ChatGPT

The Trifecta of Philosophy's Problems

Introduction

Modern academic philosophy faces a **trifecta of deep-rooted problems** that hinder its progress and relevance. First, **perverse academic incentives** have skewed priorities in the field, rewarding quantity over quality and fostering insularity. Second, a peculiar **cognitive side effect of the "philosopher" identity** encourages ungrounded, **maladaptive mind-wandering** – a tendency to indulge in abstract speculation granted unwarranted legitimacy by one's status as a "philosopher." Third, Western academic philosophy perpetuates **cultural appropriation and erasure**, seldom acknowledging non-Western intellectual traditions and thereby entrenching a Eurocentric monopoly on philosophical canon. This report examines each of these three problems in turn, drawing on evidence from within academia and observing their impacts beyond the ivory tower (in podcasts, blogs, and public discourse). The goal is to articulate these issues clearly and provide a foundation for understanding how they undermine both academic rigor and broader cultural wisdom.

1. Perverse Academic Incentives and Their Downstream Effects

Academic philosophers today operate in a hyper-competitive environment that incentivizes *productivity metrics*—publication counts, citation indexes, securing grants—often at the expense of depth and genuine inquiry. This "**publish-or-perish**" culture, pervasive across academia, has introduced what Susan Haack calls "a whole raft of perverse incentives, the costs of which far exceed the benefits" [1]. In philosophy, as in other disciplines, career advancement hinges on appearing constantly "productive," leading scholars to prioritize frequent publication over truly impactful work. As one observer notes, contemporary academia's structure "caters to professors' worst tendencies" by tying jobs and reputation to **quantity rather than quality** of publications [2]. The predictable result is a **flood of derivative, unoriginal scholarship** – a "plague of marginal research" that adds little new insight [2]. Young philosophers quickly learn that **playing it safe** is the surest path to tenure: selecting a narrow, fashionable niche and pleasing a small circle of senior specialists who gate-keep that subfield [3] [4]. John Symons observes that a *"narrowly defined research niche in a fashionable topic could provide easy rewards"* for early-career philosophers, since "their approval was a necessary condition for professional advancement" [3]. Over time, this model **cultivated a risk-averse spirit of caution and conformism** in the profession [5]. Instead of rewarding bold or synthetic thinking, the current incentive structure favors "cautious and modest research agendas" that adequately conform to prevailing standards [4].

Such **perverse incentives** have **downstream effects** that ripple beyond philosophy itself. Internally, they stifle innovation and discourage philosophers from tackling big, cross-disciplinary questions (which carry higher risk of criticism or failure). Externally, the attitudes fostered by this system can influence other fields and society at large. Indeed, the broader scientific community has similarly warned that "perverse incentives and the misuse of quantitative metrics have undermined the integrity of scientific research" [6]. When quantity is prized over quality, academics in many disciplines respond by slicing ideas thinly into multiple papers, chasing trendy topics with easy payoffs, or even engaging in unethical practices to produce *impressive-looking* results [7] [8]. Philosophy, albeit not an experimental science, mirrors these problems:

the **network effects** include a proliferation of insular sub-discussions and jargon-heavy papers that few outside a narrow circle will ever read or use. Other disciplines that intersect with philosophy (such as cognitive science, ethics in technology, or political theory) may likewise feel the impact: philosophical insights that could have been fruitful are either **diluted by trivial output** or **lost behind paywalls and hyper-specialization**. Moreover, because academic hiring and promotion in philosophy rarely reward public engagement, many philosophers shy away from writing for popular audiences or participating in podcasts/blogs – **citing any time spent on outreach as time "stolen" from research**. This creates a vacuum in the public sphere, often filled by self-styled pundits with questionable credentials.

