



## Attitudes Concerning Knowledge. From Influencers to Scholars – An Essay

Florian Marcel Nuță<sup>1</sup>

The three characters discussed here subscribe to three different perspectives. Apparently, each of them possesses knowledge and delivers it to a certain audience. However, as we will see in the following, some manipulate, being interested in having their own image validated by the public rather than in the information serving as a bearer of validated truth, while others promote scientific truth and avoid conflicts of interest or manipulation. In the end, the discussion can be considered conducted within parameters related to morality, expertise, validation, and vanity.

Personal perspectives and interpretations in any field and on any subject, beyond any filter of the scientific validation apparatus, but which “sound good”, are current, or have the gift of stimulating interest precisely because they are “different”, constitute the medium of manifestation of *the influencer*. He does not seek challengers and critics to perfect his own truth or his own world. Instead, he seeks validation and blind fidelity beyond any evidence and logic. Personal perspectives, which are the basis of the pedestal on which he climbs, are interpretations and perceptions that arise from personal experiences, particular cases and events, and which, passed through the filter of scientific rigor... or even common sense, cannot be empirically validated and cannot be generalized. *The influencer* is best represented by what C.S. Peirce described as the “method of tenacity” in his 1877’s *The Fixation of Belief*, namely, the stubborn affirmation of “truths” and the rejection of any evidence that supports a different reality. In his analysis, C.S. Peirce does not refer to religious beliefs but to the most trivial things reflected in everyday activities, up to policies that concern wider communities. This attitude is mainly influenced by personal comfort and can foster a state of well-being and peace of mind. More than that, expresses an attitude of “possessor of the truth” that does not need testing through filters or validation mechanisms, because the influencer already has their own community that does not critically analyze the respective “truths”, does not look for evidence, but just blindly accepts them beyond any doubt. This fact is also perhaps evident because the influencer sells the feeling of

<sup>1</sup> Danubius International University of Galati, Romania, Address: 3 Galati Blvd., Galati 800654, Romania, Corresponding author: floriann@univ-danubius.ro.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.  
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the  
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY NC) license  
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

belonging to a group or an experience: “Yes, I also experienced exactly what influencer X is telling!” or... “Yes, that’s right! I was there too, and I saw that this is exactly what happened!”, which reinforces a false sense of stability and security among followers.

*The bestselling author* may start with the idea of popularizing science, but that does not always happen. The presentation of previously scientifically validated knowledge (in whole or in part) and its transposition into a language accessible to the general public, including the presentation of personal perspectives that are not scientifically validated or on the verge of validation (e.g., Harari vs. Mommsen), is the tool at hand. He does not stop at the cold presentation of scientifically validated knowledge and information, but enters into a debate with himself, in which he interprets certain events and facts, taking things into the “talk-show” zone. *The bestselling author* sells the illusion of expertise. How many of us have not had the feeling that we know everything about Economics, after leafing through *Crisis Economics* (Roubini), *The Third Wave* (Toffler), or *Making Globalization Work* (Stiglitz)? How many of us have not become “experts” in human history after reading Harari?... The danger here is different from that in the influencer case. This is because it produces false experts who will generate a background noise. Why is this background noise of imaginary experts dangerous? Because it ends up covering up real and valuable debates, limits access to science-based knowledge, and makes certain things fall into ridicule. The newly created “experts” are instrumental in promoting fake news and pseudo-science. Moreover, placed in a power context, the false experts can marginalize scientific knowledge through the authority.

*The scientist*, on the other hand, does not sell anything. He is informative but may seem boring to those who lack the minimum background to decode the information. When you read a scientific publication you are “stumbled” by all kinds of references to other writings and concepts, which you should go through – or have already gone through – to understand the things contained in a 20-pages article. However, the scientific apparatus verifies, tests, and validates knowledge by passing it through its filter, and what is delivered should constitute a valid truth not only from an individual perspective but also with generalizability. In addition, without claiming to be easy or convenient for the self-esteem of an individual or group of individuals, scientific truth is stable. Its stability is not, however, something finite and absolute, because the scientific method involves permanent criticism and working in causal chains, the results of a scientific investigation becoming a premise for future scientific research and experiments. Obviously, all the scientific apparatus at the researcher’s disposal cannot eliminate errors or immorality which are a constant risk of the human nature.

From the perspective of success – perceived by each of the three – probably, a combination of the three typologies would be ideal. However, some of their attributes deny the possibility of having the others. For example, a scientist might want the public visibility of an influencer, but the critical spirit, openness to the permanent search for alternative evidence, and curiosity would not allow him to maintain a “perfect” public image. Thus, the three typologies will continue to exist and will mark society in their own way...