC?

In favour of this approach, we offer a number of arguments: the decisive role of intellectuals in the progress and evolution of mankind; the historical evolution of the human being towards social, political, cultural, ethnic and religious freedom, freedom for which intellectuals have sometimes made sacrifices; the sudden and significant changes that take place in the world of the intellectuals in support of progress; the

Romanian contemporary society is a sick and confused society, but one that seeks role-models; the need for role-models in Romania following the events of December 1989; the media blames the social absence of intellectuals, but it denigrates them both individually and in groups; the exponential numeric growth of intellectuals.

D. WHY DID WE USE THE NAME "TRIBE OF INTELLECTUALS"?

Considering which metaphor to use, I hesitated between two concepts: caste and tribe, idealizing and being realistic, and I chose the latter term. The metaphor starts from the idea that, in contemporary sociology, the different social groups seem to have melted in the magma of the so-called social classes, when, in fact, they have only become different and more individual, emphasizing the group's tribal features, with unwritten goals and laws.

Although, from the oldest times, intellectuals had a significant effect in the social, economic, scientific and cultural evolution, they didn't have the power which they actually ignored, dedicating themselves to the physical and spiritual knowledge of the world in general and of the human society in particular.

Without representing a distinct class from the beginning, intellectuals achieved a diffuse structure perceived in the depths of the social classes, but only accidentally identifying themselves with them (Spinoza - merchant, Gauguin - accountant, Socrates - mason, etc.).

Their rational way of interfering in history, the openness and highlight of some fields such as philosophy, science, arts, poetry and literature in general led to a category which is part of a closed group, dominated by connections and internal rules, which possesses interior hierarchies, its own means of recognizing and appreciating values, its critical means of spiritual regeneration, its own proliferation capacity, which created and developed its communication system, firstly by oral communication (the peripatetic school), then through the Gutenberg Galaxy, the Binary Galaxy, journals, books, up to the television, radio and online media.

A tribe is nothing else than a group of human beings connected through its concerns, with its own language, promoting its own values, having its own initiation rituals, defending its members and at the same time hosting actions to marginalize the unwanted ones, promoting the fight of ideas up to lynching and spiritual murder, but at the same time cultivating its own taboos, among which we offer some examples: the physical nonviolence taboo, the verbal nonviolence taboo, the taboo of not involving the family in conflicts, the taboo of unfair assimilation of other people's labour, the taboo of argumentation using rational logic, the taboo of augmenting through experiment, etc. Therefore, here is the tribe of the intellectuals!

E. PERSPECTIVES ON GROWING THE NUMBER OF INTELLECTUALS

The university represents a source of intellectuals.

The Bologna process imposed various measures regarding the European higher education. This simple phrase "the massification of higher education," without being assimilated in terms of its consequences, lies at the basis of the huge number of youngsters who assault universities, without always having proper training conditions. Mass higher education, here is the world that we build!

In 2025-2030, in Europe, intellectuals will reach a percentage of 27%, whereas in Romania the percentage will only be 11%. The European target for the year 2050 is 42%, whereas the target for Romania is 27%.

"The world is full of intellectuals," said a European journalist.

Starting from the 19th century, Ion Creangă asked himself: "Who will put on our boots from now on with so many people with studies?"

In a few decades, the members of the tribe will grow considerably from a numerical point of view.

F. WHAT MAKES YOUNGSTERS WANT TO BE PART OF A GROUP?

There is a double interest in forming the group. On the one hand, the state is interested in having highly-qualified labour force so that they

hold management and prospecting positions, and, on the other hand, the individual who wants to fulfil his aspirations regarding social inclusion. If we were to highlight some of the personal motivations, these could be the following: intellectual training offers the individual a higher self-esteem, the hope of getting a respectable place in the social hierarchy, sufficient income, a confirmation of his social usefulness, and last but not least a certificate that confirms his membership to the tribe. Another highly significant motivation is that, usually, the tribe's patron is the state which often is more stable when it comes to various offers, but it is not more generous.