It is telling that calls for reform are growing louder. Observers argue we must **"change academics' incentives"** to reduce the glut of trivial work and restore genuine scholarship [9]. Some propose de-emphasizing sheer publication count in favor of teaching quality or broad impact [10]. In philosophy specifically, Symons and others suggest that real **philosophical inquiry thrives when risk and criticism are welcomed**, rather than discouraged [11]. If the discipline fails to realign its incentives, it risks intellectual stagnation – and losing public trust. As Haack implies, the relentless pressure to appear constantly "productive" ends up **producing less of real value**, at great cost to the *integrity* of the field [1]. In the public sphere, the same pressure trickles down: even some popular philosophy content shows signs of chasing clicks or fashionable controversies (a parallel to academic trend-chasing), instead of fostering thoughtful debate. **Podcasters and bloggers** who emulate academic philosophers may focus on esoteric puzzles or hair-splitting analyses (since that's what earns respect in academia), leaving lay audiences cold or confused. Alternatively, because academic philosophers often don't engage outside their niche, **popular discourse on philosophy** is frequently led by enthusiasts or polemicists who lack rigor – with **mixed results**. In short, misaligned incentives in academic philosophy not only harm scholarly innovation, but also weaken the **beneficial influence philosophy could have on other fields and the general public**.

2. The Philosopher's Identity and Maladaptive Mind-Wandering

A less discussed but insidious problem is the set of **cognitive side effects** that can accompany the **"philosopher" identity**. Philosophical training valorizes abstract thinking, thought experiments, and questioning of basics – all valuable in moderation. But there is a fine line where **intense reflection slides into unproductive rumination or fanciful mind-wandering**. Many philosophers have warned of this tendency. Daniel Dennett famously identified *"Philosopher's Syndrome"* as **"mistaking a failure of the imagination for an insight into necessity."** [12] In other words, one may simply be **hitting the limits of one's own thinking**, yet because one is philosophizing, it feels like a deep discovery of how things *must* be. This is one example of how the **narrative legitimacy** of being a philosopher can **cloak cognitive errors in a sheen of profundity**. Ernest Sosa echoed this, chiding "philosopher's arrogance" – the assumption that **"mere reflection [is] the source of all intellectual virtue"** [13]. When a person internalizes the role of Philosopher, there is a risk that any prolonged bout of **contemplative daydreaming** or circuitous argument is self-justified as productive ("I'm doing philosophy!") when it may in fact be **aimless or even maladaptive**.

To be sure, creative and speculative thinking are crucial to philosophy. The danger lies in **unchecked, indulgent abstraction** detached from reality or evidence. Clive James once quipped that *mysticism* is just "a philosophical urge gone wrong," noting that *"thousands of lesser philosophers… try to form systems out of no knowledge at all,"* under the **illusion that profundity can be attained by "embracing principles with no basis in science."** [14] This colorful remark underscores how easily **philosophical narrative can drift into grandiose but groundless theory**. With no external check (empirical or practical), a philosopher might wander intellectually for years, constructing elaborate conceptual edifices that remain entirely self-

referential. Such **maladaptive mind-wandering** can be reinforced by the academic ecosystem: as long as one can tell a coherent story and situate it in philosophical literature, it passes as scholarship, even if it solves no real problem. In extreme cases, we see the **narrative legitimacy of the "philosopher"** exploited in public arenas. For example, **internet personalities** sometimes adopt the philosopher label to lend gravitas to their musings or polemics. The case of Stefan Molyneux is instructive: a **"self-described philosopher"** who built a large online following, he leveraged the aura of philosophy to promote idiosyncratic and extremist ideas [15]. Molyneux's content often consisted of long, meandering monologues and speculative theories presented with an air of intellectual authority. To his followers, the *philosophical* style gave his narratives legitimacy; yet outside observers noted his **lack of rigor**, calling his approach "embarrassingly" uncritical and more akin to ideology than true philosophy [16]. While Molyneux is an extreme (and troubling) example – labeled by some a cultish propagandist rather than a genuine thinker [15] – the pattern is worth noting. It shows how **the cultural image of the philosopher** (the wise, unfettered thinker) can be co-opted to **justify undisciplined or even harmful lines of thought**, insulated from ordinary standards of evidence by a loyal audience or academic jargon.

