ChatGPT

Systemic Flaws and Limitations of Contemporary Western Philosophy

Introduction

Contemporary Western philosophy – as practiced in universities and popular discourse – faces numerous systemic flaws that limit its impact and relevance. This white paper examines these flaws in a structured way, drawing on published data and critical analyses. It covers the low scholarly uptake of philosophical research ("the uncitation problem"), the perverse incentives driving hyper-specialized yet inconsequential output, the ongoing marginalization and appropriation of non-Western traditions, philosophy's comparative underperformance relative to other disciplines in practical domains (happiness, clarity, problem-solving), the misapplication of philosophical training (from unproductive rumination to bad-faith misuse), and deeper systemic failures (epistemic insularity, methodological stagnation, overproduction of trivial work, and lack of falsifiability). Where relevant, we also acknowledge areas where philosophy retains genuine utility – for example in normative policy design, AI ethics, or education – while cautioning against attempts to overclaim authority in domains better served by other fields. The goal is an evidence-based, critical overview of the state of Western academic philosophy and its broader cultural role, organized under clear headings with thorough documentation and analytical precision.

1. The "Uncitation" Problem: Low Impact of Philosophical Research

Figure: Disciplines with the highest rates of uncited publications after 5 years (for works published in 2012; philosophy ~52% uncited). Source: Times Higher Education / Scopus.

A fundamental indicator of academic impact is whether scholarly work is cited by others. Philosophy fares poorly by this measure. According to an analysis of **Elsevier's Scopus database**, over **52% of philosophy research publications in 2012 had *zero* citations in the ensuing five years** [1] [2]. In other words, more than half of recent philosophy papers were *never referenced* by any subsequent publication. Even restricting to peer-reviewed journal articles and reviews, the uncited rate for philosophy was about **49%** – among the highest of any field [3]. (By contrast, in many scientific subfields, well under 10% of papers go uncited in that timeframe [4].) Major humanities disciplines share this "uncitation" problem – *philosophy and history each had over half their 2012 output uncited by 2017* [2] – underscoring a generally insular citation culture outside the sciences.

This pattern suggests that a huge portion of philosophical writing has **minimal visibility or influence**, even within philosophy itself. It has given rise to bleak quips that *the median number of readers for a philosophy article is one*, and that publishing an article is often not much different from throwing it into a void [5]. While top-tier philosophy journals do somewhat better (e.g. one study found a median of 20–36 citations after 10 years for articles in elite journals), the typical mid-level philosophy paper still garnered a median of only ~8 citations over a decade [6] – indicating that only a handful of specialists ever engage with it. Outside the discipline, the uptake is even more limited. It is rare for work in mainstream philosophy to be cited in the sciences or engineering; even within the humanities, cross-disciplinary citation is modest. One

philosopher noted that roughly *25% of the citations to his most-cited paper (in meta-ethics) came from outside philosophy (law, history, psychology, etc.)* [7] – demonstrating some interdisciplinary impact – but acknowledged this might be an **outlier** case [8] [9]. Another scholar found that essentially *all* citations to his work came from philosophy alone [10]. Overall, the picture is that **philosophers largely write for a tiny in-group**: many papers are not even read (or at least not cited) by other philosophers, let alone by scholars in other fields or the general public.

It is important to note that citation rates vary by subfield and prestige. Work in applied ethics or philosophy of mind might attract more attention (including from practitioners in law, cognitive science, etc.), whereas esoteric subfields see little uptake. Additionally, philosophy often has a long "citation tail" – ideas might be cited decades later rather than within a few years [11] [12]. Some defenders argue that low early citation counts partly reflect the field's slower pace and habit of citing older "classic" sources instead of recent papers [13] [14]. Even so, the *sobering reality* remains that **much of academic philosophy fails to penetrate even its own discourse** [15] [16]. As Kieran Healy's analysis of elite journals showed, *nearly one-fifth of articles in top philosophy journals were never cited by anyone*, and just over half were cited five times or fewer [15]. This low uptake is not merely a natural fact of "slow-burn" humanities research – it also points to problems in relevance, dissemination, and scholarly communication within philosophy. In short, the **uncitation problem** signals that a large share of philosophical output has *little impact on advancing knowledge*, raising questions about *why* so many papers are produced and whether the field's publication practices are aligned with meaningful intellectual progress.

2. Structural Incentives and the Push Toward Irrelevance

Many of the uncited, little-read papers in philosophy are not accidents, but symptoms of structural incentives in the academic system. The **professionalization of philosophy** over the 20th century – its embedding in the modern research-university model – created conditions that reward quantity, technicality, and niche specialization at the expense of broader insight. Career necessities like tenure and promotion impose perverse incentives: philosophers are expected to publish prolifically in peer-reviewed journals, which pressures them to **find ever narrower slivers of debate to make a "contribution"**. As one observer notes, *"the vast majority of publications are for the purpose of adding items to the CV rather than because the scholars have something new and important to say. It's the natural end result of an academic system that prizes sheer quantity of scholarship."* [17] Under the tenure-clock hustle, young academics may churn out papers dissecting minute logical distinctions or hair-splitting a colleague's argument – not necessarily because it matters, but because it pads their dossier. Journals, in turn, often favor dense, specialized work that meets certain technical standards (rigorous citation of existing niche literature, formulation of arguments in a formal style, etc.), even if the question being addressed is esoteric or of minimal real-world import. This creates a self-reinforcing loop of **narrow specialization**: to get published and hired, one must dive into a sub-sub-field and produce incremental refinements that only the few other experts in that micro-area will ever read.

Philosopher Robert Frodeman and Adam Briggle, in their critique "When Philosophy Lost Its Way," argue that the discipline's institutionalization in academia led it down a path of *"self-imposed irrelevance"*. In the late 19th and 20th centuries, philosophy reacted to the success of the natural sciences by recasting itself as just another specialized scholarly discipline, "one more discipline alongside the sciences within the modern research university" [18]. To secure a place in the academy, philosophy *"needed its own discrete domain, its own arcane language, its own standards of success and its own specialized concerns… Philosophy adopted the scientific modus operandi of knowledge production, but failed to match the sciences in terms of making progress*

in describing the world." [18] In other words, philosophers started churning out research articles and technical jargon, **mimicking the appearance of scientific progress**, yet without the corresponding payoff in reliable knowledge. Frodeman and Briggle note that *"we [philosophers], too, develop sub-specializations far from the comprehension of the person on the street. In all of these ways we are so very 'scientific.'"* [19] But unlike scientists manipulating genes or chemicals, philosophers "manipulate words" – and the *point of philosophy now is to be smart, not to be good*, a fundamental undoing of its original purpose [20]. This biting diagnosis captures how **perverse incentives and mimicry of science's publish-or-perish model have led philosophy into technical hair-splitting and trivial pursuits**, detached from the larger questions of living a good or wise life.