This last argument can be the reason why the tribe lost a major part of its spontaneous reactions which were targeted against the lack of justice and unfairness. Being offered rich gifts as a token of their social product "the thinking," they usually ended up in misery, while others lived their entire lives like this. Even today the myth of the lack of financial interest of the intellectual is sometimes confirmed. He lives in his own world full of illusions. We have to admit that such an image is becoming increasingly rare and even obsolescent.

In order to develop the creative activity, society has come up with various incentives, such as: The Goncourt, Pulitzer or Herder Prize, the Nobel Prize and many other more or less important prizes. Society promoted them in elitist professional societies, in which accreditation as a member is more important than the material stimulus.

The consumption society transformed intellectual production into a merchandise and romantic enthusiasm into an immediate interest. Here, there is no longer the idea of sacrifice for an idea or for the liberation of those oppressed by the lack of justice. That is why, after the December 1989 revolution, in Romania there are no longer any social attitudes, not even literature, music or painting do not present any social or national ideals anymore. Everyone tries to get hold of as many "social parts" as possible in order to quietly consume them on an exotic beach or in a big capital from the Western world. What about the Westerners? They reached the maximum of regaling themselves from "the social product," as one can notice from the information below. I

analysed a group of 30 contemporary intellectuals also trying to find out the loading of their accounts. I randomly present the results for some of them: J. W. – molecular biology, 15,8 billion dollars; G. M. – innovator engineer, 6,7 billion dollars; R. S. – surgeon, 3,7 billion dollars; N. C. – linguist, 275 billion dollars; J. G. – anthropologist, 175 billion dollars and the list goes on.

In this way, the society enclosed the intellectual capacity of the tribe, annihilating the social engagement side characteristic to the intellectual world.

This reduction of the intellectual presence in the social life of the citadel was interpreted by some sociologists as “the death of the intellectuals,” and the change of the mechanisms that made the tribe more dynamic, oriented in another direction, gave the impression of a moral shipwreck of intellectualism, of the intellectualism involved in supporting those oppressed, against autocracy and abuses.

G. GROUP DELIMITATIONS

Intellectuals identified themselves as a group much later, after the disorganised initial occurrence of the intellectual concerns. The tribe was recognized and its members were named as such only in 1898, in some circumstances which led to an extremely increased social tension in France at the end of the 19th century.

In fact, this is what was called “the Dreyfus business”. In 1894, Captain Alfred Dreyfus, Jew of origin, is accused of espionage in favour of a foreign power, judged without any evidence and sent to life imprisonment. He was arrested in a prison on the Island of the Devil, Guyana.

Leon Blum (future writer and politician) together with a group of friends filed a petition to the war law-court in which they denounced the unfair sentence, without any evidence, the defendant having alibis that were not taken into account. The petition was firstly signed by a group of writers and journalists from Paris, and later on from the entire France.

In a few years’ time a more and more important current of opinion was formed which included the social classes that were unhappy with the unfairness of justice and with the social injustice in general.

The idea of resuming the law suit and of correctly analysing the file was becoming more and more appealing to the great minds of that time, Emile Zola writes his famous article “J’accuse” and then the brochure “L’Affaire Dreyfus. La vérité en marche.” For this article, Zola himself is sued, and this makes him flee to England for more than one year. There are special editions of the newspaper in which the case of the falsely accused person was supported. It’s no coincidence that some evidence against the real culprit starts appearing, and he is no one other than the young earl Esterházy.

Strangely enough, in April 1898, the lieutenant colonel Henri commits suicide cutting his carotid with a blade because he was disgraced of the fact that some evidence from the conviction folder against Dreyfus turned out to be counterfeit. This is how both Dreyfus and Esterházy were acquitted.

In December 1898, due to the pressure of the clear attitude against injustice of an honest officer, the Court admitted its error and captain Alfred Dreyfus was set free.

George Clemenceau, a French politician, who housed some of the debates from the “L’Aurore” newspaper, stated in the pages of the newspaper that this success against the abuses of justice was possible due to these “intellectuals,” who joined themselves in spirit, managing to defeat the ineptness of a corrupt system. This was the first usage of the concept of intellectual, taken with pride, promoted and developed as we shall later present.