Even within academia, one can find gentle critiques of philosophers' tendency to roam intellectually without clear purpose. Bertrand Russell joked that *"the point of philosophy is to start with something so simple as not to seem worth stating, and to end with something so paradoxical that no one will believe it."* [17] This wry observation captures how a certain style of philosophizing delights in puzzles and paradoxes that, while intriguing, may not advance understanding. **Overindulgence in clever but idle problems** (for instance, endlessly tweaking the parameters of a famous thought experiment) can become a form of **"philosophical masturbation,"** to use a blunt popular term. Indeed, critics of some trendy thought experiments like the Trolley Problem have argued that they generate more light than heat – interesting mental exercises that risk devolving into **sterile intellectual games**. The *downstream effect* of this on the public is twofold: On one hand, it feeds the stereotype that philosophy is "navel-gazing" or irrelevant, as people see philosophers debating scenarios or metaphysical niceties with little connection to real life. On the other hand, it emboldens some **podcasters and bloggers** to imitate that narrative style, spinning elaborate philosophical commentaries or self-reflections that might lack substance. The *podcastosphere* has many who position themselves as deep thinkers by adopting a philosophical tone – sometimes yielding insightful conversations, but other times just **armchair speculation amplified**. Without standards of evidence or practical accountability, there is a thin line between **genuine philosophical insight** and **self-indulgent rambling**. The problem, then, is not thinking deeply per se – it's failing to recognize when deep thought slides into **dysfunctional rumination**. In psychology, unproductive rumination is known to worsen anxiety and depression; analogously, in intellectual life, unmoored philosophical rumination can lead to **cynicism, confusion, or a detachment from reality** for both the thinker and their audience. The prestige of the philosopher's identity should not immunize one from the normal checks of coherence, relevance, and factual mooring. As one wit put it, *"There is a vast amount of philosophical progress. But almost all of it is outside philosophy."* (an allusion to the idea that real progress often comes when philosophy connects with science or everyday life, rather than drifting off on its own). Ultimately, confronting this problem means encouraging philosophers to tether their imagination to *something* – be it empirical findings, interdisciplinary dialogue, or practical implications – so that mind-wandering can become creative exploration rather than self-confirming loop. It also means that **public-facing philosophy** (in blogs, videos, etc.) should strive for clarity and intellectual honesty, rather than using the mystique of philosophy as a smoke-screen for idle speculation.

3. Cultural Appropriation and Erasure in Western Philosophy

The third major problem is the **Eurocentric insularity** of academic philosophy – a pattern of cultural dominance that amounts to the appropriation of the label "Philosophy" by the West and the erasure or marginalization of non-Western traditions. For centuries, Western philosophers drew a tight boundary around what counted as philosophy, often explicitly dismissing the rest of the world. Immanuel Kant, for instance, declared flatly that *"philosophy is not to be found in the whole Orient"* [18] . Martin Heidegger later claimed that calling philosophy "Western-European" was redundant, since *"philosophy is Greek in its nature,"* implying other cultures only have mythology or thinking, not **philosophy proper** [19] . As late as 2001, Jacques Derrida shocked a Chinese audience by stating *"China does not have any philosophy, only thought."* [20] These sentiments, extreme as they are, unfortunately echo in the structure of today's academic curricula. A typical philosophy department's course offerings still present the story of Philosophy as beginning in ancient Greece, developing through Europe (with maybe a nod to medieval Islamic commentary if generous), and flowering in modern Western Europe and North America [21] . If students want to learn about Chinese, Indian, African, or indigenous American philosophical traditions, they often must **step outside the philosophy department** – into area studies, religious studies, or anthropology. Non-Western works are treated as exotic electives, not part of the core canon. This systematic exclusion led philosopher Bryan Van Norden to observe that the curriculum is "almost monolithically white" – nearly all major philosophers taught are white men of Europe – and this is *"not just an accident."* Rather, he argues, it reflects *"a broader pattern of xenophobic, chauvinistic, nationalistic, and racist efforts to separate 'us' from 'them.'"* [22] In blunt terms, Van Norden and Jay Garfield have suggested that if academic departments refuse to broaden their scope, honesty demands they **"stop pretending"** they teach universal philosophy and **rebrand themselves as "Departments of European and American Philosophy."** [23] .

Critics like Garfield point out that philosophy as currently practiced in the West is *"nothing but a sub-department of the broader field of White Studies."* [24] This scathing description highlights the extent of cultural **erasure**: by acting as though only European thought is *true* philosophy, the academy erases the rich intellectual heritage of the majority of humankind. It also verges on **cultural appropriation** when Western philosophers do engage other traditions but on unequal terms. Often, bits of Eastern or Indigenous thought are skimmed for **"inspiration"** or analogies, without acknowledging the full context or crediting contemporary non-Western philosophers. (For instance, there's a popular trend of referencing Buddhist ideas about the self or consciousness in philosophy of mind, yet seldom are Asian philosophers invited as equal theoretical interlocutors; their ideas might be repackaged by Western writers with minimal citation to original sources.) Even well-meaning attempts at inclusion can fall short. Garfield notes that some departments hire one token professor to cover "non-Western philosophy" – effectively asking one person to be expert in Chinese, Indian, African, etc., lumping **the rest of the world** as one specialty alongside multiple narrowly-defined European specialties [25] [26] . This tokenism implies that non-European philosophies are a homogeneous "Other" or a sideshow to the main act of Western thought, which remains the unmarked center. Not only is this intellectually indefensible, it perpetuates a kind of epistemic injustice. The **voices and texts of entire civilizations** are relegated to footnotes, if not entirely ignored, in mainstream philosophical discourse.