Concrete examples of these structural distortions abound. Journal referee processes often enforce orthodoxy within a tiny debate: a paper will be rejected if it doesn't cite the referee's own favored literature or if it tries to address a big-picture issue instead of the narrow question at hand. Specialization becomes a safe strategy – one can always say, *"I'm the world's leading expert on the second paragraph of Kant's Third Critique"* – but this hyper-specialization fosters insularity (few outside that niche care) and **fragmentation of knowledge**. There is little incentive to write synthesis or survey work for a broader audience; such work is often deemed not sufficiently "original research" for tenure. Likewise, methodological innovation is rare: the field largely sticks to its traditional modes (conceptual analysis, argumentation in textual form) because flashy new methods (e.g. empirical experiments, computational models) might not be valued by conservative hiring committees. In sum, contemporary academic philosophy is structurally primed to encourage *"academic gamesmanship"* – clever but ultimately **irrelevant abstraction**, pursued chiefly to satisfy career metrics. The incentive structure rewards being **precisely wrong** (producing meticulous analyses of tiny problems) rather than **broadly right** (asking big or useful questions). This structural critique helps explain why so many philosophical articles end up uncited: they are *products of a system that rewards production for its own sake*. As one commenter quipped, *"too many mediocre articles are being published… people are citing a too narrow range of articles"* [21]. The result is a glut of publications that **few find worth reading**, reflecting a discipline whose internal reward system has drifted away from wider intellectual or public value.

3. Cultural Erasure and Appropriation of Non-Western Traditions

Another major limitation of **contemporary Western philosophy** is its continued marginalization of non-Western and Indigenous intellectual traditions – often accompanied by subtle forms of cultural appropriation. Despite some recent calls for diversification, the mainstream philosophy curriculum and canon remain overwhelmingly Eurocentric. Courses and publications focus on the **Western philosophical lineage (Greek, European, and Anglo-American thinkers)**, frequently to the exclusion or tokenization of millennia of thought from Asia, Africa, the Americas, and Oceanian Indigenous cultures. Philosopher Jonardon Ganeri has described modern academic philosophy's *"dark secret"* as *a lingering fear of perspectives beyond the Western canon* [22]. Non-Western philosophies, when acknowledged at all, are often shuffled off to departments of religious studies or area studies, as if they are not **real** philosophy but curious cultural artifacts [22]. For example, Bryan Van Norden recalls being gently encouraged in graduate school *to take his interests in Chinese thought elsewhere – perhaps to Religious Studies or "ethnic studies" – because it didn't fit the philosophy department's concept of philosophy* [23]. Such anecdotes illustrate a pervasive bias that **treats European-American thought as the default universal philosophy**, with other traditions seen as tangential or "other."

The consequences of this bias include both erasure and appropriation. **Cultural erasure** occurs when philosophical ideas from outside the West are ignored or their originators never mentioned. For instance, courses on ethics or epistemology might never mention classical Chinese, Indian, or Islamic philosophers who explored parallel questions, leaving students to think only Greeks and Europeans pondered these topics. Non-Western philosophies are thus rendered invisible or "provincialized," reinforcing the colonial notion that only Westerners do rigorous theory. Meanwhile, **appropriation** can occur when insights from non-Western or Indigenous sources are repackaged by Western thinkers and presented as universal or as the West's own idea. A striking example is how **Buddhist-derived concepts** (such as mindfulness or the nature of the self) have been integrated into Western philosophy of mind and psychology, often without explicit credit to Buddhist scholars, instead reframed in secular or Western terms. The *colonial dynamic* here is that Western institutions cherry-pick attractive elements of other traditions but strip them of context and avoid acknowledging the original frameworks, thereby maintaining the appearance that "philosophy" in the generic sense is something that **Westerners own and define**.

Critics point out that this dynamic is not an accident but a continuation of Eurocentric chauvinism. Van Norden and Jay Garfield famously argued that if academic philosophy refuses to include non-Western thought, it should **truthfully rename itself "Department of European and American Philosophy"** [24]. They note that the typical philosophy curriculum is *"almost monolithically white," presenting nearly all great philosophers as white men*, and that this exclusion of other cultures' sages is part of *"a broader pattern of xenophobic, chauvinistic, nationalistic, and racist efforts to separate 'us' from 'them.'"* [25] In other words, *colonial-era attitudes persist in the canon*. Even today, when a university syllabus marginalizes African or Indigenous philosophy, it tacitly sends the message that those knowledge systems are inferior or not really philosophy. And when ideas that originated in Indigenous contexts (say, concepts of environmental stewardship or holisticknowledge systems) are discussed, they are often reframed in Western theoretical jargon without mentioning Indigenous sources – effectively **appropriating the ideas while erasing the people** who developed them. Such practices "mask" the colonial power dynamics by making the contributions of non-Western cultures invisible or subsuming them under Western categories.

There are, to be fair, ongoing efforts to change this. Some philosophy departments are introducing multicultural philosophy requirements or hiring specialists in Chinese, Indian, Islamic, or Africana philosophy. Journals and conferences on "global philosophy" have proliferated. Yet, the pace is slow and often met with resistance. Detractors sometimes argue that non-Western texts don't "count" as philosophy because they come in forms (aphorisms, sutras, dialogues) that differ from modern analytic argumentation [26]. Others claim that incorporating (for example) Hindu or Confucian thought requires too much cultural and linguistic expertise to ask of philosophers – effectively an excuse to avoid engagement. These rationalizations have been criticized as a kind of **intellectual imperialism**: *who says non-Western traditions must conform to Western definitions of philosophy to be valid?* [27]. The **irony** is that philosophy, supposedly devoted to examining all aspects of wisdom and human experience, limits itself by ignoring a vast portion of the world's epistemologies. In doing so, it not only perpetuates a colonial mindset but also impoverishes its own resources. As philosophers diversify or "decolonize" their discipline, they often *"discover" insights long known in other traditions – sometimes rebranding these as new developments without acknowledging their true origins*. For example, contemporary ethics discussions on interconnectedness and community might draw on ideas akin to the African concept of *Ubuntu*, yet if those influences aren't cited, Western authors might get credit for ideas Indigenous thinkers articulated ages ago.

