

Towards Genderizing Philippine Philosophy Education: Reflections on the CMO No. 26, Series of 2017

Gina A. Opiniano¹
Independent Researcher
gaopiniano@gmail.com

Mark Gil J. Ramolete
Saint Louis University, Baguio City, Philippines
mgjramolete@slu.edu.ph

Arvin R. Burbano
Saint Louis University, Baguio City, Philippines
2170347@slu.edu.ph

Abstract

This article revisits CMO No. 26, Series of 2017 as it attempts to elucidate the need to genderize Philippine Philosophy Education at the collegiate level. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order No. 26, Series of 2017, Policies, Standards, and Guidelines (PSG) for the Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy Program serves as the basis of colleges and universities of the minimum standards in teaching Philosophy at the College level. The 2017 PSG in Philosophy facilitated the change into a learning competency-based standards/outcome-based education while simultaneously providing for basic competencies expected of the graduates of the AB in

¹ The authors are members of philosophy professional organizations such as the Philosophical Association of Northern Luzon, Philosophical Association of the Philippines, Philippine National Philosophical Research Society, Women Doing Philosophy

Philosophy program graduates. Anchoring on the works of some luminaries in Philosophy, the article exhibits the need to enrich the 2017 PSG in Philosophy in relation to the Gender and Development (GAD) Program of the Philippine government, which speaks of the development of the full potential of both men and women in society. Towards the end, the paper recommends approaching Philosophy through genderizing the curriculum.

Keywords: genderizing philosophy, gender mainstreaming, emancipative and inclusive education

Introduction

Typical philosophical dialogues in the academe bring forth articulation of philosophical concepts or ideas of figures in the discipline that represent the male, *i.e.*, male in terms of sex, rationality, and stereotypes. Customary in these conversations would be the mention of names of renowned philosophers like Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, and Kant, among others, and reference to the philosophical concepts of these “key” figures. Male philosophers throughout the history of Philosophy make up the so-called luminaries in the discipline. As educators of Philosophy, we have witnessed these philosophical conversations that seem to be a “fad” and are acceptable, at times even emulated and modeled for their being “philosophical” and “intellectual.” Putting this kind of practice in the classroom context, one can imagine that when engaging in such discourses, learners tend to subscribe to this kind of “culture” wherein conversations rarely include female philosophers and their ideas.

Philosophy tends to push women to the margins as irrational and frivolous. Luminaries from Aristotle to Socrates to Kant have even questioned the capacity of women for sustained thought. Throughout the history of philosophy, philosophers seem to have perpetuated the view that women are *only* secondary. Earlier female philosophers have testified against this long-established underprivileged position of women in society. Hypatia, Diotima, St. Hildegard of Bingen, Mary Wollstonecraft, Simone de Beauvoir, Edith Stein, and Hedwig Conrad-Martius just to name a few have all argued about the egregious impacts

of the second-class position assigned to women which continues to persist to this day. In the context of the academe, contemporary feminist philosophers articulate the impacts women experience. The struggle for recognition—not only in academic and professional excellence—extends beyond the domain of the University. In the Philippines, for instance, we have not coalesced into a critical mass that can “slay the specter” in its multifarious faces: (internalized) misogyny, alienation and exclusion, classism, racism, gender discrimination, clericalism, gaslighting, and nepotism among others.² “[T]he various observations for philosophy’s woman problem are like Zeno’s arrow, inching ever closer to a target they can’t quite hit.”³

The struggle for recognition continues to this day. While it can be argued that the context of the foregoing narratives is Western, the same could be said true for many non-Western cultures and the practice of doing Philosophy (and philosophizing) therein. For instance, the case of the Philippines can be gleaned from Hazel Biana’s “A ‘Gender Turn’ in Philosophical Discourses in the Philippine” (2022) arguing that a ‘gender turn’ in philosophical discourses in the Philippines is happening emanating from a historical literature review of research works by women philosophers and gender-related topics. This ‘gender turn’ in the Philippines is evidenced by a steady increase in gender-related themes found in scholarly works from the 1950s to the 2010s, and the gender-related undertakings of various philosophical organizations in the Philippines.⁴

