
Editor's Note

This volume does not have a common theme, but it reflects the varied interests of our members and contributors. Pavo's paper, for one, explores the possibility of viewing objectivity as a guide for one's action. Relying on Galison's interpretation, Pavo contends that objectivity as a regulative ideal represents man's earnest attempt to fully comprehend his world. Thus, objectivity, for him, guides human beings in coming to terms with reality.

In the light of Pavo's paper, one can think of Maboloc's paper since political consensus requires a certain element of "objectivity" based on "reasoned judgment". Maboloc analyzes the political impact of the somatic cell nuclear transfer (SCNT) or cloning in biomedical science especially with regard to the issues of utility and human instrumentation. The best way to have political consensus, he argues, is to begin with such "non-negotiable values" as "the sanctity of human life, human dignity, and moral autonomy".

Tao and Mangibin differ from the issues raised by the two earlier articles but they focus on the same topic, education. On the one hand, Mangibin draws out an educational philosophy from Hartshorne. He sketches a model of a human person from a process perspective and develops a view on education that emphasizes such process concepts as social/relativity, creativity, contributionism, and aesthetic value. Mangibin esteems the crucial role of an educator, who must recognize the various elements of process education. On the other hand, Tao compares the two social critics: Freire and Foucault. He begins with their biographical influences as a point for analyzing their critique of the modern society. Tao highlights Freire's and Foucault's critiques of the society laden with various techniques of domination, which perpetuates an oppressive society. In the end, both philosophers share, Tao argues, the same vision of a society peopled by "enlightened individuals".

While Tao's paper deals with domination on the level of education, Oca'y's paper counters domination from the view of a Critical Theorist, Herbert Marcuse. He heavily favors Marcuse over the three "great theorists in their own right." The shortcomings of the theories of Habermas, Foucault, and Honneth, Oca'y reckons, are addressed appropriately by Marcuse's critical view, which cultivates the "spirit of Great Refusal".

Another article centers on social and political philosophy. Urbano's paper argues for Pogge's institutional approach to human rights. In Pogge's view, human rights are "moral claims on social institutions," and thus, members of social institutions share the responsibility of allowing "secure access" to their basic rights. This institutional approach, Urbano is convinced, will be able to address the poor's access to vital rights or needs.

The next contribution comes from our sagacious colleague who witnessed the birth of the Philosophical Association of the Visayas and Mindanao (PHAVISMINDA). As a founding member, Velez vividly documents the “moved mover” behind the PHAVISMINDA. In her account, Fr. Quintin Terrenal, SVD, PhD, STD, personifies what Pythagoras means by “*philosophia*”. He shows this deep love for wisdom through his writings and shares this affection to students and others through myriad ways, one of which is the founding of the PHAVISMINDA.

Our last contribution is Abulad’s review of Mercado’s book *Explorations in Filipino Philosophy*. His incisive analysis may make one revisit the literature on and rethink one’s notion of Filipino Philosophy.

In all, this volume attests that philosophy is still vibrant, and the association breathes the same brio radiated by its founder. In this regard, I invite members to continue cultivate philosophy and contribute to the body of literature in it.

I would like to thank Celeste Villaluz-Sanchez for the help in producing this volume and, of course, Ryan C. Urbano, who would formally commence—though he already had non-formally—his philosophic career.

Orlando Ali M. Mandane Jr.