In sum, **contemporary Western philosophy still struggles with Eurocentric insularity**. It continues to marginalize non-Western and Indigenous philosophies by excluding them or by selectively appropriating

their insights without proper credit or integration. This not only raises ethical issues of representation and justice, but it also means the discipline fails to learn from a wealth of human wisdom. Philosophy risks presenting a distorted self-image – claiming universality while silently assuming a parochial, colonial posture. Addressing this flaw requires conscious effort: genuine inclusion of diverse philosophical voices in curricula and research, and humility about the West's tendency to reframe others' insights as "universal" while glossing over historical power imbalances [25] [24].

4. Comparative Underperformance: Philosophy vs. Other Practices

Philosophy is often justified as a supreme exercise of reason and a guide to the good life. However, when we compare its track record to other disciplines and cognitive practices, philosophy often underperforms in delivering concrete benefits such as **happiness, clarity of mind, practical reasoning skills, and real-world problem solving**. Other approaches – from therapeutic techniques to scientific methods and systems theory – frequently yield more tangible improvements in these domains, raising the question of what unique value philosophical approaches provide (and whether philosophers sometimes claim too much).

Mental Health and Happiness: Traditional philosophical reflection – sitting alone wrestling with existential questions – has no systematic evidence of improving mental well-being. In contrast, fields like **clinical psychology** have developed evidence-based methods (some rooted in philosophical ideas, but operationalized scientifically) that demonstrably enhance well-being. For example, **Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)**, which was partly inspired by Stoic philosophy's insight that our thoughts shape our emotions, has been rigorously tested and found effective for reducing depression and anxiety. **Mindfulness meditation**, a practice with roots in Buddhist philosophy, has been extensively studied in clinical settings. A comprehensive review of mindfulness-based interventions concluded that *"mindfulness brings about various positive psychological effects, including increased subjective well-being, reduced psychological symptoms and emotional reactivity, and improved behavioral regulation."* [28] These are measurable, repeatable benefits – e.g. lowering of stress and anxiety levels, greater life satisfaction – achieved through a structured practice that blends philosophical concepts (e.g. non-attachment, presence of mind) with practical training. Likewise, a recent study that combined **meditation exercises with guided discussions on philosophy and psychology** found significant improvements in participants' life satisfaction, emotional self-regulation, and reductions in anxiety, stress, rumination, and anger over a nine-month program [29] [30]. In other words, *when philosophical ideas are coupled with practice (meditation, therapeutic exercises)*, the results are impressive in terms of happiness and mental health. By contrast, simply reading Aristotle or doing abstract epistemology has no comparable evidence of yielding such positive changes. Philosophical counseling – an approach that tries to use philosophy directly as therapy – remains niche and lacks the robust outcome data that mainstream therapy has. Even advocates admit that philosophical counseling cannot treat severe mental illness and must be careful not to overstep into pseudo-therapy [31] [32]. In summary, **if one's goal is peace of mind or personal happiness, philosophy per se is usually not the most efficient route**; practices like CBT, mindfulness, or even secular life coaching grounded in psychology outperform pure philosophical contemplation by leveraging empirical techniques and active skill-building.

Clarity and Critical Reasoning: One might argue that philosophy's forte is sharpening the mind – improving clarity of thought, critical thinking, and rational argumentation. Indeed, studying philosophy has been correlated with gains in analytic reasoning and logical skills. Philosophy majors tend to do very well on tests like the LSAT or GRE. Additionally, teaching philosophy (for instance, via the "Philosophy for Children" programs) has been shown to boost young students' critical thinking and even improve academic

performance in reading and math [33] [34]. (In one large UK trial, 9-10 year olds who had weekly philosophical discussions showed about two extra months of progress in literacy and numeracy compared to controls [33] – a surprising positive transfer effect.) This suggests that *some* forms of philosophical education can indeed foster mental clarity and reasoning ability, especially when done in an interactive, inquiry-based manner. However, it's important to note that these gains come from *active engagement and pedagogy* – debating ideas, asking questions, evaluating arguments – rather than from passively absorbing philosophical content. One could similarly get critical thinking benefits from studying science or law or participating in debate club. In fact, many fields train critical thinking in context: **scientific training** teaches how to reason from evidence, **legal training** teaches how to reason from principles and precedents, etc. Philosophy's advantage is perhaps its generality – it focuses on reasoning itself – but it can also become **overly abstract**, detached from concrete verification. Philosophers sometimes pride themselves on clarity, yet professional philosophical writing is often notoriously dense or laden with technical jargon (especially in analytic philosophy). By contrast, fields like *systems thinking* or *engineering* emphasize clear modeling of real-world systems, and *cognitive science* uses clear experimental frameworks – arguably providing more feedback on whether one's reasoning is grounded and clear. In short, while philosophy can sharpen the intellect, it is not unique in doing so; **other disciplines often offer equal or better training in clear thinking** but tethered to real-world reference points or data, which can prevent the kind of circuitous, self-referential intellectualizing that academic philosophers sometimes fall into.

Practical Problem-Solving and Real-World Impact: Perhaps the clearest contrast is in solving tangible problems. Western philosophy has produced profound reflections on ethics, justice, meaning, etc., but it has a much harder time claiming direct success in, say, alleviating poverty, improving technology, or formulating public policy that works. In areas like governance, climate change, public health, or engineering challenges, philosophers contribute important *normative* perspectives (e.g. "what would be a just policy?") and conceptual clarity (defining what we mean by "well-being" or "rights"). However, the heavy lifting of *solving* these problems – designing effective interventions, collecting data, iterating solutions – is done by social and natural sciences, by policy analysts, by practitioners on the ground. **Systems thinking** is a good illustrative counterpoint: as an interdisciplinary approach (drawing on cybernetics, ecology, engineering), systems thinking provides tools to map complex problems (like a city's transportation network or an ecosystem's dynamics) and identify leverage points. It emphasizes feedback loops, unintended consequences, and holistic understanding – all things one might consider "philosophical" in a loose sense (it indeed has an underlying philosophy of interconnection [35] [36]). But systems thinking is **action-oriented** and model-driven. It has helped in areas from organizational management to environmental policy by offering concrete frameworks (systems maps, simulations, etc.) that lead to practical interventions. Philosophy, on the other hand, often operates at one remove from practice: a philosopher might write about the ethics of climate change in very general terms, whereas a systems analyst runs a climate-economy model to advise policymakers on trade-offs. When it comes to *"happiness, clarity, practical reasoning, and real-world problem solving,"* philosophy's contributions are often **indirect and hard to quantify**. People generally do not solve personal or societal problems by reading a philosophy journal article; they might use a therapy technique, a scientific insight, a business tool, or an intuitive heuristic.