In explaining the tendency to push women in Philosophy in the margins, Sally Haslanger refers to the schema and articulates this as the

² Cassandra Teodosio, “To Slay a Specter: On the Founding of the Women Doing Philosophy Group in the Philippines,” *The Women Doing Philosophy Group in the Philippines* (blog), *Blog of the APA*, March 2, 2021, <https://blog.apaonline.org/2021/03/02/the-women-doing-philosophy-group-in-the-philippines/>.

³ Katy Waldman, “What Is Philosophy’s Problem With Women?” *Slate*, September 9, 2013, <https://slate.com/human-interest/2013/09/philosophy-has-a-woman-problem-lets-try-to-figure-out-why.html>.

⁴ Hazel Biana, “A ‘Gender Turn’ in Philosophical Discourses in the Philippines,” *Social Ethics Society Journal of Applied Philosophy*, Special Issue: Marginalized and Underrepresented Voices (2022): 108-127.

most compelling model in understanding (unconscious) bias.⁵ A schema resembles a stereotype but is more inclusive and neutral. Gender schemas are hypotheses that we all share, men and women alike, about what it means to be male or female. Schemas assign different psychological traits to males and females. We see boys and men as capable of independent action, as agents; they are task-oriented and instrumental. We see girls and women as nurturant, communal, and expressive. In brief, men act while women feel and express their feelings.

In "Creating Safe Spaces: Strategies for Confronting Implicit and Explicit Bias and Stereotype Threat in the Classroom," Lauren Freeman expounds on the concept of implicit bias as that which occurs when someone consciously rejects stereotypes and even supports anti-discrimination efforts, but, at the same time, unconsciously holds negative associations in his or her mind.⁶ It affects how members of a stigmatized group are perceived, judged, or evaluated. Furthermore, Lauren Freeman also defines stereotype threat (ST) as the way that a person's awareness of his or her group membership can negatively affect his or her performance on a given task. As in any other form of discrimination and marginalization, the consequences of biases and threats are serious, pervasive, and enduring. Such being the case, if the philosophy classroom has perpetuated these attitudes, there is reason to believe that a problem needs to be addressed.

The sorts of problems posed by implicit bias and stereotype threat demands action from philosophers and institutions. Moreover, the call for action from philosophers premised on the concern for equity (especially, gender equity, which "refers to the policies, instruments, programs, services, and actions that address the disadvantaged position of women in society by providing preferential treatment and affirmative action"⁷). While equity or equality is important to consider

⁵ Sally Haslanger, "Changing the Ideology and Culture of Philosophy: Not by Reason (Alone)," *Hypatia* 23, no. 2 (2008), 217.

⁶ Lauren Freeman, "Creating Safe Spaces: Strategies for Confronting Implicit and Explicit Bias and Stereotype Threat in the Classroom," *APA Newsletter on Feminism and Philosophy* 13, no. 2 (2014), 4.

⁷ "The Magna Carta of Women," Rep. Act No. 9710, (August 14, 2009) (Phil.), <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2009/08/14/republic-act-no-9710/>.

thinking that something should be done about implicit bias and stereotype threat in philosophy, preponderant as it is the care about philosophy and the future of philosophical thinking.

