

## EDITOR'S NOTES

The past year, 2022, marks another milestone for this thriving journal, as it was included in the collections of journals of the Philosophy Documentation Center, <https://www.pdcnet.org/pijp/Philosophia:-International-Journal-of-Philosophy>. As the global pandemic is ending and we welcome the "new normal," here is another insightful and thought-provoking issue of *Philosophia*. This issue has nine articles, a commentary, and a book review.

In the article *Cicero and Wang Chong and their Critique of Divination*, Mark Kevin S. Cabural presents Cicero and Wang Chong as theorists of divination, focusing on their significant criticisms of divination, which emerged as corrective for the practice of divination by supporting or disapproving and extending or limiting its underlying principles. According to Cabural, although different and may even be opposed, their critical attitudes are complementary and both necessary. However, despite their differences in terms of their philosophical backgrounds and methods, they are similar in terms of being critical, which indicates their aim to rectify the false and inadequate beliefs of their time and to transform the way of thinking of their people.

Xudong Hao, in his article *What do Paraconsistent Logics Reject? A Defense of the Law of Contradiction* analyzes the specific properties of the positive logic plus approach, non-adjunctive approach, and relevant approach of paraconsistent logic and presents three definitions of the law of contradiction. *There are two types of the law of contradiction in C-logics, and the law of contradiction with classical negation is valid in them. Hao argues that the law of contradiction with classical negation is also valid in a non-adjunctive approach and explains why this law cannot be deduced in some relevant logic systems.* According to Hao, the law of contradiction we have held for millennia is still valid in C-logics.

Patrick O. Aleke, in his article *Cognitional and Intentionality Analysis as the Key to Epistemic Foundation*, argues that to establish foundational epistemology, there is a need to prioritize cognitional and intentionality analysis over conceptual analysis. He stresses that instead of focusing on intentional signs or products, attention should be paid to intentional acts – experiencing, understanding, and judging – of the knowing subject. Paying adequate attention to human cognitional structure is vital in defense of epistemic foundation and that the foundation is found in the structure of human knowing rather than in the products of human knowing. Furthermore, it will help to account for both epistemic foundation and epistemic pluralism. Aleke further argues that when cognitional and intentionality analysis is adequately carried out, it could eliminate any controversy regarding the possibility of African perspectives on knowledge because the African epistemic environments and different cultural contexts would account for African perspectives on knowledge.

In the article, *The Problem of Evil from a Decolonial Viewpoint*, Luís Cordeiro-Rodrigues, and Jonathan O. Chimakonam argue against the notion that evil does not exist or that it is a mistaken grasp of reality. They analyze two versions of this

argument: the 'orchestra argument' and the 'mystical argument,' which both contend that those who affirm the existence of evil in the world have a limited view of reality. They argue that these views are either over-abstract from reality or do not offer a plausible approach to the problem of evil. Instead, they advance what they regard as a decolonial perspective on evil, which does not understand it as illusory but instead grounds it on people's experiences. According to them, this perspective has a more substantial explanatory power for evil in the world than the alternative that understands evil as inexistent. It is also more morally attractive because it does not entail bizarre moral theories about why God decided to make some groups suffer more than others.

In the article *Action and Agency in Artificial Intelligence: A Philosophical Critique*, Justin Nnaemeka Onyeukaziri explores the notion of "action" and "agency" in artificial intelligence (AI). By employing a metaphysical notion of action and agency as an epistemological tool, he critiques the notion of "action" and "agency" in artificial intelligence. According to Onyeukaziri, autonomy is necessary for moral and ethical responsibility; therefore, AI cannot be morally and ethically responsible. Furthermore, he suggests that as the research and design of AI advances and are associated with humans, this calls for a socio-political response to the question of moral, ethical, and legal responsibility in AI. AI, per se, is not a free (moral and ethical) agent; thus, it is the duty of the global community to define and enact policies as to who takes responsibility for actions executed by AIs.