Philosophical training can even backfire in practical contexts. The habit of endlessly qualifying and doubting can lead to **analysis paralysis** – an inability to act because "on the one hand, on the other hand…" thinking never concludes. While rational deliberation is valuable, there is a point where decisive action must occur. Philosophers sometimes struggle with this, as they are trained to spot exceptions and counterarguments rather than to reach closure. In contrast, professional domains like medicine or engineering teach when to stop analyzing and implement a solution (knowing it can be revised). Additionally, **other "cognitive styles"**

like meditation or intuitive thinking can sometimes outperform discursive reason in certain tasks – e.g. mindfulness can improve focus and reduce emotional overreaction, where purely intellectual analysis might just amplify anxiety or overconfidence. Of course, philosophy as a field does encompass more than abstract thought – for instance, ancient philosophies (Stoicism, Buddhism) were very much practical guides to life. But the modern academic approach often strips away that practical aspect, turning philosophy into theory of language, logic puzzles, or thought experiments far removed from everyday concerns.

In summary, across several important metrics, **philosophy often under-delivers compared to other approaches**: It does not empirically increase happiness or mental health as reliably as therapeutic or meditative practices do [28] [29]; it is not the sole or necessarily best path to clear thinking and may introduce obscurity when over-intellectualized; and it is not as directly useful in solving concrete problems as interdisciplinary, empirically grounded methods like systems engineering or policy science. This is not to say philosophy has no value (the next sections and the conclusion will note its unique contributions), but the evidence suggests that *philosophy's benefits are often more limited or require translation via other practices to be realized*. Philosophers should thus be cautious in claiming primacy or superiority of their approach in domains where **empirical data or pragmatic techniques have proven more effective**.

5. Misuse and Poor Execution of Philosophical Thinking

Not only does philosophical training sometimes fall short in outcomes, it can also be **misapplied or executed poorly**, leading to unproductive or even harmful patterns of thought. One issue is a tendency for some trained in philosophy to engage in **sterile intellectual games or rumination** – spinning complex arguments or counterarguments that go nowhere, or obsessing over abstract problems at the expense of living life. Philosophical rumination differs from clinical rumination (repetitive negative thinking) but can be analogous: an individual might, for example, endlessly question the foundations of meaning or knowledge in a way that yields no resolution, only anxiety or nihilism. Without practical grounding, self-reflection can slip into a kind of *intellectual tail-chasing*. Indeed, the earlier-mentioned study combining meditation with philosophical learning specifically observed a *significant decrease in negative thoughts and rumination* among participants [29] – implying that a *structured, mindful approach to philosophical questions reduced unproductive stewing*. This suggests that when philosophy is done poorly (unguided armchair pondering), it may actually fuel rumination and confusion, whereas when coupled with mindful practice and real-life context, it can be illuminating. In everyday terms, many people find that reading philosophy without guidance can be more frustrating than enlightening – complex arguments can be misinterpreted or lead one to doubt common sense without offering a better alternative, sometimes worsening one's mental equilibrium. This is not an indictment of philosophy per se, but of its **misuse – treating deep existential questions as mere puzzles or getting stuck in analysis without application**.

Perhaps more striking is the **misuse of philosophy in popular culture and bad-faith rhetoric**. Throughout history, we see examples of people taking philosophical ideas or terminology and twisting them to lend false legitimacy to questionable agendas. In today's context, certain extremist or dishonest actors invoke philosophy to justify harmful views. A clear case is the *alt-right and other ideologues misusing Nietzsche, Heidegger, or other philosophers* to cloak racism or misogyny in intellectual garb. For instance, one analysis of alt-right blog posts found that they frequently reference canonical philosophers like **Hegel, Nietzsche, or Žižek**, *summarizing their ideas in a superficial way while omitting crucial nuances and context* [37] [38]. In one such article, the author cited Nietzsche's critique of modernity and admiration for pre-Socratic culture as support for a return to "tribalism, elitism, and tradition" in society – but *failed to mention Nietzsche's actual reasons for criticizing modern values or his belief that the solution was a new way of*

philosophizing, not a simple return to the past [39]. By cherry-picking what they like (Nietzsche's disdain for aspects of modern egalitarianism) and ignoring what they don't (Nietzsche's disdain for reactionary traditionalism as well), these alt-right writers **distort the philosophers' positions**. The result is a pseudo-philosophical rationale for regressive politics. As commentator Nathan Eckstrand noted, *this kind of context-dropping misuse does a disservice to readers and breeds distrust*: when people see philosophy being marshaled in deceptive ways, they may lose faith in philosophical discourse altogether [40].

Other common misuses include **pop-cultural dilutions** of complex ideas – terms like "nihilism", "existential", or "logic" get thrown around without understanding. Pop psychology or self-help sometimes adopts philosophical jargon (e.g. "quantum consciousness" or misappropriations of "Zen") to sell products, often mangling the original meaning. In political and media debates, we often witness *bad-faith actors weaponizing philosophical concepts*: for example, someone might invoke "postmodernism" or "moral relativism" to argue that *truth doesn't matter*, thereby excusing lies – a gross mischaracterization of those philosophies' intent. Another might use "free speech principles" (rooted in liberal philosophy) to defend harassing or silencing others, flipping a principle into a shield for the opposite behavior. Similarly, ethical terms like "Kafkaesque" or "Orwellian" (though literary, they have philosophical weight) get applied so loosely that they lose meaning. This **dumbing down and twisting of philosophy in the public sphere** often comes without the careful reasoning that academic philosophy would demand. The net effect is that philosophical concepts become tools of sophistry – exactly what Socrates warned against – in the hands of polemicists.

