

EDITORS' NOTES

The Dominican motto—*Contemplare et contemplata aliis tradere* ("To contemplate and to share the fruits of contemplation with others")—was popularized by St. Thomas Aquinas. While formulated in a theological context, this principle offers an incredibly rich framework for modern academic research and publication. Contemplation is not just passive daydreaming; it is an active, rigorous, and disciplined focus on truth. In the realm of philosophy and science, this maps directly onto the research phase. True research requires blocks of uninterrupted time to read, experiment, analyze, and think. This mirrors the contemplative retreat from noise to find clarity. In research, contemplation means setting aside biases to uncover what the data or historical evidence actually reveal, rather than what we want them to reveal. St. Thomas' greatest work, the *Summa Theologiae*, was essentially a massive literature review and synthesis of classical philosophy and medieval thought. Modern research similarly requires "contemplating" what has come before to build something new.

Contemplation without sharing is an incomplete act. Research without publication is an incomplete endeavor. Truth is meant to be diffuse. This provides a deep moral and functional purpose for academic publishing. Academic research should not sit in a hidden notebook or a locked hard drive. Publication is the act of *aliis tradere*—handing over those hard-earned insights and discovered truths to the global community. Academic publications rely on peer review to ensure that the "fruits" being shared are healthy, verified, and beneficial to the field. This motto aligns perfectly with the modern push for open-access publishing. If the goal is to share the fruits of contemplation, to share newfound truths, and advance the frontier of human knowledge, then the locking of knowledge behind exorbitant paywalls defeats the purpose. Sharing of knowledge should be generous and accessible. When researchers view their work through this lens, it changes *why* they publish.

In modern academia, pressure to publish can lead to "publish or perish" syndrome—where scholars rush incomplete or low-quality work into print just to boost their resume. The motto *Contemplare et contemplata aliis tradere* counters this by demanding that what is shared must be a genuine *fruit* of contemplation. It demands quality over quantity, and accuracy over speed. It demands genuine scholarly engagements rather than just clicks and mindless citations. It is based on truth, not on an algorithm. Ultimately, research is the quiet gathering of truth, and publication is the generous act of feeding the world with it.

It is in this spirit of contemplating the truth in research and generously sharing the fruits of research through publication that we present this issue of *Philosophia*, consisting of ten insightful articles on various topics and an interesting book review.

The featured article is on artificial intelligence and Catholic education. In the article, "AI Integration in Catholic Higher Education: Philosophical Reflections in the Light of John Paul II's *Memory and Identity*," Edward J. Alam reflects on the history of the development of Artificial Intelligence, tracing its roots from Aristotle and

through the philosophies of the modern thinkers until the famous workshop at Dartmouth College in 1956, when the term “artificial intelligence” was first coined. Alam seeks to reposition this intellectual achievement within the long and venerable tradition of philosophical reflection on the intellectual and moral virtues, in light of John Paul II’s book, *Memory and Identity*. His paper argues that deeper metaphysical and theological resources must be rediscovered and applied to Catholic pedagogical movements to highlight the dignity and particularity of the human person. AI need not be a dehumanizing technology. But he warns against its tendency to depersonalize human persons by deceptively blurring the distinction between reality and virtual reality. Alam stresses that, to counter this, Catholic pedagogy must be animated by the fire and power of the Holy Spirit, inspiring young people to reflect on the philosophical and moral questions of AI in a spiritual, and even mystical way.

The next article is on politics and society. In the article, “Revolution and Reform: On Change, Collective Agency, and Becoming Differently,” Sebastián Alejandro González Montero, Catalina López-Gómez, and Ana Mercedes focus on debates over revolution and reform that often swing between romantic idealizations of human willpower and technocratic management of social behavior. They offer an alternative path by inquiring into the underlying images of thought that assume humans can unilaterally command reality through individual actions and institutions. By focusing on a relational ontology, they explore how capable beings navigate a world stubbornly independent of human intent. Drawing on the turbulent historical and political landscape of Latin America, they argue that reality is not a static container but a dynamic process of motion and becoming. Hence, within this context, change is redefined as an emergent property of social structuring processes and complex assemblages rather than a direct product of political leadership.

From political philosophy, we cross over to modal logic. Jeremiah Joven Joaquin, in the article “A Cenizan Account of Modal Truths,” focuses on modal truths, necessity, possibility, and possible worlds, among others. He notes that the possible worlds account of modal terms has been the standard approach since Saul Kripke introduced it in 1959. The standard account explains modal truths as truths in possible worlds. Within this general philosophical background, the Filipino philosopher Claro R. Ceniza (1985) proposed his “new definitions for possibility, impossibility, necessity, and contingency,” contra the standard possible worlds account. In his article, Joaquin develops an account of some familiar modal truths, inspired by the ideas presented in Ceniza’s paper, “The real meaning of modal terms.” Joaquin argues that, compared to the standard account, the proposed account is not based on the metaphysically problematic notion of possible worlds but on arguably more neutral notions of self-compossibility and ontological necessity, and delivers the same modal truths as the standard account without resorting to possible worlds. While serious concerns may be raised about the proposed non-standard (non-possible-worlds) account, he believes that the Cenizan account provides a satisfactory explanation of the target modal truths.