But before 1898, which was the path that history reserved for the intellectual activity?

We must admit that examples of the depth of thought and of adequate social behaviour existed in all eras. I would offer here the example of Socrates who crossed the town market every day mocking the self-satisfied, the fools, the speculators, the thieves and others.

The Athenian Agora still preserves the stone on which the philosopher held his speeches in direct contact with his fellow-citizens, without microphones, Internet or the television that we have today.

We will not remain in this period for very long, although it created some very subtle schools of philosophical thought: the school of Pythagoras

in Croton, Plato's Academy, Aristotle's Lyceum and others.

One example could be that of Seneca, the philosopher remaining an example of wisdom, of a balanced life and of a dignified attitude. He was killed by Nero because of the behavioural contrast between the two and of the well-known reputation that he had among the Romanian citizens.

The religious lines of some great scholars who have significantly influenced the cause of history include the Christian contribution, but also those of Buda, Confucius and Mohamed, which are all worth mentioning.

They have gracefully passed over centuries of evolution in which, in some blessed places, philosophical and religious doctrines were built, essential for the spiritual development of mankind. But we cannot go further without also mentioning the intellectuals who were dedicated to science and made important discoveries, refused by the officials of those times. It is necessary, but not sufficient to quote Giordano Bruno's sacrifice.

The sacrifice and their activity in the intellectual history led to a decrease in the clerical authority which was meant to be sovereign and in the field of sciences, in the administrative or artistic field. Renaissance placed the individual in the centre of attention, but the 17th and the 18th centuries led to a significant change concerning the decrease in credibility of a corrupt papacy and of a clergy which was influenced to the same extent. This is the period in which thinkers like Voltaire appear, who significantly influenced the social impact of the Church and of its parishioners. At the same time, Voltaire's sharp and ironic writing also didn't forgive the society which was only preoccupied with getting rich using abuses and oppression. Voltaire's thinking led to significant changes and especially when it came to the critical thinking in France, as well as in the rest of Europe. For all this, Voltaire ended up trashed in the street, prosecuted and sent to prison.

The one who influenced the mentalities of a society the most, which he analysed with a highly critical spirit was J. J. Rousseau. He was characterised as a crazy genius, having a disorderly life, in and out of prison, and he was

always full of debts. He had five children and he sent them all to orphanages, without even giving them a name. It is said that his nonconformist ideas were at the basis of the ideology behind the French revolution, that they influenced and still influence the rebellious spirit against the system, the desire for freedom and equality of the French.

As Johnson synthesizes, his doctrine can be resumed as following: the individual is born with qualities that society changes; the mind of the individual is linked to social actions, but it still finds the practical and intuition resources; the good is probed by introspection; through evolution and education, the natural selfishness of the human being transforms into a selfish self-love; the civilized world has overrated competition, which perverted interpersonal relationships.

H. AFTER 1898

It was synthesized by Michel Winock in his outstanding work "Le siècle des intellectuels," which speaks about, in over 700 pages, 1500 socially active characters of this century called "the century of the intellectuals."

The author divides this period into three stages according to the personalities that dominated the intellectual life: **The Barrès Years (1862 - 1923); The Gide Years (1869 - 1951); The Sartre Years (1905 - 1980).**

The century of the intellectuals that Winock describes is the 20th century, a century historically divided according to the two World Wars, which the author systematizes in relationship to the development of the pro-active intellectual thinking, in which philosophers, scientists and highly well-known artists shone, who pushed humanity towards real knowledge boundaries.

However, the attitude engaged experienced powerful pulses, but a little bit less active especially towards the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century.

I. THE INTELLECTUALS' CONFLICT WITH THE SOCIETY

In all times, the intellectuals' conflicts with the society were supported or generated by the

conflicts between intellectuals. The atmosphere inside the tribe was always tense between the very small groups or people who competed in pride and intolerance.

In all historical eras there have been attempts to annihilate the free spirits using various methods, starting from forbidding to share their ideas, up to public condemnation using unfair law-suits or ad-hoc sentencing through lapidation.