Even within academia, poor execution can plague philosophy. Some philosophical arguments devolve into **semantic quibbles** – long debates about how to define a word or interpret a phrase, with little payoff. Others might rely on intuitions or thought experiments that are culturally biased or poorly conceived, leading to faulty conclusions that then have to be unraveled. A lack of methodological checks (like empirical falsification) means a clever-sounding but flawed idea can circulate for a long time before being recognized as empty. Philosophers can be very good at constructing intricate edifices of argument – but those edifices may rest on shaky foundations (questionable premises or imagined scenarios that don't map to reality). When executed poorly, such philosophical reasoning is, to quote one critic, *"empty gesturing"* and *"vague generalities"* that only give an *illusion* of insight [41] [42]. In academic journals, one sometimes encounters exactly this: highly technical debates that, in retrospect, were barking up the wrong tree because they mis-framed the problem initially. Without external correction, the discussion can circle endlessly (for instance, scholastic debates on angels on pinheads, updated into modern analytic form).

In summary, **the misuse and poor execution of philosophy take several forms**: - **Unproductive rumination** by individuals who get stuck in analysis without end or practical result.
- **Bad-faith appropriation** of philosophical ideas by cultural and political actors (e.g. alt-right misreadings of Nietzsche) to lend credibility to harmful ideologies [38] [40].
- **Popular culture dilution** of terms and ideas, leading to misconceptions (turning profound ideas into clichés or buzzwords).
- **Scholarly misfires**, where complex arguments are built on dubious premises or semantic confusion, generating heat but no light.

These phenomena do not condemn philosophy entirely – often, the problem is *not* philosophy itself but rather people **failing to do philosophy well**. A rigorous, context-aware, and honest philosophical approach would avoid these pitfalls. But the fact that philosophy is so often *done badly* (or co-opted for ill ends) is itself a critique: it suggests the discipline's norms have not translated well to broader culture, and that

philosophers perhaps need to do more to guard against misinterpretation and to demonstrate *good faith, clarity, and relevance*. Otherwise, the public sees "philosophy" as either a frustrating head-in-the-clouds exercise or, worse, as sophistry in service of extremism – the very opposite of what philosophy aspires to be.

6. Deeper Systemic Failures: Insularity, Stagnation, Overproduction, and Unfalsifiability

Zooming out, we can identify some **systemic failures in contemporary Western philosophy** that underlie many of the issues discussed so far. These are entrenched characteristics of how philosophy is often practiced and advanced as a field:

- **Epistemic Insularity:** Philosophy has a tendency to form **closed circles of discourse**, drawing only from its own history or a narrow group of insiders, rather than engaging with outside knowledge domains. Philosophers often **cite and read only other philosophers**, leading to a kind of intellectual echo chamber. Empirical sciences or non-Western sources may be ignored because they fall outside the tradition or method a philosopher is trained in. One manifestation of this is the heavy reliance on philosopher's **"intuitions"** as evidence in arguments – thought experiments ask "what would you say about X?" and proceed as if the philosopher's gut reaction is authoritative. But studies show that intuitions can vary widely across cultures and individuals [43]. Indeed, *"even where a majority of philosophers share the same intuitions, the intuitions of non-philosophers from non-Western cultures often diverge… we could all be wrong,"* making philosophers' intuitions a *"poor counterpart to the observations of scientists."* [43] This insularity means philosophers sometimes argue past each other endlessly because they're not bringing in new empirical information that could resolve questions, nor are they always aware of parallel discussions in other fields. However, there are glimmers of change: some philosophers (as noted by Charles Pigden) are "prone to exogamous citations," drawing on psychology, economics, or evolutionary theory in their papers [44]. Pigden suggests that those who "take a larger view" and cite outside research **often do better work**, and that if philosophy *"really is continuous with science… we OUGHT to be citing outside the discipline."* [45] Yet, this very point implies that many philosophers *don't* take that broader view, remaining insular. Insularity is also reinforced institutionally (e.g. insular hiring: departments cloning their own kind of philosophy, marginalizing interdisciplinary or cross-cultural expertise). The **net effect** is an epistemic bubble – one that can lead to stagnation and parochialism.

- **Methodological Stagnation:** Compared to other fields, philosophy's methods have remained relatively static. The dominant analytic method (conceptual analysis, logical argumentation, thought experiments) is not drastically different in kind from what it was decades ago. While sciences developed new tools (statistics, imaging, randomized trials, etc.) and even other humanities embraced new methods (digital humanities, experimental history, etc.), philosophy has been slower to expand its toolkit. There is a small **experimental philosophy (x-phi)** movement where philosophers actually conduct surveys or experiments to inform philosophical questions, but it's still a minority approach. By and large, **methodological innovation is resisted** in favor of "pure" reasoning. The stagnation also shows in how problems are approached: the same classic puzzles (free will, consciousness, the trolley problem, etc.) are rehashed endlessly with similar methods, often yielding no decisive progress. In fact, an oft-heard criticism is that *philosophy hasn't solved any of its core questions* – we still debate mind vs body, realism vs anti-realism, as the ancient Greeks did, just with more pages of literature now. Frodeman and Briggle's critique highlighted that philosophy

adopted the form of scientific inquiry (professional research papers) without the progressive results [18] [19]. Where science evolved methods to test and discard ideas, philosophy largely relies on dialectic that can go on indefinitely. The method of "logical argument from intuitions" has inherent limits: if parties don't share intuitions or starting premises, there is no external reality check to force convergence. As a result, one could say **philosophy's methodological engine is idling** – it produces subtle distinctions and hypothetical scenarios, but often cannot converge on conclusions or rule out faulty positions. Some systemic issues, like *lack of diversity in method*, connect to earlier points: the heavy emphasis on certain analytic styles marginalizes other methods (like phenomenology, or non-textual forms of philosophizing), which could reinvigorate the field if given more space.

- **Overproduction of Narrow Scholarship:** We touched on this in Section 2 with the incentives for quantity. The outcome is a **flood of highly specialized publications** – hundreds of journals, thousands of conference papers – such that no individual could possibly keep up. As Adrian Piper noted, "the literature" on many philosophical issues has grown *exponentially* and is no longer a manageable body that any one person can survey [41]. This leads to scholars talking *only to sub-subgroups* because they cannot handle the deluge of output even within their subfield. Charles Pigden vividly describes how *"much more is published in most philosophical areas than anybody can actually manage to process… we are all in tacit competition for the attention of our peers. Attention is a limited resource."* [12] If one person's paper gets read and cited, another's (perhaps equally worthy) might be ignored simply due to volume overload [12]. This overproduction is a systemic failure because it dilutes quality control (journals must fill pages; many papers of marginal merit get through) and it arguably **devalues each individual contribution** – important ideas might get lost in the noise. It also ties to the uncitation data: if half of all papers are never cited, that suggests a field pumping out more work than it can digest [1] [2]. Overproduction is fueled by the academic career structure (publish or perish), but it ultimately undermines the scholarly conversation by fragmenting it and causing burnout (both intellectual and actual burnout of philosophers trying to keep up). In a healthy academic ecosystem, one would hope that work is produced at a pace where significant contributions get recognized and trivial ones phase out. In philosophy, however, *"much is published that cannot possibly all be read,"* leading to a scenario where importance and validity are hard to discern. Essentially, the signal-to-noise ratio is poor.