Jose Ramon E. de Leon and Napoleon M. Mabaquiao, Jr., in their article, *Facts, Abilities, and Concepts: Knowledge Argument and Physicalism*, discuss the challenge of the knowledge argument against physicalism. The knowledge argument shows that there are facts, the phenomenal facts, whose existence cannot be deduced from the existence of physical facts. According to de Leon and Mabaquiao, the knowledge argument contends that phenomenal facts are non-physical and, consequently, that physicalism is mistaken. There are two powerful physicalist replies to the knowledge argument, namely, the ability hypothesis and the phenomenal concept strategy (PCS). They examined several objections to the ability hypothesis and the PCS and showed that they could be defended well from these objections. However, they also contend that showing their defensibility does not mean establishing the truth of physicalism.

In the article *We, The People, Silent and Powerless: A Critique of Recent Pluralist Conceptualizations of the People*, Anthony Lawrence A. Borja discusses the recent pluralist accounts of the People and popular sovereignty that define it as a performance or a process, thus divorced from the realities of mass disempowerment. He argues that these recent theories exclude the reality of mass disempowerment within contemporary democracies by marginalizing agency, presupposing empowerment, and assuming the resonance of the various representations of the People. Moreover, these theories suffer from an activist-centric bias that renders the politically alienated, disempowered, and inactive as irrelevant entities, a nameless shadow lurking behind analyses of popular power. Thus, he takes on the task of clearing the ground for a more comprehensive theory of the People and Popular Sovereignty by exposing the roots, limits, and costs of this activist-centric bias.

Hazel T. Biana and Jeremiah Joven B. Joaquin, in their article *Questioning Demeterio's Approach to Filipino Philosophy*, raise some fundamental issues with Feorillo Demeterio's approach to Filipino Philosophy. They show that his work's

conclusions rest on questionable methodological assumptions that make the discourses that the work arrived at and the rankings in terms of "developmental potential" superficial and ungrounded. Moreover, instead of fulfilling the main aim of advancing research in Filipino philosophy, the proposed approach may lead to its stagnation and demise. They argue that if these issues are unanswered, Demeterio's whole approach to Filipino philosophy will be rendered unsound and may put into question the employment of such an approach. While they acknowledge that Demeterio's project makes them think about Filipinoness of a discourse and whom to consider as a Filipino philosopher, they also wonder what makes a published philosophical work high quality, and what is considered outstanding in the field of philosophy. They also ask how we should actively engage with these works and come up with fresh ideas, and how can we heighten the cognitive level of our philosophical discourses.

In the article *Religious Freedom in Tertullian Political Thought: Sources and Coordinates for a Contemporary Rethinking*, Eugen Tănăsescu and Daniel Dăneci-Pătrău argue that the roots of religious freedom in the West can be found many centuries before the time of the Reformation, particularly in the writings of Christian apologists like Tertullian, who defended the right to practice the Christian faith in the Roman Empire. They argue that based on the writings of Tertullian, religious freedom is a natural right according to philosophical and political developments over the centuries. Although we do not have a developed argumentation like the argumentation in contemporary thought, this does not invalidate the force of the principle to militate for the defense of religious freedom; religious freedom is an attribute of individuals, not an exclusive attribute of the polis.

In his commentary, *The Critical Role of Philosophy in the Future of the Philippines*, Jove Jim S. Aguas discusses the evolution of philosophy in the Philippines, what the teachers and philosophers have done in and for the academe, and what else they need to do not only for the future of philosophy in the country but for the future of the country as well. He stresses that what is needed is to contribute to shaping the people's critical consciousness as the philosophers contribute to nation-building. The future of philosophy in philosophy in the Philippines cannot be separated from the country's past and future. It cannot be divorced from Filipinos' moral and critical consciousness. In order to be relevant, philosophy must contribute to shaping such consciousness; philosophy must contribute to nation-building.

In his Book Review, Juan Rafael G. Macaranas reviews Fleur Jongepier and Michael Klenk's *The Philosophy of Online Manipulation*, a product of collaboration among different minds applying philosophical concepts on online manipulation, providing different points of view of philosophers and scholars who explain online manipulation.

We hope our readers find the contents of this issue work their time and enthusiasm as much as we worked hard to continue publishing thought-provoking and insightful pieces. We express our gratitude to the contributors, reviewers, and editorial consultants for their invaluable contributions to this issue.

**Jove Jim S. Aguas**  
**Editor**