

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

John Weaver¹

¹ Georgia Southern University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I like the premise of the article and I like the writing style. But I wonder what does the author mean by bad writing in philosophy? I can think of some dreadfully boring philosophy but does the author have the same thing in mind or is the author one of those philosophers who thinks anything that is not clear, concise, and not analytical philosophy then it is bad like Derrida or Serres. How could the author know my views on bad philosophy and how could I know his since the author has not stated them? If the author is speaking from the latter perspective then I am not with the author.

Ok P.3 I get a sense of what the author means by bad philosophy knowledge acquisition. If by this the author means utility, we go to college to get a job, then I am with the author.

The author then switches from knowledge acquisition to knowledge inquiry and then states this violates three of elementary rules of reason. Which are? Maybe a footnote here is sufficient because I like the flow of the authors writing and I do not want to disrupt it.

p.4 the following repeats from the previous paragraph: "actively promote

public understanding of what our problems are, and what we need to do about them" This has to be deleted or rewritten since it adds nothing to the article.

"Just last year, Susan Haack went so far as to publish an essay entitled 'The Real Question: Can Philosophy Be Saved?' She is not hopeful" (Kaufman 2019)."

If that citation is correct then of course it was not last year but four years ago. I am not sure though even why that citation is there unless it is Haack being quoted by Kaufman.

"is body of work has been prominently published, by leading publishers, and in leading scientific and academic journals. Furthermore, book after book expounding and developing this work has been favourably reviewed by leading philosophers and scientists in leading philosophy and scientific journals. Christopher Longuet-Higgins, Mary Midgley, Robert May, J. J.C. Smart, Sherrilyn Roush, Daniel Dennett, Robert Sternberg, Anjan Chakravartty, Norman Dixon, Marvin Harris, Alan Sokal, Agustin Vicente, Julian Baggini, Alasdair MacIntyre, Harald Walach, and many others have commented favourably on my work in journals such as Nature, British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, The Philosophical Review, Mind, Metascience, Philosophy, International Philosophical Quarterly, Journal of Consciousness Studies, Isis, Inquiry, British Journal for the History of Science, Metaphilosophy, Journal of Applied Philosophy, University

Quarterly, New Statesman, Social Studies of Science, Review of Metaphysics, The Philosopher's Magazine, Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics, Times Higher Educational Supplement, Canadian Philosophical Reviews, Journal for General Philosophy of Science, Times Literary Supplement, Science, Technology, & Human Values, Canadian Philosophical Review, Trend in Cognitive Sciences, Philosophy of the Social Sciences, American Political Science Review, Social Science Quarterly, British Journal of Educational Studies, International Studies in the Philosophy of Science, and elsewhere.⁹ Despite all this praise, mainstream philosophy continues on its way as if oblivious of this body of work. That only intensifies the scandal. If this body of work had been published in obscure places"

This is just name dropping and chest thumping here, not very helpful. This turns this essay into a complaint filed under why are you people not reading my work?

p.8 repeats this again with no explanation. Academia dominated by knowledge-inquiry violates, in a structural way, THREE of the four most elementary rules of rational problem-solving conceivable.

The repeating of previous points with no development is not conducive to good writing or debating.

p.8 Physics needs to acknowledge that there is a substantial, highly problematic metaphysical assumption concerning the physical comprehensibility of the universe implicit in the methods of physics. Physics needs to adopt a new philosophy of physics that acknowledges problematic."

Why limit this to physics? What about Biology and Chemistry?

There are major revisions that need to be done here. I generally like rants but this rant needs work.