- **Lack of Falsifiability and No Clear Progress:** Perhaps the deepest issue is that philosophical claims often lack a mechanism for decisive resolution. In science, a hypothesis can be **falsified** by evidence – if you predict X and experiment shows not-X, your theory is at least partially wrong. In philosophy, propositions are usually not empirically testable in that straightforward way. As the philosopher James Ladyman quipped, in philosophy *"nothing is ever definitively settled; there are no former philosophers, only current philosophers and dead philosophers."* This means **debates can persist for centuries** with no consensus. The Aeon essay on philosophical progress notes that *"the jury remains out on… every problem in philosophy. Philosophy displays increasing ingenuity without an emerging consensus."* [46] By contrast, *"within the natural sciences… there's widespread consensus and significant progress"* on many issues [47]. This isn't to say philosophy fails utterly – sometimes it clarifies why a question was wrong-headed, or splits a problem into parts that can be separately addressed – but it rarely *solves* things in a final way. Karl Popper's criterion of falsifiability famously demarcated science from non-science [48]. If we try to apply that to philosophy, we hit a snag: *"philosophical theories don't make predictions about what we observe… observe all you like, and you won't refute Berkeley's idealism"* [49]. There is no empirical test that can knock out Berkeley's claim that material objects are

just ideas, because any observation is compatible with that claim (Berkeley would say the observation itself is an idea). Thus, philosophical theories are often **underdetermined by any possible experience**. The only recourse is argumentation, but argumentation can always introduce new distinctions to save a theory (similar to ad hoc moves in pseudoscience). Consequently, **bad or false philosophical ideas aren't discarded – they linger**. One philosopher might decisively refute another in their own opinion, but the opponent can publish a rebuttal, and so on ad infinitum. There is no consensus-building process that forces agreement; instead, you get schools of thought proliferating. As a result, philosophy fails to converge and can even **oscillate** (trends and fashions see ideas revived, dismissed, then revived again decades later).

This lack of falsifiability also feeds the overproduction: since you can't ever settle a question, you can always publish something new about it – yet without moving closer to truth. Some have argued that philosophy *progresses by transforming questions* rather than answering them, or by improving the precision of concepts. That may be true in the best cases, but the *perception* from outside (and many inside) is that philosophy is a lot of *"sound and fury, signifying nothing"*. When a field cannot point to clear, cumulative knowledge growth (the way, say, chemistry can point from alchemy to the periodic table to modern biochemistry), it justifiably looks like a systemic failure. Even many philosophers acknowledge this. Eric Dietrich, for example, has written on "many great insights in philosophy – but no progress"; David Chalmers compiled a volume on the "progress" issue, showing it's a live concern. It's telling that one rarely hears of a philosophical theory being abandoned because it was proven wrong; instead, it just becomes unfashionable until maybe a revival later.

To recap, the **specific systemic failures** include:
- *Insularity:* not integrating broader evidence or diverse viewpoints, leading to parochial discussions.
- *Stagnant methods:* doing what has always been done and expecting new results, a kind of methodological conservatism.
- *Glut of trivial output:* an academic culture that incentivizes publishing anything to pad CVs, resulting in an unwieldy literature with low average impact [17] [2].
- *Unfalsifiable debates:* questions that cannot be settled, allowing endless argument and a lack of consensus or clear progress [50] [47].

These failures are interrelated. Because debates don't resolve, you get more and more papers (overproduction) trying to have the last word. Because the field is insular, it doesn't use outside data that might resolve or at least constrain positions. Because the method is argumentation-driven, charlatans or sophists can always muddy the waters with clever rhetoric, and honest philosophers can unintentionally do the same by complicating rather than clarifying. All told, it paints a picture of a discipline at risk of **intellectual deadlock** and growing irrelevance unless reforms or new approaches are embraced.

7. Philosophy's Remaining Value: Roles and Domains of Utility

The critiques above are weighty – yet it would be a mistake to conclude that philosophy has no value or that it should cede all ground to other disciplines. Philosophy, done well and kept in proper scope, retains **distinct utilities** that are hard to replicate elsewhere. In this concluding section, we acknowledge some areas where contemporary philosophy *does* make important contributions, while stressing the need to distinguish genuine value from overreach or monopolization.

Normative Insight for Policy and Ethics: One domain where philosophy shines is in **normative reasoning** – deliberating about what *ought* to be, rather than what *is*. While social and natural sciences inform us

about facts and causal relationships, they do not tell us what values or goals we should pursue. Philosophers specialize in analyzing concepts of justice, rights, the good society, obligations, etc. In **public policy design**, this kind of input is crucial. For example, when crafting healthcare policy, economists can predict outcomes of various models, but questions of fairness (e.g. is healthcare a right?) call for ethical analysis. Philosophers contribute frameworks like John Rawls' theory of justice (with its principles of equal basic liberties and benefiting the least well-off) that have influenced debates on political and economic policy. In bioethics, philosophical work on the moral status of embryos, end-of-life decisions, or consent has directly shaped guidelines and laws. Philosophers often participate on ethics committees for government or international bodies, helping to clarify the value trade-offs in policy choices. **Importantly, this is a contribution of *philosophy working in conjunction* with other fields**, not claiming sole authority. Political scientists, legal scholars, and sociologists also weigh in on these issues with empirical and pragmatic considerations. The proper role of philosophy is to provide conceptual clarity and ethical **guardrails**, not to dictate policy in a vacuum. When done right, philosophy does not try to usurp political science or economics, but rather complements them – for instance, ensuring that a policy aimed at efficiency also respects human dignity, or questioning what "freedom" really means in a given legal context. In short, philosophy retains utility in the **normative foundations** of policy-making and law, so long as it collaborates and doesn't confuse its abstract models for complete expertise in governance (a mistake would be a philosopher thinking their theory of justice is sufficient to design a tax code, disregarding economists' input – that would be overreach).

