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