The next article is on sustainability and educational technology. In the article, “Sustainability as an Ethical Voice of Educational Technology,” Fleurdeliz R. Altez-Albela discusses the human voice in the use of technology in learning. She seeks to identify what persists in our most radical use of tools by expounding on the

significance of sustainability, particularly in education technology. She argues that sustainability may provide an ethical framework for the extensive use of technology in learning by setting logistical, economic, and social parameters for continuous learning and action while keeping the people (i.e., consumers and learners) of the future in mind. Drawing on Heidegger's *Gestell* (*enframing*) to critique the tendencies of objects both present and ready at hand to encroach on the human consumer, and Levinas' metaphor of the *tamarisk* that may be interpreted as a call to protect the natural processes that carry every moment towards a future, she stresses that humanity cannot use technology only for personal gains, and more that we cannot be encroached by the tools that we created. She concludes that the challenge to sustainability in educational technology is not only about making EdTech greener, fairer, and more effective, but to guarantee that learning is truly geared to human formation and flourishing, and that education is open to its profound possibilities.

The next article is on artificial intelligence, artificial communication, and intentionality. In the article "Thinking without a Subject: The Cartesian–Turing Lineage and the Ontology of Artificial Intelligence," Roland Theuas DS. Pada and Anton Heinrich L. Rennesland analyze the ontologies of artificial intelligence and the mind to determine what distinguishes humans from AI. They argue that there is an ontological misunderstanding concerning artificial intelligence and posit communication as a mark of human identity. Such a misunderstanding is grounded in a problematic claim based on a two-fold understanding of 'intelligence,' the first from the problematic accretion of Turing's conception of AI as an observation of behavior, and the second from the operational understanding of 'intelligence,' which they trace to the Cartesian dichotomy of body and cogito, as articulated in Gilbert Ryle's *The Concept of Mind*. The Cartesian error is similar to Turing's claim that deception is the ground for the perception of thinking. Searle debunks the idea of the semblance of thinking through the *Chinese Room*, demonstrating that machines excel at formal operational procedures without needing to understand the process. Pada and Rennesland claim that the potential root of this misunderstanding is the lack of intentionality in the apparent 'conversations' with AI. Following Esposito, they argue that, instead of intelligence, what is exhibited in AI is artificial communication. Humans have intentionality, which is circumstantially motivated to react to stimuli. While AI systems are complex like humans, the difference lies in the fact that human intentionality is aware of its own consciousness, whereas AI systems are not.

The next article relates artificial intelligence to dating applications. In the article, "Algorithmic Relationships: Artificial Intelligence, Consent, and Manipulation in Dating Apps," Gerlie T. Caspe-Ogatis, Agnes M. Sunga-Oblefias, and Bernardo N. Caslib, Jr. address how technology-fueled connections have been reshaping human intimacy, especially through the platform of dating applications. They note that while these online applications and artificial intelligence-powered digital spaces offer convenience and easy access to prospective romantic partners through the introduction of new social connections, they also pose ethical challenges. In traditional Filipino ethics and culture, which have always depended on genuine relationality, dating apps powered by artificial intelligence have come under scrutiny. They argued that while new technological tools have opened up possibilities that promise convenience, ease,

and other utilitarian benefits, genuine human relationships and connections, especially in the context of the Philippines, can truly flourish only in the presence of actual, face-to-face connections and interactions.

In the article “The Problem of Facebook as an Extension of the Public Sphere: The Hyperreal Perspective,” Beaujorne Sirad A. Ramirez focuses on cyberspace, hyperreality, and the public sphere. Explores the possibility that social media, like Facebook, can serve as an extension of the public sphere, he argues that cyberspace cannot be an extension of the public sphere. He proves this by drawing on Baudrillard’s notions of hyperreality and simulation to show that Facebook cannot be an extension of the public sphere. There is a simulation that occurs on Facebook through absences and disconnections, and the impact on mental health and well-being. The sign circulation affecting political engagement on Facebook can be categorized into image curation and a problematic sense of reality. While political engagement happens online, it can take the form of questionable notions of solidarity. Lastly, there is distrust that arises regarding public trust in archiving on Facebook. He concludes that the hyperreality occurring on Facebook results in incarceration and pseudo-omniscience of the people. Facebook exacerbates the failures of the public sphere by simulating participation while intensifying fragmentation, surveillance, and self-alienation.