Conceptual Groundwork in Emerging Fields (e.g. AI Ethics): New technologies and disciplines often face conceptual and ethical questions that are not yet well-defined. Philosophy's strength in conceptual analysis becomes an asset here. A prominent example is **artificial intelligence ethics**. As AI systems gain capabilities and take on roles in society, we encounter questions like: What does it mean for an AI to be "fair" or "accountable"? Can an AI have rights or moral status? How do we value algorithmic decisions versus human judgment? These questions straddle technology and ethics, and philosophers have been central in framing them. For instance, the very notion of "autonomous systems" or "moral agency" for AI draws on decades of philosophy of mind and action. Philosophers working with computer scientists have helped articulate principles for **responsible AI** – such as fairness, transparency, and justice – and pointed out conceptual pitfalls (e.g. the difference between bias in the statistical sense and bias in the ethical sense). **Conceptual engineering**, a newer approach in philosophy, explicitly aims to refine and redefine concepts to better suit our current needs (like clarifying what we mean by "privacy" in an era of big data). In fields like AI, biotech, or environmental policy (think of rights of nature, animal ethics, etc.), philosophy provides a kind of **ethical and conceptual scaffolding** that guides scientific and public discourse. The key again is *collaboration*: these issues are inherently interdisciplinary. Philosophy contributes depth of thought and consistency checking (making sure our values don't contradict or that we notice hidden assumptions), but it relies on science/tech fields for factual inputs and relies on public deliberation for legitimacy. When philosophers stick to clarifying and guiding rather than dominating, they add tremendous value. A misstep would be if philosophers tried to claim AI ethics entirely, ignoring the crucial technical and social knowledge from other experts – fortunately, most working in AI ethics acknowledge it's a team effort (philosophy, computer science, law, etc. all together) [51] [52].

Education and Critical Thinking: As noted earlier, philosophy can improve critical thinking skills, especially when taught interactively. Philosophy's questioning attitude – the encouragement to not take things at face value, to examine assumptions – is a valuable antidote to an age of misinformation and superficial thinking. Educational research (like the UK "Philosophy for Children" trials) demonstrates that even a modest exposure to philosophical inquiry in schools can boost students' reasoning and even academic performance

across subjects [33] [34]. Furthermore, philosophy courses in college often teach students how to structure arguments and evaluate evidence in a way that general education courses might not explicitly do. Many students testify that philosophy taught them "*how to think, not what to think*," which is a crucial skill in any career or civic life. So there is a strong case for philosophy as a part of a well-rounded education – not to produce more narrow academics, but to produce **critical, thoughtful citizens**. Studies have found that students in philosophy classes show greater improvement in argumentative writing and critical reasoning than peers in other humanities classes [53]. Philosophy majors also tend to do well later in professional training (e.g. they have among the highest law school admission rates, high mid-career salaries in some analyses, etc.), suggesting the skillset transfers. However, it's important to distinguish this genuine benefit from a **monopoly claim**. Philosophers sometimes imply that only philosophy teaches critical thinking; in truth, other disciplines also do (a science student learns to critically evaluate hypotheses, a history student learns to critically analyze sources). Philosophy's advantage is that it targets reasoning skills more directly. The best outcome is for philosophy to be integrated into broader curricula (as a method of inquiry that can be applied to any subject) rather than isolated. If philosophers overstate and say "philosophy is the *premier* way to teach thinking, all students should major in philosophy," that would be overreach and ignore the complementary thinking skills taught by other fields (quantitative reasoning in math, empirical reasoning in science, narrative understanding in literature, etc.).

Guarding Against Intellectual Monopolies: Finally, a meta-point of utility is that good philosophy can serve as a *critic of overreach* – including its own. Philosophers are well-positioned to call out when someone in any field is making unjustified claims that X approach can solve everything. For instance, philosophers of science often warn against **scientism** (the idea that science alone can answer all questions, including moral ones, which it arguably can't). Likewise, philosophers can warn against their own kind making imperialistic claims. A healthy philosophy of the discipline would say: "Political science, economics, systems theory etc., each have their domain. Philosophy can inform and critique but not subsume them." Indeed, some contemporary philosophers explicitly emphasize *"epistemic humility"* – recognizing the limits of philosophical methods and engaging in genuine dialogue with other disciplines and forms of knowing (including Indigenous knowledge, lived experience, etc.). If philosophy embraces this role, it becomes a kind of **integrative discipline** that helps weave together insights from various fields, while keeping an eye on big-picture coherence and ethical orientation. It should *not* claim to be the queen of the sciences (an outdated notion that all fields were once "natural philosophy"). Instead, it can be the *mediator* or *quality control* that asks each field the hard questions about assumptions and implications.

In conclusion, while **contemporary Western philosophy has serious flaws and limitations**, it is not without redeeming strengths. Its value is most apparent when it **focuses on its core competencies** – clarifying concepts, examining values, fostering critical dialogue – and when it **collaborates across disciplines** rather than isolating itself or claiming supremacy. Philosophy can be highly relevant in shaping normative frameworks for policy, in grappling with ethical challenges of new technology, in educating minds to think rigorously, and in preserving a space for reflection on meaning and purpose that is not reducible to empirical facts alone. The task for philosophers and institutions is to **amplify these genuine utilities while reforming or discarding the counterproductive tendencies** outlined earlier. This means reforming incentives to value quality over quantity, opening the canon to global ideas, updating methods or at least partnering with those who have complementary methods, and being vigilant against the misuse of philosophy by charlatans or extremists.

Conclusion

Contemporary Western philosophy stands at a crossroads. On one hand, it faces justified criticisms of insularity, lack of impact, and perpetuating a narrow, perhaps colonial, vision of wisdom. The evidence shows a discipline in which half the research may go unread [2], where perverse incentives yield reams of specialized discourse with little societal relevance [17], and where an insensitivity to cultural breadth has hindered its own growth [25]. Moreover, compared to pragmatic disciplines and practices, philosophy often under-delivers on promised benefits like enlightenment, progress, or personal improvement – unless it is translated into more actionable frameworks [28] [29]. These flaws are not merely external perceptions but are supported by data and analysis: high uncitation rates, stagnation in debates, and continued underrepresentation of non-Western voices are all documented problems.