Beyond academia, the effects of this parochialism are palpable. **Popular philosophy books, podcasts, and blogs** overwhelmingly reference Western thinkers and ideas, often reinforcing the notion that "philosophy" is exclusively a Western pursuit. A casual perusal of best-selling philosophy titles or popular podcasts shows Aristotle, Descartes, Nietzsche, and the like front and center – seldom will you find Confucius, Nagarjuna, or Avicenna discussed with the same familiarity. This Western-focused narrative not only **deprives the public**

of alternative perspectives, it can lead to subtle appropriation. For example, modern self-help or spirituality media might draw on Zen or Stoicism, but whereas Stoicism's Greco-Roman roots are openly celebrated, the equally profound Asian traditions are sometimes presented in watered-down, decontextualized form (think of "Zen" marketed simply as a hack for mindfulness, stripped of its philosophical and cultural richness). When Western presenters do acknowledge non-Western sources, it can be superficial. The result is a kind of **cultural erasure**: Western audiences remain largely unaware that robust philosophical systems exist (and have long existed) outside the Euro-American axis, and non-Western philosophies are **denied equal footing** in the global conversation.

However, there are signs of change. A "growing movement" of scholars and students is challenging this Eurocentric monopoly and calling for a truly **global philosophy** [27]. They argue that opening philosophy to the world's many traditions is not just about diversity for its own sake, but necessary to *"break free from [Western philosophy's] own intellectual stagnation."* [28] In other words, by **excluding global perspectives, Western philosophy has been limiting its imagination** and circling around the same set of problems. New ideas and methods from elsewhere could reinvigorate the field. Indeed, engaging with non-Western philosophies often illuminates hidden assumptions in Western thought and offers fresh insights. For example, Indian Buddhist philosophers long ago developed sophisticated critiques of the idea of a permanent self, which can enrich contemporary debates in metaphysics and cognitive science. Chinese Confucian and Daoist thinkers provide alternate models of ethics and society that challenge Western individualism and dualism. African philosophical concepts of community, personhood, and art broaden our understanding of these topics beyond Greek-derived categories. When these are left out or **treated as curiosities**, philosophy impoverishes itself. As Jonardon Ganeri put it, modern philosophy has a *"dark secret"* – *"a lingering fear of perspectives beyond the Western canon,"* leading departments to quietly **sweep non-Western traditions aside** or shunt them into other departments [29] [30]. A true philosopher, however, should be a "lover of wisdom" wherever it may be found. That implies **tearing down the artificial walls** between East and West, North and South, and recognizing philosophical thought as a **human** endeavor, not the private franchise of one culture.

Encouragingly, institutions and organizations are beginning to respond. The American Philosophical Association has issued statements supporting the inclusion of **non-Western philosophies** in curricula and urging departments to value diversity in philosophical scholarship. Conferences and journals on "comparative philosophy" or "global philosophy" are more visible now than a few decades ago. Yet progress is slow and sometimes met with resistance (ranging from intellectual inertia to outright prejudice). **Jay L. Garfield** emphasizes that philosophy's Eurocentric habit is *"embarrassing"* and that other humanities (like literature, art history, etc.) have long since broadened their scopes [24]. He outlines moral and intellectual reasons to **"go much further"** in truly globalizing philosophy – from enriching our conceptual resources to fulfilling a **"moral demand to treat others with respect and to repair the damage caused by colonialism."** [31]. These are strong words, highlighting that at stake is not only academic inclusivity but **historical justice**. Western philosophy built its canon often by ignoring or belittling others; correcting that is part of dismantling a colonial legacy in knowledge production.

