

VERY INTERESTING, BUT HOW IS THAT PHILOSOPHY?

P1: X-phi is all about empirically testing philosophical judgments (like Gettier judgments, Frankfurt judgments etc.), which can only reveal **who makes which judgments and what influences them**, but never **whether and why the judgments are true**.
 P2: Philosophy is all about finding out whether and why philosophical judgments are true.
 C: X-phi is not philosophy.

ARGUMENT
BEHIND
THE
QUESTION

Reject P1

DILEMMA 1

Reject P2

P1: Finding out who makes a philosophical judgment cannot reveal whether and why the judgment is true.
 P2: Finding out what influences a philosophical judgment cannot reveal whether and why the judgment is true.
 P3: X-phi doesn't do anything else.
 C: X-phi can't show whether and why philosophical judgments are true.

PROBLEMS:

Why are opinion polls that target philosophical opinions not considered examples of philosophical practice? And more generally, how is it possible to do philosophy without trying to answer philosophical questions?

Reject P1

DILEMMA 2

Reject P2

"[we] justify our philosophical beliefs on the basis of their accordance with our philosophical intuitions" (Alexander 2012)

"Philosophical inquiry has never been a popularity contest, and experimental philosophy is not about to turn it into one." (Knobe & Nichols 2008)

PROBLEMS:

"since it is allowed that philosophical questions are typically not psychological questions, the link between the philosophical theory of a non-psychological subject matter and the psychological evidence that it is supposed to explain becomes problematic: the description of the methodology makes the methodology hard to sustain" (Williamson 2007)

"Philosophers don't rely on intuitions when they philosophise so the project of studying intuitions isn't relevant to anything we're doing. (...) [Experimental philosophers] are the exception to the rule: they are the (only) philosophers who rely on intuitions when they philosophise. So the more of those we have in the profession, the more the profession changes into one in which intuitions (of the worse kind) play a role." (Cappelen 2017)

PROBLEMS:

Knobe argues that philosophical significance of x-phi lies in examining "underlying processes that drive people's intuitions" and evaluating contents of these intuitions based on whether the processes are reliable (forthcoming). This, however, is **circular reasoning**: assessing the reliability of psychological processes is only possible if one first assumes that what the processes produce is true or false.

CONCLUSION: The Reject P1/ Reject P1 path leads to the conclusion that x-phi is a kind of bad philosophy, based on invalid appeals to group opinion. The Reject P1/Reject P2 path leads to the conclusion that x-phi is another kind of bad philosophy, based on circular reasoning. The Reject 2 path leads to the conclusion that x-phi isn't philosophy at all.