From artificial intelligence, we shift to Filipino philosophies. The article, “*Sukisok* Framework: Expanding Philippine Philosophies in the *Amianan* (North)” by Tanya Sue D. Barayuga and Danilo S. Alterado, focuses on indigenous philosophy, particularly the Ilokano framework. The authors examine the *sukisok* framework (*sukisok* is an Ilokano term for careful investigation), how it was developed and applied to advance Philippine philosophy in the *Amianan* (Northern Philippines) context. The *sukisok* framework builds on the earlier *Maiyannatup a Panagripirip* approach, expanding it with new philosophical components. The framework brings together six interrelated elements: *saririt* (ontology), *putar* and *partuat* (epistemology), *taripato* (axiology), *empresario* (aesthetics), and *takneng* (politics). Drawing on qualitative documentary and thematic analysis, together with palpaliw (textual hermeneutic observation), the study applies these components to the literary works of contemporary Ilokano writers Aurelio Solver Agcaoili and Alegria Tan-Visaya, and also engages with philosophical theories such as Mignolo’s decoloniality and Alatas’s alternative discourse. Barayuga and Alterado argue that this framework broadens Ilokano philosophy by introducing new Ilokano terms that earlier work had overlooked, leading to a fuller understanding of Ilokano thought and a deeper sense of cultural self-understanding. It is a culturally grounded, adaptable methodological tool that can be used interchangeably to examine regional Philippine philosophies and is recommended for broader indigenous studies as it interweaves the philosophical approaches of ontology and epistemology into a unified framework.

In the article, “What is a Post-Secular Church,” Joseph P. Paña focuses on post-secular society, the post-secular church, and the public sphere. He notes that the term “post-secular church” lacks a clear point of origin, yet its emergence resonates deeply with Jürgen Habermas’s concept of the “post-secular society.” Hence, he explores how Habermas’s framework provides a lens for understanding the meaning, formation, and implications of this idea. In a secular world, the persistence and even resurgence of

religious thought in public social life challenge long-standing assumptions about the fate of faith in modernity. So, what does it mean for a church to exist in a post-secular world? To answer this question, Paña argues that the post-secular church is not simply a retreat from modernity but a dynamic reconfiguration of religious identity in the public sphere. While it occupies a liminal space, neither fully absorbed into secular rationality nor retreating into pre-modern enclaves, it reflects an evolving dialogue between belief and doubt, tradition and progress, sacred and secular. Such a concept can be understood as a form of religious life that remains faithful to tradition while becoming reflexive in relation to modernity.

Rabiah Medjekdoud and Brahim Kerrache, in the article “Nietzsche’s Critical Approach to Modern Philosophical Rationality,” discuss Nietzsche, ethics, metaphysics, and rationality. They note that the emergence of modernity, with its emphasis on rationality as a dominant worldview, was fundamentally rooted in practical application. This emphasis on rationality led to its elevation as the primary epistemological and organizational framework underpinning human societies across diverse domains, including politics, ethics, and cosmology. By adopting rationality as its core, modern philosophical discourse systematically marginalizes or excludes manifestations of the irrational. Nietzsche criticizes this modern rationality. However, the authors claim that the Nietzschean project of critiquing modernity cannot be complete without returning to the critique of modern philosophical rationality. Nietzsche contends that a genealogical critique of modern philosophical rationality must go beyond surface analysis to uncover its origins, expose its illusions, and strip away its disguises. This rationality is deeply flawed, clinging to an instinct of weakness—incapable of creating new meaning or values—and remaining entangled with religious beliefs, metaphysical constructs, and entrenched dogmas. For Nietzsche, modern rationality is not a sign of progress, but a reactive force rooted in a decayed moral and ontological foundation. They conclude that characterizing Nietzsche as entirely anti-rational misrepresents his critique and overlooks its nuance. Nietzsche’s challenge is not a rejection of reason per se, but a denunciation of how reason has been misapplied, employed beyond its legitimate scope, and used without regard for its limits or internal conditions. His critique is meant to re-legislate and reorient philosophy, breathing new life into it by uncovering the generative and transformative values essential to the future.

In the book review of Fannie Bialek’s *Love in Time: An Ethical Inquiry*, Noelle Leslie Dela Cruz describes it as philosophically ambitious and, in many respects, a remarkably successful work. She notes that one of its most notable achievements lies in its ability to bring into conversation a wide range of traditions—ancient Greek accounts of eros, Christian reflections on agape, and contemporary analytic discussions of love and reasons—while maintaining a coherent and compelling central thesis. Bialek does so in prose that is both readable and conceptually precise, given the conceptual diffuseness and overuse of the term “love,” which often lends itself to idealization and cliché. For Dela Cruz, what ultimately emerges from Bialek’s analysis is a conception of love that resists both idealization and reduction. Love is not a stable achievement grounded in value, nor is it a purely volitional commitment insulated from contingency. It is an ongoing engagement with another whose future and whose

significance for us cannot be fully known in advance. Hence, for Dela Cruz, it reorients the discussion of love; thus, *Love in Time* is best understood not as a definitive account of love, but as a compelling invitation to rethink its ethical and temporal dimensions.

We hope that these papers will provide insights that broaden our readers' horizons or help them in their search for truth and knowledge, which they can also share through their teaching, research, and publications.

Jove Jim S. Aguas
Editor-in-Chief