Anchoring on the context that collegiate education in Philosophy in the Philippines may have similar iterations, this paper revisits the CMO No. 26, Series of 2017 or the PSG for the AB Philosophy Program. The paper is critical and phenomenological in the sense that it is essentially made to describe and examine the sample curriculum and the syllabi for selected core courses in CMO No. 26, Series of 2017, while employing a critique of the said sample curriculum and syllabi for selected core courses. The paper also relied on participative observation through the years of experience by the authors themselves as members of the academe for at least five (5) years now handling philosophy subjects both at the collegiate and graduate levels. The paper utilized indirect sources and secondary sources of research materials coming from the archives of the Philippine government, including sources from pertinent philosophers of equal importance and relevance. The paper can serve as an aid to schools, teachers, and students with existing philosophy programs through the enrichment of the 2017 PSG in Philosophy as guided by the Gender and Development (GAD) Program of the Philippine government. Such enrichment is with the ultimate objective of having a more gender-responsive school, classroom, community, and as a nation as a whole where the development and harnessing of the human potentials of people regardless of sex or gender are taken care of.

Philosophy Education in the Philippines Under CMO No. 26, Series of 2017

Education ought to be for everyone. Education is a basic human right where everyone should have access to quality education, fair opportunity to improve life, and engage in social, economic, and political aspects of human life. Open Society Foundations mentioned that a lot of students feel excluded and discriminated against in schools due to different situations like disability, economic status, race or

ethnicity, religion, and even gender.⁸ This sense of exclusion or discrimination causes learners to drop out.

Philosophy as a discipline should be a venue where education becomes inclusive, liberating, emancipating, and empowering. Nonetheless, this can only be realized if the learning materials or even suggestive learning materials are inclusive, liberating, emancipating, and empowering. Rather than having over-dominant male-centric sources of learning materials, women authors and authors across genders and cultures should be recognized.

Philosophy education, more particularly at the collegiate level, is essentially grounded on a set of rules and regulations issued by the Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 26, Series of 2017, Policies, Standards, and Guidelines (PSG) for the Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy Program serves as the basis of colleges and universities of the minimum standards in teaching Philosophy at the college level.

The AB Philosophy Program “stems from the tradition of human search for the true, the good, the beautiful and the just grounded on the various ancient and contemporary traditions: the rational, intuitive, analytic, humanistic, scientific, technological, biological, intellection of both East and West.”⁹ Per the Sample Curriculum given and the Sample Syllabi for Selected Core Courses found in the PSG, the AB Philosophy Program strives to balance the philosophical lenses of the East and the West while seemingly striving to be inclusive in its directional approach.

With a passion for the search for what is true, the good, the beautiful, and the just, the AB Philosophy program seeks to develop critical and creative thinking among students. The program likewise equips students with skills necessary for research along and across multi disciplines. Furthermore, per CMO No. 26, Series of 2017, the AB Philosophy Program is there to empower students to form sound value judgments.

⁸ “The Value of Inclusive Education,” *Open Society Foundations*, last modified May 2019, <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/explainers/value-inclusive-education>.

⁹ Commission on Higher Education, “Policies, Standards and Guidelines for the Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy Program (CMO 26, series of 2017),” <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-26-s-2017.pdf>.

Examining Article V on Curriculum, specifically Section 9 (Sample Curriculum) of the said CMO, the AB Philosophy Program Curriculum consists of seven (7) key parts. These seven (7) key parts are as follows: (1) the CHED-prescribed General Education Curriculum (following CMO No. 20, s. 2013) at thirty-six (36) units; (2) the professional courses at fifty-one (51) units; (3) the seminar courses at fifteen (15) units; (4) the electives at fifteen (15) units; (5) the six-unit foreign language courses; (6) the undergraduate thesis/oral comprehensive examination and synthesis paper at three (3) units, and (7) other required/mandated courses at fourteen (14) units.¹⁰ While the word “sample” is apparent from the face of the CMO, HEIs offering the program are enjoined to align their program offering in Philosophy under the same CMO.

