

EDITOR'S NOTES

This issue is unique for it combines volume 16 & 17 of *PHAVISMINDA Journal*. While it contains only 7 articles as contributions, it is rather thick and, expectedly, more expensive for the printed issue. For this reason, some essays are not included, while others need further revisions.

Undeniably, the management of the journal has been affected by the Philippine educational reforms on two fronts. First, there is a mounting pressure to increase the research output through publications in commercially-indexed and CHED-accredited but scholarly-academic journals. Second, there is an apparent lackadaisical effort or sluggishness in lightening the teaching and research loads of the academicians. As a result, many articles are submitted to hasten their publications and indexed-accredited journals are often the most sought-after, regardless (or regardful) of quality. This journal has endured such state of affairs as it was, then, unmoved by the urge to have the professional organization's publication accredited by another body whose authority only happens to be within the ambit of most of our member's professional practice. In this regard, the direction is to follow the educational zephyr, to put it mildly (or calmly), not so much as to insure publication quality (we take pride in what we do) but so as to assuage our members and authors just in case their educational technocrats would be looking for a credible statistical data that would increase research output.

As regards the quality of the output, our professional philosopher-readers can make an informed view as they examine the authors' arguments. In this issue, thus, philosophy and education are the prominent themes that the authors argue about. Santiago Sia, for one, examines the clamour for educational reform by founding the meaning of education. Simply put, education, for Sia, is not unlike a philosophical quest for wisdom that is engaged not in abstruse musings—philosophers are erroneously depicted this way—but in creatively and truthfully looking for ways to face life. For his part, Rhoderick John S. Abellanos really undertakes such “educative” quest. His question—“Will Filipinos ever Become Philosophers?”—is a rhetorical guide in examining the opposing views on whether or not there is “Filipino Philosophy”. While he does not address the issue head on in his lengthy and comprehensive essay, he *perhaps* unwittingly characterizes “Filipino Philosophy,”—he must be referring to activity of the thinkers who have been engaging in the Filipino Philosophy-question—as an effort to make sense of the Filipino life predicament.

Somewhat related to this “effort” of facing life’s predicament is the next essay. Raymun J. Festin, SVD, engages his Filipino Philosopher-*confrere* Br. Romualdo E. Abulad, SVD, on the most compelling Filipino predicament lately: extra-judicial killing (EJK). Unlike Abulad, Festin argues that justifying the morality of EJKs using the thought of Kant and Jesus’ teaching is never tenable in all possible worlds. Of course, one can examine closer Abulad’s argument in *King’s Clarion*, whose references Festin dutifully provided.

On the education theme, Sia’s second essay analyses the “business model,” which recognizes the market or the “labour arena” as a de facto context of any educational endeavour. Although he does not totally deny the importance of considering the market in the educational process, Sia emphasizes the primary role of education in the development of the human person. In addition, Noe M. Santillan’s paper focuses on the educational milieu; this time, he addresses the knowledge-gap among the teachers who, in the midst of educational reforms in the Philippines, are forced to teach Marxism despite in-depth understanding of the subject matter. Tacit in his claim is the neoliberal influence that has crept into the educational system.

Focusing on a different theme, Benedicto P. Tao takes a “second look”, so to speak, at Peter Singer’s claim of an ethical imperative that would affect the well-to-do peoples. For Tao, Singer’s proposal need not be dismissed immediately as it is viable when given a detailed account. Here, Tao uses Paul Taylor’s notion of hierarchy of interests to support such claim.

Finally, Jan Gresil S. Kahambing and Feorillo Petronilo A. Demeterio’s submission is included here, despite the nature of the study as being more of an organizational analysis, because it concerns the PHAVISMINDA as an organization of philosophers (liberally construed) from the Visayas and Mindanao. Their interviews with the leading officers of the organization allow a glimpse of the organization.

Of course, let not these short vignettes dissuade the readers from examining the articles herein. They (vignettes) are, after all, merely *aperitifs*. Read on. Lastly, I invite everyone to send their articles for publications to this journal.

Orlando Ali M. Mandane Jr.