

## Editorial

GIVEN THIS ISSUE'S THEME, one may not expect to read my finding about social phenomena since the articles herein are supposedly not about specific scientific inquiries into some specific social phenomenon. These articles are, or are supposed to be, theoretical and/or philosophical reflections of what social researchers are, or ought to be doing, while conducting their business. This task is of meta-science, where philosophers and social scientists meet.

In this context, *reflection* means going down to the base of social science beliefs and practices to take a hard look at them—interpellate them, subject them to basic interrogations. Reflection then calls for the social researchers/scientists to suspend his/her fundamental beliefs and practices and be for a while a philosopher.

Philosophizing in the aforementioned manner is something a social researcher/scientist may not do too often in conducting his/her business; otherwise, he/she would accomplish very little, if at all, as a social researcher/scientist. But, on the other hand, the importance of reflexiveness at appropriate times cannot be over-emphasized. Reflexiveness is to a scientist as inspection of tools is to a craftsperson. He/she could produce the best products if his/her tools are in good condition; and to insure that they are, he/she must inspect them from time to time.

Lack of reflexiveness could be symptomatic of *prosaicness*, the state of being unable to see and think of things beyond the ordinary and the banal; or of *complacency*, the state of complete contentment with the current values, practices and habits which are simply taken for granted, and so one goes on with business believing that all is well. (We dare even venture that mediocrity has, partly at least, its roots on the lack of reflexiveness.)

The articles in this issue range from the technical to the testimonial, from the experimental to the historical.

Two articles are squaring off about formal/informal logic: one appeals to Wittgenstein, the philosopher who sought to make philosophy appear

quotidian after centuries of profundity; the other appeals to Forms and seeks to go back to profundities.

Two other articles are their authors' testimonies of what they had been doing as teachers or social researchers. Whatever theoretical, methodological or philosophical lessons they bear are left for the brilliant readers to bare.

One article is purely historical. What it has about what Filipino social scientists had done *qua* social scientists, as expert observers of society—rather than teachers to social science students, or convenors of meetings, symposia or seminar—is rather exiguous at best. Nevertheless it is an informative article.

The rest are experimental in the sense that they seek out new ways of doing things or new concepts in their respective disciplines, namely History, Sociology and Philosophy.

—E.S.FRONDA