A. On Ethics Education

One General Education (GE) subject worth paying attention to is Ethics. As put under CMO No. 20, Series of 2013, Ethics deals with principles of ethical behavior in modern society at the level of person, society, and in interaction with the environment and other shared resources. Examining the course syllabus issued by CHED for this GE subject in relation to CMO 26, Series of 2017, Ethics is divided into the following parts: Introduction: Key Concepts; Part I: The Moral Agent; Part II: The Act; Part III: Frameworks and Principles Behind Our Moral Disposition Frameworks; Conclusion: Ethics Through Thick and Thin, and Ethics and Religion.¹¹

The conclusion part of the Ethics syllabus exhibits the following questions: (1) what are the challenges to ethical behavior in today's world? (2) Is it still meaningful to search for universal values? (3) How do we respond to an increasingly pluralist and individualist globalized world? With these questions in this section of the Ethics syllabus, topics on gender mainstreaming or gender and development should already be integrated. A topic on social justice should also be made to complement the topic on distributive justice in Part III of the ethics

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Commission on Higher Education, “Ethics Preliminaries,” <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Ethics.pdf>.

syllabus. While these topics are conspicuously absent therein, teachers' creativity may be explored to enrich the syllabus already prescribed by CHED. If the graduates are to be innovative, locally responsive, yet globally competitive, institutionalizing the teaching of these topics is imperative. Doing these is also a way by which the nation explores various ways to strengthen the moral fiber of society. Having these topics included in the syllabus is also one way by which alignment of teaching strategies and objectives with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals is achieved. Having these topics enriches the level of moral education in the Philippines, where "moral education should be integrated with any form of education as it can be counterintuitive to the role of education as vanguards of truth if it will simply stop on a feeble superficiality of quantifiable values that are rendered in the form of rankings, that are more often fake than not."¹²

As to the authorship of books in the Ethics syllabus found under the Ethics Resources and Other Requirements section, in addition to Patricia Licuanan et al., Emerita Quito, a Filipino philosopher and other women thinkers may be introduced. At the earliest stage of the collegiate life of the students taking the Ethics subject, introducing Quito and/or other Filipino female philosophers whose position in Ethics are relevant is worth noting. For example, introducing Quito's ethos of "pagkamakatao" to understand the Filipino Worldview, would provide a venue to see the contributions made by this renowned Filipino philosopher in the area of ethics.

B. On the Professional Philosophy Courses, Seminar Courses, and Electives

Dissertating the professional courses at fifty-one (51) units along with their respective sample course syllabi, the seminar courses at fifteen (15) units with their respective sample course syllabi, and the electives at fifteen (15) units, one can observe the conspicuous absence

¹² Blaise D. Ringor, "She Will Crush Thy Head: Edith Stein's Emancipative Empathy as a Critical Voice against Neoliberalism in Education," *Social Ethics Society Journal of Applied Philosophy*, Special Issue: Marginalized and Underrepresented Voices (2022), 66.

of Feminism or Women Studies as a professional course or even as a seminar course.¹³

While the government emphasizes Gender and Development (GAD) in the pursuit of certain policies and programs, the failure to include courses or approaches anchored on GAD seems to fall short of the mandate of CHED to have graduates who are innovative, locally responsive, yet globally competitive. To have graduates who are innovative, locally-responsive yet globally-competitive, including a course or strategy that would mold the students to be gender sensitive and gender responsive is deemed imperative.

Courses anchored on principles of GAD are recommended. The offering of such a course is meant for the creation of a more gender-sensitive and gender-responsive society. A CHED-sponsored action has to be done to this effect by revisiting CMO 26, Series of 2017, to accommodate the necessary changes, modifications or enrichment. Nonetheless, if a CHED-sponsored action is difficult to materialize to institutionalize the offering of the subject, then the same can be done as an starting point elective. Offering the subject as an elective can be explored in furtherance of the academic freedom of HEIs with an AB in Philosophy Program. Having Feminism or Women's Studies or Gender and Development Studies as a stand-alone professional subject or as a seminar course, or as an elective is an avenue to integrate gender mainstreaming in the discipline. With gender mainstreaming in the discipline, philosophy can contribute to society not only in the sphere