The lapidation of Pythagoras took place due to an important person of that place who asked to become one of the disciples of the great philosopher. The ascetic lifestyle promoted by the school of Pythagoras is well-known. Since the claimant didn't have the preoccupations that recommended him for the selection, the philosopher refused him several times. To take revenge, he organized a riot of the citizens paying some rowdyisms who drove him away, hitting him with rocks. He died in a field of beans, a vegetable that he couldn't stand at all.

Socrates was also the victim of the "Citizen's conscience" reaction, stimulated and exaggerated by his enemies in the Athenian Agora. There was this custom that a person who breaks the law of the citadel to be judged by the citizens. The trial could also take place if a person, due to increased awareness, became a danger for democracy, a debatable and easy to invoke fact. The citizens in the market were given pieces and clay tablets and they wrote the verdict on them. The one who was facing trial was later on sentenced according to the will of the majority. This is how the term ostracized appeared, ostracism could have been a financial punishment, an exile or a public execution through poisoning. As Socrates had many enemies due to his harsh argumentations, and especially due to his ironies directed towards those who lived in luxury, or those who abused their slaves without any clear reason, he was punished with the death penalty under the false accusation of not respecting the gods. Although his friends tried to help him cross the border, the philosopher refused because he said that if he does not respect the will of the citizens, then he will give a bad example to the youngsters, who he has always trained to obey the laws.

In another order of ideas, Jesus's sentencing, accused of the new teaching that he preached

and which had a significant impact in the spiritual becoming of humanity, represents the most eloquent example of the reactions that can be triggered by the innovative concepts confronted with the ineptness of the human society.

There are numerous such examples, but I believe that we owe ourselves at least to remember the Nazi persecution before World War II, which, besides the abominable crimes against the Jewish intellectuals, also brought in the foreground the hateful adage "when I hear people speak about culture I just want to pull the trigger."

Let's not forget that also in Romania the history of those years was marked by the crimes of the Legionnaires against important intellectuals, such as N. Iorga, Petre Andrei and others.

Closer to the Romanian experience there is the attitude of the communists towards the intellectuals.

Lenin explained the problem right from the beginning using the well-known adage "the one who is not with us is against us," therefore excluding any confrontation of ideas. Regarding the lack of appreciation of the intellectuals, this can be noticed also in the texts of the same historical character, who considered that intellectuality was uncertain for the social construction that he had in mind, stating that "intellectuality is hesitant."

This ill-fated idea led to the organization of the future gulags.

The Romanian version of the same system abolished intellectuality as a social entity, regarding it in the administrative documents as "clerks." But the aggressive violence on this elitist social class took on destructive forms both in prisons and in the social life.

Even the situation with Dreyfus which we previously spoke about did not only generate support for justice. The intellectuals united around a noble cause were persecuted by the administrative and legal authorities supported by some press colleagues from that time who, in the name of the nationalism required by that era, accused them of betraying the country together with the victims of this unfair law-suit. Many people who supported Dreyfus were dragged to court, and some of the press named them heroes of some dirty pamphlets.

In the last decades, the world was confronted with the unhappy experience of terrorism, a manifestation in which the intellectuals, either clergymen or not, played a significant role, by directly participating inside or outside the place of warship at the indoctrination of youngsters and their transformation into well-known criminals.

The period after December 1989 led Romania to some necessary restarts, an unlimited unleashing of revenges using the means of the modern media. This is how the media lynching was developed, which has nothing in common with the elegant literary polemics from the interwar period, going beyond even the scale established by the pamphlets of this period.

Of course that without the contribution of some of the members of the tribe, these intellectual murder attempts couldn't take place. It is enough to mention the media lynching that Zoe Dumitrescu Buşulenga was subjected to (and this wasn't the only case) by one of her students.

Even the poet of the nation had to face his detractors: "But allow at least the ancestors to sleep in chronicles," said Eminescu in one of his poems. Unfortunately, not even they are allowed to enjoy their posthumous glory because a member of the tribe steps in and tells us that Eminescu is a skeleton from the closet of our nation, that George Călinescu is surpassed, that Nicolae Iorga was too superficial, etc.