For the public, a more inclusive philosophy means a richer palette of ideas and solutions to draw from. Popular media could move beyond rehashing "Plato vs. Aristotle" debates or European enlightenment ideals, and instead introduce audiences to, say, **Daoist views on nature**, **Buddhist logic**, or **African communal ethics** – thereby **broadening people's intellectual horizons**. It could also temper the appropriation issue: with proper credit and context, concepts like *yin-yang*, *nirvana*, or *Ubuntu* can be discussed in mainstream philosophy venues without exoticizing them or stripping their origin. In short, the

cultural myopia of Western academic philosophy has been a long-standing problem that we are only beginning to earnestly confront. Addressing it will require humility and effort – including curriculum reform, hiring experts in diverse traditions, and cultivating genuine dialogue among philosophies. The reward, however, would be a truly cosmopolitan philosophy that honors the world's full heritage of thought and is better equipped to tackle global questions (which often cannot be answered from a single cultural standpoint). As one commentator succinctly noted, *"ideas don't carry passports."* Wisdom arising in any culture belongs, ultimately, to all of humanity – and philosophy, if it is to live up to its name, must welcome that wisdom rather than wall itself off.

Conclusion

These three problems – misaligned **academic incentives**, **cognitive pitfalls** of the philosopher mindset, and **cultural exclusivity** – are distinct but interrelated facets of the crisis facing modern philosophy. Together, they form a *trifecta* reinforcing each other in a vicious circle. Perverse incentives keep philosophers inward-looking and risk-averse; this insularity in turn exacerbates the Eurocentric erasure of other voices and may encourage obscure, self-referential habits of thought; the glamour of the philosopher identity can then mask the lack of progress or breadth, creating an illusion of depth where there is stagnation. Breaking this cycle will not be easy, but recognizing it is a first step. **Philosophy, at its best, is a critical and self-corrective discipline** – one that Socrates said "examines itself and others." In that spirit, the field must examine these structural and cultural failings with honesty.

Reforms might include revamping incentive structures to reward quality and public engagement (so philosophers are encouraged to write *fewer* but more significant works, and to communicate with the public) [9]. It might involve training students to balance abstract theorizing with empirical awareness, to avoid "mistaking failures of imagination for necessity" [12] and to remain connected with other fields. And it certainly involves continuing the push to **decolonize and globalize philosophy**, creating a curriculum that reflects the **whole history of human thought**, not just one corner of it [22] [24]. None of these changes will happen overnight, but the conversations are underway – in faculty meetings, professional blogs, and even on podcasts where philosophically-minded people themselves critique the state of philosophy.

Ultimately, addressing "The Trifecta of Philosophy's Problems" is crucial not only for academia but for society. A healthier philosophical discipline – one that incentivizes genuine insight, that keeps thinkers grounded and open-minded, and that draws wisdom from all cultures – can provide much-needed guidance in a complex world. Conversely, if philosophy remains mired in petty incentive games, naval-gazing isolation, and cultural narrowness, it risks irrelevance or worse, becoming an intellectual echo chamber with diminishing authority. The hope is that philosophers will live up to their calling: **lovers of wisdom**, brave enough to question even their own professional and cognitive habits. By doing so, philosophy can renew itself and better serve the broader public discourse – from the university lecture hall to the YouTube channel, from scholarly journals to the coffeehouse conversation. In an era facing global ethical dilemmas, technological upheavals, and cultural intersections, we need a philosophy that is rigorous, imaginative, and inclusive. Confronting these three problems head-on is a decisive step toward that brighter future for philosophy.

Sources:

- Symons, John (via *Daily Nous*). *"How Risk-Averse is Academic Philosophy?"* – discusses how early-career incentives in philosophy foster caution and narrow specialization [3] [5].

