

EDITOR'S NOTE

In this 11th volume, our contributors focus on issues that have affected or influenced Filipinos in their cultural milieu. The writings articulate what might be regarded as attempts at bringing to the level of philosophical discussion the nagging issues of the time.

Aptly, we can begin examining Pavo's epistemology as he proposes a conceptual model for understanding certain divergent notions of 'Filipino Philosophy'. Pavo acknowledges varied ideas of *Filipino* thinkers on the term due to their different emphases, and he points out keenly that among these ideas are several concerns that can further develop philosophizing in the Philippines. Such areas of interests as mediating local and foreign ideas, reconciling "indigenous/local practices and concepts" and "academic/textual discourse", and developing a "respected, recognized, and relevant philosophic stance"--all these require delicate balancing as they 'overlap'. Taking the cue from but in no way uncritical of R.G. Collingwood, a British philosopher and historian, Pavo proposes a way of addressing these concerns through the vantage of a Social-Scientist-Philosopher.

Sario's piece addresses an issue that is very indispensable if Filipinos were to keep abreast with the *Zeitgeist*: education. An educational administrator himself, Sario regards a model of development education as wanting, and true to his position, he offers 'educational praxis model,' an alternative and progressive model of development education as it is grounded on political liberalism. In this way, the educational praxis model, he claims, "promotes cooperative political virtues, advocates social cooperation and shared responsibility, values reflective equilibrium, facilitates public reason, enriches public political culture, challenges particularistic cultural traditions, and upholds objective political dialogue."

Animal right remains an unsettled issue for Filipinos from the viewpoint of Maboloc since there are serious advocates of animal rights. Claims of animal rights, however, may run counter to some Filipino practices or pose a conflict to the Filipino way of life. In this circumstance, animal right has no primacy over human right. While it is admirable to promote the welfare of nonhuman animals, our moral duty towards our fellow human beings is, Maboloc argues, still the most pressing concern. In his words, "[t]he greater task of each one of us is to see to it that people, rich and poor, both enjoy the good life... nonhuman animals can come next in terms of moral concern."

As a national hero, Rizal is not unknown to many Filipinos. His death from the hands of Spanish colonists is one of the facets of his life that earned him the admiration of the Filipinos. In his work, *De Catalina* examines whether Rizal's preferential death arose out of volition or compulsion. Using

Rudolf Steiner's concept of moral imagination—one might raise an eyebrow considering that Steiner is of Austrian descent—De Catalina argues that Rizal freely accepted his death as he possesses “moral imagination”. In this regard, “Rizal's death is a noble self-giving sacrifice.”

Our next two contributions tackle a more universal theme, which is still germane to the Filipino concern. In his piece, Mangibin traces conceptual development of the human person. Finding certain theoretical distortion in the view of the human person from ancient philosophy to the present, Mangibin finds the integral humanism of Jacques Maritain as restorative of the true image of the human being that was distorted by various conceptions of the past. On related subject, Macaraan values the human person in the face of the market-oriented society. Although the society appears to have a materialist and consumerist bent, he is optimistic that the human person can still cultivate his ideal values since such society is not “inimical and hostile to the values of the ideal person.”

The next article elaborates on the grounds of the theories of global justice. In her own way, Sayson explains the “informational base” of different social philosophies of such figures as Rawls, Nozick, Sen, Nussbaum and others. Of course, she promises to offer answers based on the insights of her critical exposition.

Finally, the last two articles examine the human being's digital milieu. For his piece, Guevarra studies what might be regarded as the Facebook, and with a critical lens, he is not totally pessimistic about the phenomenon. To him, Facebook as a SNS is a novel way of self-presentation and need not diminish the importance of physical encounter. Facebook as a social construction is an avenue for many to “accumulate social capital”. And without doubt, engaging in Facebook is, Guevarra holds, a “new way of being-in-the-world.” The last piece projects a positive outlook toward self-presentation in Computer-Mediated-Communications (CMCs) and Computer-Mediated-Relationships (CMRs). Using Charles Taylor's view on identity, the author holds that the self presented in CMCs and CMRs is in no way disconnected to the actual physical self. By claiming that the self is constituted in a ‘moral space’, he holds that the self is also constituted in the cyberspace, which is akin to a moral space because it solicits the same moral responsibility from every member of such digital space.

Whether one agrees or not to the arguments proffered herein, one would be dishonest to oneself if one would not acknowledge that these writings are humble contributions to the PHAVISMINDA in its lonely effort of promoting philosophical scholarship.

Orlando Ali M. Mandane Jr.