J. TYPES OF INTELLECTUALS

At even a superficial analysis, the structure of the group doesn't seem so homogenous anymore as in the early periods, when the thinker decorated the yard of a senior who offered him protection. The definition of the intellectual, beautifully presented by J. P. Sartre, required the fulfilment of two conditions: to have intellectual preoccupations, the field of his activity to develop within the area of reason, and on the other side to react to the social events that concern the violation of democracy, of the individual or collective freedom, to be completely opposed to injustice, abuse and the violation of the law. Social engagement requires nonviolent and non-political means of action. Therefore, Romain

Rolland states the idea that "the intellectual engaged in politics is like a golden commercial on a dumpster."

Social life identifies all three types of intellectuals: Sartre's intellectual who presents both rationale engagement traits, the politician intellectual and the intellectual isolated in the ivory tower, living in a complete isolation of ideas, detached from everyday problems. George Călinescu has an unforgettable saying about the shelter in the world of books: "Ah, says the author, the joy of being alone and timeless for one hour!"

Completely detached from the surrounding realities, living in their own worlds, many of the great scientists submerged theoretical reasoning which became the subject of more or less true stories. Archimedes comes out of the bathroom and runs on the streets "tout a fait nu" shouting "Evrika," Newton throwing the watch in the boiling water, holds the egg in his hand patiently waiting for it to boil, etc.

The capitalist society revealed another type of intellectual, namely the proletarian intellectual, crowding the customs together with construction workers, looking for the right social insertion. They themselves become the victims of an indifferent society and they stop thinking about finding a job, they only think about the next day. A true gathering of intelligent minds in a true East-West or South-North hegemony invaded Western countries, which they fully took advantage of.

The "niche intellectual" is usually the common type, which graduates a university and then honestly devotes himself to a profession for which he opts more or less aware. He is the typical product of the Bologna process, whose target is the massification of higher education with 42% of graduates in the following decades. In this way the tribe ensured the social supremacy and maybe this is not a bad thing. In the same happy decades, 25% of the graduates will overcome the common condition by applying to a Master programme (approximately 10% out of the 42%). Access to a higher form of academic instruction through doctoral programmes is scheduled for 25% of the master graduates, meaning a quarter of those 10%, which means a percentage of 25% of the European population. Where will the trained

population of Romania be compared to the European population? Romania's target figures lead us to a maximum of 50% in comparison to Europe's population, which means a 50% lower trained population. We don't yet take into account the issue of quality.

Another category of intellectuals is the intellectual that we called the "consumption individual," a contemporary expanding species. He is the expression of globalization, has his luggage always ready and plane tickets in his pocket, he goes wherever he finds a better paid job in a sort of continuous "intellectual rodeo," a race that finishes "ubi bene ibi patria."

A complete classification of intellectuals is hard to accomplish and for this reason there are numerous classifications possible. In relationship to a knowledge scale, they can be divided into not-successful (and these are the one who shout the most that they want their certificates to be acknowledged), minimal, standard, and well-known. The latter usually are part of prestigious institutions. This classification doesn't include the snobs, as they can be found in every class. Their name stems from the fact that the Eton College in England admitted only the children from noble families. In time, there were also some exceptions and children without noble titles were admitted. In the school register they were written down as "sine nobilitas" (without nobility). That is where the term snob comes from and it defines the situation in which someone cannot prove that he is part of a noble category. Snobs can be found not only in theatres and concert halls, but also in research laboratories or academic institutions.

An interesting classification of intellectuals could be achieved in relationship to the knowledge manner. A first category would be the group that practices rational knowledge and here we include the owners of all sciences. Knowledge through revelation is a manner characteristic to artists and clergy, which form special categories of intellectuals.

K. THE INTELLECTUAL ERROR

Through the social position that they hold, intellectuals can have a decisive influence on the

development of the society as a whole, or they can direct their knowledge in their particular field through the results of their research. Their responsibility is even greater when the success of an experimental model, or imagined social model, is responsible for the lives of some people, in larger or smaller groups, or even of the society as a whole.