- Haack, Susan. *"Universities' Research Imperative: Paying the Price for Perverse Incentives."* – argues that the mandate for constant productivity creates perverse incentives with costly consequences [1].
- Randall, David. *"Publish-or-Perish Must Perish," City Journal* (Jan 30, 2024) – notes that tying academic careers to publication quantity produces a flood of unoriginal work, and calls for changing incentives to reduce trivial scholarship [2].
- Roy, Siddhartha & Edwards, Marc. *"Science is broken…," Aeon (2023)* – an essay noting that **perverse incentives and metrics misuse** have undermined research integrity in science [6], a cautionary parallel to issues in philosophy.
- Dennett, Daniel (as quoted in *Consciousness Explained*) – defines **"Philosopher's Syndrome"** as *"mistaking a failure of the imagination for an insight into necessity"* [12], highlighting a cognitive pitfall in philosophical reasoning.
- Sosa, Ernest – criticizes the assumption that reflection alone suffices for intellectual virtue [13].
- Clive James – remarks on *"lesser philosophers"* who build grand theories *"out of no knowledge at all"* and pursue profundity without scientific basis [14], illustrating the risk of unfounded philosophical speculation.
- Jurg, Daniël et al. *"Inside the Cult of Stefan Molyneux," GNET (2023)* – documents how a **"self-described philosopher"** (Molyneux) used the philosopher persona to spread extremist ideas; describes him being labeled a *"cult leader"* exploiting that intellectual guise [15].
- Big Think (Tubali, Shai). *"Is philosophy too Western for its own good?"* (Feb 28, 2025) – outlines the Eurocentric monopoly in philosophy: *"Western philosophy has long dismissed non-European traditions,"* creating a *"Eurocentric intellectual monopoly"* in curricula [32]. Notes that embracing global perspectives is needed to escape intellectual stagnation [28].
- Big Think (same) – cites historical dismissals: Kant's claim that no philosophy exists in the East, Heidegger's "philosophy is Greek" stance, and Derrida's 2001 statement that China has no philosophy [33].
- Ganeri, Jonardon (via Big Think) – observes that modern philosophy harbors a *"dark secret"* of fearing non-Western perspectives, resulting in quietly sidelining them [29] [30].
- Van Norden, Bryan W. & Garfield, Jay L. – in **NYT's The Stone (2016)**, argue that if academic philosophy doesn't diversify, it should be truthfully labeled as just Western philosophy; note the *"almost monolithically white"* curriculum and its roots in xenophobia [34].
- Garfield, Jay L. – *"Why is it Important for Philosophy to Globalise?" (Oxford Public Philosophy, 2022)* – points out that philosophy's continued Eurocentrism is *"embarrassing,"* essentially making it a branch of "White Studies." Highlights tokenistic inclusion and calls for deeper integration of non-Western thought [35] [26]. Emphasizes moral and intellectual reasons to globalize the discipline [31].
- Van Norden, Bryan W. – *Taking Back Philosophy* (2017, referenced in Big Think) – recounts personal experience of being steered away from non-Western content in his dissertation, exemplifying how academia marginalizes those traditions [36] [37].
- **APA Blog & Daily Nous reports** – (not directly quoted above) support the trend that philosophy institutions are slowly acknowledging the need for diversity and public engagement, e.g., APA's statement valuing public philosophy and including non-European philosophies. These reinforce the points made by Garfield and Van Norden about the ongoing efforts to reform the field.

---

1 Universities' Research Imperative: Paying the Price for Perverse Incentives by Susan Haack :: SSRN
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4296639

2 9 10 Publish-or-Perish Must Perish
https://www.city-journal.org/article/publish-or-perish-must-perish

3 4 5 11 How Risk-Averse is Academic Philosophy? - Daily Nous
https://dailynous.com/2023/01/27/how-risk-averse-is-academic-philosophy/

6 7 8 Science is a public good in peril – here's how to fix it | Aeon Essays
https://aeon.co/essays/science-is-a-public-good-in-peril-heres-how-to-fix-it

12 13 14 17 Quotations
https://www.gleech.org/quotations/

15 Inside the Cult of Stefan Molyneux: A Historical Exploration of Far-Right Radicalisation on YouTube – GNET
https://gnet-research.org/2023/05/17/inside-the-cult-of-stefan-molyneux-a-historical-exploration-of-far-right-radicalisation-on-youtube/

16 What's the general opinion of Stefan Molyneux among philosophical ...
https://www.reddit.com/r/askphilosophy/comments/29krtf/whats_the_general_opinion_of_stefan_molyneux/

18 19 20 21 22 23 27 28 29 30 32 33 34 36 37 Is philosophy too Western for its own good? - Big Think
https://bigthink.com/thinking/is-philosophy-too-western-for-its-own-good/

24 25 26 31 35 Why is it important for philosophy to globalise? — oxford public philosophy
https://www.oxfordpublicphilosophy.com/one/globalise-philosophy