

EDITOR'S NOTE

At last, our 2015 issue has materialized. The wait is so long that perhaps the eagerness has ebbed; thus, the fear that what comes out is nothing new seems valid at this point. The articles, however, may not disappoint such wait—after all, a worthwhile harvest follows a farm carefully tended.

In the first essay, Raymund Pavo deepens his appropriation of Collingwood's notion of overlap—this time he adds “re” to the three “Ts”; thus, re-thinking things through. What is novel in this essay from his earlier one three years ago is that his rumination, he claims, is aided and informed by the social science of Anthropology. His research on the Agusanon Manobo culture exemplifies the practical extension of his theoretical analysis. This essay displays the promise of philosophy.

Christopher Ryan Maboloc's piece focuses on the influence of social media technology on human relationship and society. This essay views virtual relationships with pessimism as the media transform the individual into an entity that depends on technology, although it appears that the medium is value-neutral. In this sense, real life relationships, he claims, remain irreplaceable. Despite such cold treatment towards the social media, Maboloc acknowledges the technology as valuable political tool. Still, the technology has not yet redound to the benefits of those who are the margins of society. For this article, patient tracing of the author's argument is much desired.

Peter-Paul Elicor, in the next contribution, challenges the soundness of Rawls's idea of public reason in the context of Philippine politics. Agreeably, he recognizes that public reason is important when citizens decide on matters concerning fundamental rights and ideals; public reason is, admittedly, important in determining social goals and shaping the lives of the citizens within a state. For Elicor, however, public reason has no foothold in the Philippines despite the country being democratic. Political dynasties, he argues, blanket the political culture that they “cause the reversal” of public reason. But of course, the reader will be able to follow Elicor's argument in the full article.

Regleto Aldrich Imbong's writing confronts the waves that constantly pound our shore: educational reform and neoliberalism. Owing much to Alain Badiou's theorizing, Imbong painstakingly

dissects the ongoing educational reforms and identifies education as a locus of political struggle. In such a situation, he offers possible strategies, one of which is Critical Pedagogy. It is best, at this moment, that the reader would peruse Imbong's analysis.

In the following paper, Amosa L. Velez considers the existential import of "I" as an individual. On the surface, being an "I" conjures an image of aloneness laden with loneliness. Surveying the western and eastern philosophical tradition, she however dispels such an impression—while being an "I", being alone, can be a choice, such state of affair portrays solitude, not loneliness. Here, the reader is encouraged to go through Velez's argument.

Moreover, our last essay Maria Majorie Purino explains the tacit end of all philosophizing: wisdom. She compares three views from different intellectual milieus, and how she connects them pose possible difficulties. Fortunately, she seems to reconcile *tat tvam asi*, *visio intellectualis*, and *aletheia* with relative ease. Perhaps, the reader will be illumined more by reading the author's article.

Coming up with this much delayed issue is far more difficult than previous issues. The new educational structure has crept and brought uncertainty that no educator can just ignore or brush aside. It is as if philosophers have been compelled to "see that [their] papers are in order" so that when that long awaited curtain unveils they retain the right to belong to the academe. Although we, philosophy practitioners, would just dismiss it as unimportant, we have to work out the nitty-gritty of publishing to cater to the institutional demands in the long run; although we can judge, from among us, the quality of our work, we still respond to the assessment of our institutional authorities; and although we want to pass them to neglect, we submit to them, perhaps begrudgingly, so that we will not be estranged to the activity that we are passionate about: doing philosophy. These force us to aim for journal accreditation despite that ours is a publication of a professional group which is not directly attached to a higher educational institution, although almost all of our members are from higher educational institutions.

At times, our form of critical resistance is to “slay it with laughter” or this passage:

‘...I am no doubt not the only one who writes in order to have no face. Do not ask who I am and do not ask me to remain the same: leave it to our bureaucrats and our police to see that our papers are in order. At least spare us their morality when we write.’ⁱ

In any case, we address institutional pressures that confront us; thus, more daunting tasks ahead have to be reckoned with.

With these things in mind, readers and possible contributors will find the revised author guidelines on the last pages of this issue. It is important to note that we would be using the one Turabian Style of documentation, that is, endnote-bibliography format. Also, part of “seeing that our papers are in order” is to ensure that author-contributors follow the guidelines to facilitate double-blind peer review.

Finally, there are gaps in correspondences and publication processes that perhaps have led many contributors frustrated or disappointed. I acknowledge my part in them. Still, I hope that contributors will be encouraged to submit manuscripts aligned to the vision of publishing refereed articles of good quality.

Orlando Ali M. Mandane Jr.

ⁱ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*, trans. A. M. Sheridan (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 17.