Intellectual error becomes even more important when the idea even if it is a wrong one gains more and more supporters. This situation happens not only in science, but also in politics and social life. The error of the science specialist is the most saddening one. Some scientific errors are due to hypothesis that cannot be tested because of the lack of research means. This is how the Ptolemaic model of our planet system occurred and it dominated the world for many centuries. Taken from the inquisition, it led to well-known sentences for those who dared to dispute a notorious untruth, after all.

Closer to our times there is the case of the Soviet academician Olga Lepeşinskaia. Although Virchow was the one who demonstrated the biological principle "omnis cellula ex cellula," Lepeşinskaia brings false arguments that the trophoblast (the nutritive storage of the embryonic egg) generates a cell crowd. The concept, although it couldn't be demonstrated by any researcher, dominated Western laboratories and it was imposed by political force.

Marx was the promoter of such intellectual error, who took over from Lenin, Stalin and other national leaders who brought an unhappy experience to the world. It is interesting that their ideas were supported by people who, despite being sincere in their beliefs, amplified the error. Here we speak about Louis Aragon, Elsa Triolet, Henri Barbusse and, for a while, Sartre. The list of intellectuals who accepted this ideas is however much larger.

Brilliant intellectuals were also fooled by Hitler's German Nazi Party, and some even had a very strange behaviour, if we are to mention just one devastating case because of his behaviour. The German philosopher Martin Heidegger significantly influenced European philosophy through his work. A great admirer of Hitler, he entered the Nazi Party in 1933. He becomes an adamant anti-Semitic and even an informer of the Gestapo.

Marlene Dietrich was a great admirer of Hitler. She was on the top of her glory and she enjoyed large celebrity. Why did she have to embrace such political beliefs?

Herbert von Karajan – Macedo-Romanian by origin – an outstanding musician and a notorious Pro-Nazi, enrolled in the SS troupes and became major. What services could a non-German Ethnic have done to be rewarded with such a position in the SS troupes?

A Pro-Nazi and Pro-Legionary option had in the same period, without any excuse, the Criterion group from Bucharest. Emil Cioran, one of the members of the group, stated his option very clearly: “I think that there are few people in Germany who have a greater admiration for Hitler than me.”

These exaggerated options were inexplicable for some prestigious intellectuals incapable of attempering their political views and of orienting them towards the right side of the barricade. The psychology of these attitudes still needs to be researched. No matter if we speak about supporters of the left or the right, some essay-writers included them in the group of “the toxic intellectuals” at least for a certain period of time. It is interesting that none of them took back these errors with the exception of Jean Paul Sartre who resigned from the French Communist Party, detaching himself from the errors of the left and remaining a role model for the social freedom militants, being convinced that “the human being is condemned to be free.”

L. THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE TRIBE

The consumerist perspective, the more and more clear transformation of intellectual labour into merchandise, changed intellectual adhesion towards the ideas and the values, in production relationships that quantify the quantity, the

quality and the costs of intellectual labour. Together with the promoters of the globalizing capitalism, the intellectuals are the first inhabitants of the planet who are far from the national geography and history and this led to a lack of social attitude. In consonance with the consequences of globalization, universal literature speaks about the death of history, the death of geography, the death of the state, the death of the family etc.

In the same way, people interpreted the swerving of the tribe’s characteristics as “the death of the tribe of intellectuals” or “Intellectuals – the agony of a myth.”

As the tribal organization represents an empirical form of structuring sui generis, we expect in future years a passage towards a superior form of global organization of intellectuals, with the mention that some of the forms can already be noticed. It is possible that the component structures do not include any national organization forms, but only some niche international structures.

M. ENDING

We reached the end of our journey in which we refused a scholastic presentation. Without claiming that we have completely analysed such a vast topic in such a small space, we just moved, metaphorically speaking, a light spot on some aspects that we considered significant.

Loyal to the same idea, we considered hazardous to end this essay with some silent conclusions, aspect which was also avoided in some of the sources that we analysed.

With an irony which will not forgive us, or the others, in the end, we use as a conclusion the words of the former American president, Eisenhower: **“An intellectual is a man who takes more words than necessary to tell more than he knows.”**