

Review of: "In the doing of science, what is the place for naturalistic philosophy? Implications for the teaching of science"

Josko Zanic

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I didn't find this to be a particularly good article. The overall point seems to be that naturalistic philosophy should be part of science, which is acceptable (although see below), but the article meanders a lot, featuring along the way problematic understandings of terms, unjustified but far-reaching assumptions, and notions introduced but not later applied.

First of all, the term "naturalistic philosophy" is nowhere defined. However, there are claims involving it that link it particularly to natural language ("naturalistic philosophy deals with concepts that relate to the world as expressed in natural language", p. 2; "naturalistic philosophy in its existential dimension of being rooted in natural language", p. 4). This is unorthodox. As far as I know, naturalistic philosophy (as introduced by Quine) is the kind of philosophy that understands itself as continuous with science, sharing its aims and methods. There is no mention of natural language here. If naturalistic philosophy is understood as involving a particular link with natural language, this should be argued for.

As for unjustified assumptions, the article contains claims such as the following: "the ongoing formation of the world" (p. 3), "what humans do, as constitutive of the world" (p. 4). This reveals a kind of metaphysical constructivism on the part of the authors. However, this is a position that should be argued for. Also, if the overall inspiration of the article is Heideggerian ("being in the world", etc.), this should be acknowledged.

As for notions introduced, but not later applied, these involve: the notion of person; the plurivocity of world-views; time and being. In general, the article meanders a lot, touching on a lot of subjects but leaving the connections between them unclear. What has the need for naturalistic philosophy within science got to do with the plurivocity of world-views that emerges at the end of the discussion of the relation of Feynman to Wittgenstein, or with our becoming slaves of our know-how, as discussed by Arendt?

There are other glitches in the article. For example, on p. 6, the "violation of the intelligibility of natural language" seems to be equated at the same time with the "point of view of physics", as well as with a jump into metaphysics. This should be cleared up.

Finally, on the general point of the article: as I said above, it is acceptable, but there are also voices, such as that of the Nobel prize-winning physicist Weinberg (in his *Dreams of a Final Theory*), who claim that in doing physics they have no use for philosophy. This should be taken into account, especially as most working physicists really make no use of philosophy in their daily practice.

In general, I think this article requires a lot of further work.