On the other hand, **philosophy's enduring strengths** – its critical depth, its normative vision, its ability to question assumptions – remain as important as ever in a complex world. We still *need* people trained to spot logical fallacies, to debate ethics beyond the sway of partisan politics, to articulate why human dignity or justice matters when technocrats might ignore those in pursuit of efficiency. The key is that philosophy must *earn* its relevance by addressing its failures. It must become more inclusive, more empirically informed (or at least empirically humble), more engaged with real-world problems, and more self-aware of its limitations. Rather than cloistering itself, philosophy should serve as a bridge – connecting dots between disciplines, connecting the present to the wisdom of the past (from all cultures), and connecting analysis with the human condition.

In practical terms, reforms might include: incentivizing interdisciplinary research and teaching for philosophers; valuing public philosophy (engaging writing, outreach) in hiring and tenure decisions; updating curricula to include global philosophical traditions on equal footing; encouraging philosophers to incorporate findings from science and social science into their arguments (where relevant) to avoid reinventing or ignoring well-established knowledge; and cultivating a norm that philosophical work should aim, when possible, to **impact someone or something beyond a tiny circle** – be it informing another field, guiding policy, or at least teaching students to think better. Philosophy should also guard its **ethical integrity**: senior philosophers can call out bad-faith uses of philosophy and stress the importance of context and charity in interpretation, so that figures like Nietzsche or Kant cannot be so easily co-opted by ideologues without scholarly pushback [40].

In conclusion, this white paper has systematically evaluated how contemporary Western philosophy often falls short – through uncited scholarship, structural self-sabotage, cultural narrowness, comparative inefficacy, misapplication, and systemic blind spots. Each critique, however, carries an implicit suggestion for improvement. Philosophy *can* do better: it can cite more broadly and aspire to be read outside its silo [45]; it can reward meaningful contributions over volume [17]; it can truly diversify and own up to its Eurocentric biases [25] [24]; it can learn from the success of disciplines like therapy or systems science to become more practically effective; it can actively police the misuse of its own ideas; and it can address foundational issues of method and progress so that it doesn't keep circling the same unsolvable questions without evolution [50] [47]. If these changes are embraced, philosophy could realize its potential as not just an academic discipline but a *living intellectual practice* that guides action and nurtures wisdom. If not, it risks continuing down the path of increasing irrelevance – a scholastic game of diminishing returns, admired by few and ignored by most.

Ultimately, the measure of philosophy's worth should be **its contribution to human understanding and flourishing**. By that measure, there is both much to criticize in its current state and much to hope for if reforms are undertaken. This paper has highlighted the former; it is up to the philosophical community to pursue the latter, ensuring that future philosophy is richly cited, culturally diverse, conceptually rigorous yet relevant, and above all, engaged with the world rather than sealed off from it. Such a philosophy would not need to *monopolize* other fields' domains, because it would confidently inhabit its own: the critical, integrative, normative, and reflective enterprise that helps humanity navigate the complexities of thought and life in the 21st century.

Sources Cited (selection):

- Times Higher Education report on uncited research [2] ; Daily Nous summary of uncitation rates [1] [3] .
- Daily Nous (Schwitzgebel) on philosophy citation rates and perceptions [5] [6] .
- Frodeman & Briggle quoted in *The Stone* via Pigliucci [18] [19] [54] .
- Big Think on exclusion of non-Western philosophy [22] [25] [24] .
- Eckstrand (APA) on alt-right misuse of philosophy [38] [40] .
- Aeon essay on lack of consensus and falsifiability in philosophy [50] [55] [43] .
- Pigden in Daily Nous comments on citation practices and attention economy [56] [12] [45] .
- ScienceAlert on Philosophy for Children study (improved student skills) [33] [34] .
- Keng et al. on mindfulness benefits [28] .
- MedicalXpress on integrated meditation/philosophy training outcomes [29] .

---

[1] [3] [15] [16] [17] [21] Philosophy Has High Rate of Uncited Publications - Daily Nous
https://dailynous.com/2018/04/19/philosophy-high-rate-uncited-publications/

[2] [4] How much research goes completely uncited? | THE News
https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/how-much-research-goes-completely-uncited

[5] [6] How Often Are Philosophy Articles Actually Cited? Encouraging News (guest post) - Daily Nous
https://dailynous.com/2022/10/21/how-often-are-philosophy-articles-actually-cited-encouraging-news-guest-post/

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [41] [42] [44] [45] [56] Philosophy Citation Practices Revisited - Daily Nous
https://dailynous.com/2015/11/12/philosophy-citation-practices-revisited/

[18] [19] [20] [54] Has Philosophy Lost its Way? - The Philosophers' Magazine
https://philosophersmag.com/has-philosophy-lost-its-way/

[22] [23] [24] [25] [26] [27] Is philosophy too Western for its own good? - Big Think
https://bigthink.com/thinking/is-philosophy-too-western-for-its-own-good/

[28] Effects of mindfulness on psychological health: a review of empirical studies - PubMed
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21802619/

[29] [30] Happiness can be learned through meditation, philosophy and training
https://medicalxpress.com/news/2021-03-happiness-meditation-philosophy.html

[31] How Is Philosophical Counseling Different From Psychotherapy?
https://www.curioussoulphilosophy.com/newsblog/how-is-philosophical-counseling-different-from-psychotherapy/

32 [PDF] Ethics as Therapy: Philosophical Counseling and Psychological ...
https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=philosophy_articles

33 34 Teaching Children Philosophy Can Improve Their Reading And Math Skills, Study Finds : ScienceAlert
https://www.sciencealert.com/teaching-children-philosophy-can-improve-their-reading-and-math-skills-study-finds

35 Systems Thinking: What, Why, When, Where, and How? - The ...
https://thesystemsthinker.com/systems-thinking-what-why-when-where-and-how/

36 Systems Thinking: a practice and mindset - Emergent Thinkers
https://emergentthinkers.com/2020/12/18/systems-thinking-a-practice-and-mindset/

37 38 39 40 What Are You Reading...On the Misuse of Philosophy | Blog of the APA
https://blog.apaonline.org/2016/12/12/what-are-you-reading-on-the-misuse-of-philosophy/

43 46 47 48 49 50 55 Why doesn't philosophy progress from debate to consensus? | Aeon Essays
https://aeon.co/essays/why-doesnt-philosophy-progress-from-debate-to-consensus

51 A high-level overview of AI ethics - ScienceDirect
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666389921001574

52 Concepts of Ethics and Their Application to AI - PMC - PubMed Central
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7968613/

53 Does Studying Philosophy Make People Better Thinkers?
https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-the-american-philosophical-association/article/does-studying-philosophy-make-people-better-thinkers/73DCEDABFD91B2344F859F9D0DBE7772