

Plans of pluralism. Comments on “Explanatory Pluralism in Psychiatry.”

Jeroen Van Bouwel

Ghent University, Belgium

In this paper, I comment on Raffaella Campaner’s (forthcoming) overview of the debate on explanatory pluralism in psychiatry. In her overview, Campaner distinguishes between, on the one hand, pluralists that consider pluralism to be a temporary state and, on the other hand, pluralists that consider it to be a persisting state. I suggest that it would be helpful to distinguish more than those two *plans of pluralism*, i.e. different understandings of explanatory pluralism both within philosophy of science and psychiatry, namely *moderate/temporary pluralism*, *anything goes pluralism*, *isolationist pluralism*, *integrative pluralism* (cf. Mitchell 2002, 2009) and *interactive pluralism* (cf. Van Bouwel 2009). Next, I discuss the pros and cons of these different understandings of explanatory pluralism. Finally, I raise the question of how to implement or operationalize explanatory pluralism in scientific practice; how to structure a “genuine dialogue” or shape “the pluralistic attitude”? As tentative answers a question-based framework for explanatory pluralism (cf. De Vreese et al. 2010; Van Bouwel & Weber 2002, 2008) as well as social-epistemological procedures for interaction among competing approaches and explanations (cf. Longino 2002; Van Bouwel 2009) are explored.

References.

- Campaner, R. (forthcoming) ‘Explanatory Pluralism in Psychiatry: What Are We Pluralists about, and Why?’ In: M. C. Galavotti et al. (eds.). *New Directions in Philosophy of Science* (The Philosophy of Science in a European Perspective Series). Berlin: Springer.
- De Vreese, L., E. Weber and J. Van Bouwel (2010) ‘Explanatory pluralism in the medical sciences: Theory and practice.’ *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics* **31**(5): 371-90.
- Longino, H. (2002). *The Fate of Knowledge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mitchell, S. (2002) ‘Integrative Pluralism.’ *Biology and Philosophy* **17**(1), 55-70.
- Mitchell, S. (2009) *Unsimple Truths. Science, Complexity, and Policy*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Van Bouwel, J. (2009) ‘The problem with(out) consensus: The scientific consensus, deliberative democracy and agonistic pluralism.’ In: J. Van Bouwel (ed.) *The Social Sciences and Democracy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 121-142.
- Van Bouwel & E. Weber (2002) ‘The Living Apart Together Relationship of Causation and Explanation.’ *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* **32**(4):560-569.
- Van Bouwel, J. & E. Weber (2008) ‘A pragmatic defense of non-relativistic explanatory pluralism in history and social science.’ *History and Theory* **47**:168-182.