

Editorial

## **In this Issue of KRITIKE: An Online Journal of Philosophy**

---

***Roland Theuas DS. Pada***

Philology of the future! An insult thrown at Friedrich Nietzsche by his contemporary philologist, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, whose polemics dampened the reception of Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy*, is one of the reasons why philosophy should be keenly aware with the difference between the idea of doing philosophy and understanding philosophy. On the one hand, doing philosophy in the sense of elucidation and exposition falls at the border between doing philosophy and philology. On the other hand, contributing something different to a discourse is one of the ways in which philosophy is able to live on and move towards the future. On a related note, the movement of philosophy is dynamic and unpredictable, a discourse at one time may be in vogue or in fashion, only to be eventually left as archive fodder. This is not to say that what we leave in an archive is entirely useless, rather this assertion speaks more of how we should overcome the very shoulders in which we erected our own philosophical edifice. Just as Heidegger had the anxiety of overcoming Kant in *Sein und Zeit*, and Derrida moving beyond Heidegger's *Destruktion*, we must continue to think about the future of philosophy and to maintain an invisible thread that can tie and connect other discourses and disciplines together.

I am very ecstatic to present the following papers for the tenth issue of KRITIKE: An Online Journal of Philosophy. To start of with a very relevant and timely discussion of philosophy and its stand amidst the other disciplines is Jasper Doomen's "Philosophy's End." Doomen discusses the impending disintegration of philosophy by raising the question of its goals and objectives along with its problem of justifying its purpose amidst its growing specialization. Doomen concludes that philosophy is doomed to stagnation if it does not renew its focus on relevant topics that do not simply pique the interest of philosophers but also that of other disciplines.

Also, in this issue we have five papers coming from the area of political and social philosophy, starting of with Peter Meurs, Nicole Note, and Diederik Aerts's "The Globe of Globalization" as they look at globalization from the vantage point of philosophy and debates as to whether its ideal is still found within the formal boundaries of the *Bildungsideal* as opposed to the praxis of facticity. Meanwhile, in "Beyond Goods and Services: Toward a Nietzschean Critique of Capitalism," Michael Killvris examines Nietzsche's commentary on capitalism and its usual interpretation that is rooted in the argument of bourgeoisie aristocracy. He argues that the ideology behind

## ii IN THIS ISSUE OF KRITIKE

aristocracy is not based on the idea of struggle between opposing forces in history found in Marxism, rather it is based on the sense of *ressentiment* experienced through the pathos of distance. Killvris argues that the notion of individuality is used to de-mystify herd thinking and maintain an attitude of suspicion towards the valuation of these activities. For his part, John McSweeney, in “Finitude and Violence: Žižek versus Derrida on Politics,” presents a very interesting recount of Žižek’s critique of Derrida’s effort to reduce violence by introducing the concept of openness to *l’avenir* (the one’s to come), which is contrasted to the problem of Žižek’s notion of finitude. The paper opens up new avenues for understanding the politics of violence through the problem of deconstructive contexts, to which one’s anticipation of the difference from the ‘other’ will inevitably lead to the source of violence of the same. A rather unique take on Marxism is presented to us in David Byrne’s “The Victory of the Proletariat is Inevitable: The Millenarian Nature of Marxism.” Byrne traces the Millenarian roots of Marx’s notion of class struggle by comparing it with the struggle between good and evil in the *Revelations*, ultimately arguing that the theory is based on scripture rather than economics.

Robery Lacey, meanwhile, in “Leaving the Stag Hunt,” contributes his take on the idea of conservatism and questions its current orientation with its disconnection from the history of Western political thought. Moreover, we have Danny Frederick’s polemic against the freedom of expression through pornography in “Pornography and Freedom.” Frederick defends the importance of pornography and argues that it is essential for autonomy, self-development, knowledge and progress. Frederick’ defends his radical claim by arguing against allegations raised towards pornography and its harm to which he raises important issues that are of consequence when pornography is suppressed.

The next series of essays are roughly categorized under the area of phenomenology and epistemology. Gbenga Fasiku, in “The Explanatory Gap Argument and Phenomenal States: A Defense of Physicalism,” examines the explanatory gap argument and its failure to undermine physicalism as an explanation of the gap between consciousness and experience. The author further asserts that the gap does not necessarily diminish the truth behind physicalism, rather it is still dependent on the degree of our understanding of the human mind, the further we explore it the more that we will be able to close such gap. In “Questioning the Body,” Koshy Tharakan explores the philosophical underpinnings of the idea of the body as a framework in understanding technology, as a way of articulating the distinction between mind and body, which has been inevitably reduced through our technological perspective of the body as an integrated whole. Tharakan attempts to present an interesting distinction between “agentive body” and “symbolic body” as a way of disentangling our understanding of the body in a technological perspective. James Magrini shares his thought on the philosophy of education in “Reading Heidegger Through Huebner: The Implications of an Authentic Conception of Learning, Understanding, and “Historicity” for Contemporary

Education.” In this essay, Magrini explores Huebner’s essay on “Curriculum as Concern for Man’s Temporality” and its implications on the use of the phenomenological method in education and curriculum studies. He emphasizes the strong connection of curriculum reform to Heideggerian concepts such as facticity, historicity, and its relevance to personal and social dimensions of Dasein’s authenticity.

Segun Samuel’s “Cartesian Dualism: An Evaluation of Wireduan and Gilbert Ryle’s Refutations” considers the possibility of resolving the mind-body dichotomy in Descartes’ epistemology through the thoughts of Gilbert Ryle and Kwasi Wiredu as they argue and insist on a source of consciousness as the possible resolution to the Cartesian dichotomy between mind and body. In “Things are Not What They Seem: The Transcendentalism of Appearances in the Refutation of Reductive Naturalism,” James Trafford diagnoses the arguments raised against Thomas Metzinger’s refutation of reductive naturalism, to which interpreters have assumed to be connected to the conflation of phenomenology and introspection as a problem persisting in the idea of experience as appearance qua appearance. Trafford further argues that the anti-reductive arguments of philosophers are still going to rely on the transcendental assumption of consciousness amidst experience as its explanation, to which he concludes that both the *explananda* and the *explanans* of conscious experience be open to further theoretical revision. Finally, in “Laws of Nature and Counterparts,” Esteban Céspedes contemplates on the possibility of a different depiction of nature through the idea of nomological realism and Lewis’ counterpart theory. He argues that, instead of viewing nature as a consistent and regular phenomenon guided by ontological principles or through the arbitrary and habitual connection of ideas observed in nature, there is another perspective that will agree to the idea of the regularity of nature, but deny its connection to the existence of real natural laws.

As a concluding note, I would like to thank the patience and understanding extended to us by the community of contributors and referees in the course of the journal’s transition to its new system, it is their fervent support and perseverance that make the existence of this journal possible. I would also like to extend my thanks to my colleagues, Jove Aguas, Ian Pacquing, Dean Mejos, Melanie Mejia, Marella Bolaños, Darlene Demandante, Wendyl Luna, Moses Angeles, Fleurdeliz Altez-Albela, Tracy Llanera, and Peter Mara for helping me out with the refereeing procedures. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude our Editor-in-Chief, Paolo Bolaños, for extending his trust and confidence in the task of managing this journal.

*Department of Philosophy, University of Santo Tomas, Philippines*