

## Editor's Notes

PSSR 2021 Issue Volume 73 No. 1

Jorge V. Tigno

This issue of the *Philippine Social Sciences Review* (PSSR) contains two reflections in the fields of Philosophy and History. Reflections are a vital part of the social sciences. Reflections enable a deeper understanding of human behavior, societal dynamics, and the complex interplay of various factors that shape our world. By engaging in reflective practices, social scientists can critically analyze their own assumptions, biases, and perspectives, thereby enhancing the rigor and objectivity of their research and theories.

Enrique Benjamin Fernando III's **On Sovereignty Limiting Statements** tackles the philosophical paradox of sovereignty, i.e., the question of whether a sovereign entity can establish a law restricting its own power to legislate. Fernando takes inspiration from Armando Bonifacio's 1965 article in the philosophy journal *Mind* on capacity limiting statements.

A paradox is a statement that contains two contradictory claims that are both true. The paradox of sovereignty examined by Fernando touches on the tension between a sovereign body and its ability to restrict itself. This is certainly a puzzle that is worth confronting as it questions our key philosophical and ontological assumptions about sovereignty itself. Moreover, it is an issue that also speaks to the paradoxes of democracy itself. Democracy is a most highly regarded and desirable form of government. Yet, given the specific outcomes that it brings, it can also be seen as ethically unacceptable and politically unattainable.

Without intending to, Fernando touches on the extent to which the sovereign becomes accountable (and autonomous

from) not only to its subjects but also to itself. In doing so, he draws out insights on the nature of sovereignty itself as well as the boundaries of political authority.

In Ruben Jeffrey A. Asuncion's **Mga Samahang Estudyante, 1946-1958: Pakikipagtulungan sa Pamahalaan at Pagpahayag ng Sariling Tinig** we see a peculiar take on the student movement during the first decade of independence. Asuncion looks at the specific relationship that student leaders had with Ramon Magsaysay, perhaps the most charismatic leader of the period and beyond. The early independence period was a tumultuous yet ground-breaking time in contemporary Philippine history. The country had barely come out of the devastation brought about by World War II. It had only been officially independent from the United States in 1946. It can be said that the student movement during this period defined the direction that the youth movements would take in later decades.

Using primary sources, Asuncion is able to weave together a narrative that captures the role played by the student movement of the time in propelling the presidential candidacy of Magsaysay. The youth and student movement is definitely an aspect of Philippine social dynamics that is worthy of examination. The youth of the time made up a significant portion of the country's population. Their prospective membership in the Philippine elite and intelligentsia made them a powerful force to contend with. The youth leaders of the time would later move on to become part of the country's political elite in later years. This is why their support was sought after by emerging politicians like Magsaysay who made the student movement a key base of support.

Historically, the Philippine student movement has been at the forefront of advocating for social, political, and economic reforms, often challenging the status quo. The student movement serves as a training ground for activists to play significant roles in national politics later on. Student leaders of the time mentioned by Asuncion like Salvador H. Laurel would eventually become major players in Philippine national politics.

The candidacy of Magsaysay can be seen in this context of the youth challenging the establishment politicians and foisting a new type of politics. It is unfortunate that Magsaysay's abrupt demise had also cut short this collaboration with the youth although it did not put an end to the progressive character of the student movement altogether.