¹³ For professional courses under CMO 26, Series of 2017, the following are identified: Logic, Introduction to Philosophy, History of Western Philosophy 1, History of Western Philosophy 2, History of Chinese Philosophy, History of Indian Philosophy, Existentialism/ Phenomenology/ Hermeneutics/ Postmodernism, Cosmology/ Philosophy of Science and Technology, Advanced Philosophy of *Man*/ Human Person/ Rational Psychology/ Philosophical Anthropology, Epistemology/ Theory of Knowledge, Metaphysics, Theodicy/ Philosophy of Religion, Political Philosophy/Social Philosophy, Philosophy of Language, Aesthetics/ Theories of Art, Modern Asian Thoughts, Comparative Philosophy (East-West). For seminar courses under CMO 26, Series of 2017, the following are identified: Seminar on Filipino Philosophy, Special Questions in Philosophy, Special Questions in Ethics, Seminar on Contemporary Philosophy, Seminar on Plato/or Seminar on Aristotle. For electives under CMO 26, Series of 2017, the following are identified: Disciplinary/ Allied Elective 1, Disciplinary/ Allied Elective 2 Disciplinary/ Allied Elective 3, Free Elective 1, Free Elective 2.

of theory but also in practice by addressing and confronting issues of gender gap towards the possibility of addressing gender-related violence, abuse, exploitation, discrimination, and bullying from within the classroom, school campuses, and to communities.

As to integrating women philosophers in the discipline, more is to be done to position women and recognize their contributions as they should be. A careful look at the sample course syllabi for the professional subject History of Chinese Philosophy, the choice of philosophers is inclined towards male philosophers. The philosophers recommended to be tackled are Confucius, Lao Zi, Mo Zi, Shang Yang, Sun Zi, Yang Chu, Lie Zi, Zhuang Zi, Meng Zi, Hui Shi, Kung Sun Long, Xun Zi, and Han Fei Zi.

A similar observation is also apparent in the professional subject History of Western Philosophy 2. The choice of philosophers is likewise inclined towards male philosophers. The philosophers to be tackled include (1) Renaissance thoughts of Nicolas de Cusa, Florentino Marcelio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, Giordano Bruno, and (2) Modern Thinkers Rene Descartes, Baruch Spinoza, Emmanuel Kant, John Locke, David Hume, George Berkeley, Thomas Hobbes, Jean - Jacque Rousseau, Louie de Secondat Baron De Montesquieu, and Diderot.

For the professional subject Political Philosophy/Social Philosophy, its course description and course outline point to a survey of various political theories of the following listed male philosophers: Plato, Aristotle, Augustine of Hippo, Tomas D' Aquino, Niccolo Machiavelli, John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Baron Montesquieu, Karl Marx, Kautilya, Mencius, Mo Zi, Michel Foucault, and John Rawls.

For the professional subject Metaphysics, both its course description and course outline point to a general survey of the metaphysics of the following identified male philosophers: Plato, Aristotle, Lao Zi, Shankara, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Martin Heidegger. As for the seminar course Filipino Philosophy, it comes as a survey of the corpus of writings of published Filipino Philosophers. The survey includes readings of the works of the following: Romualdo Abulad, Claro Ceniza, Alfredo Co, Manuel Dy, Jr., Leonardo Estioko, Leovino Garcia, Vitaliano Gorospe, Rainier Ibana, Leonardo Mercado, Josephine Pasricha, Emerita Quito, Quintin Terrenal, Florentino Timbreza, Tomas G. Rosario, Jr., Armando Bonifacio, Manuel Pinon, Antonio Pinon,

Quintin Terrenal, Ranhilio Aquino. This seminar course comes as a breather to the male-inclined trajectory of the choice of philosophers sought to be discussed with students as this seminar course now seeks to include women philosophers in the list. Nonetheless, from these identified philosophy subjects/courses, a pattern is evident from the choice of philosophers from the framers/makers of CMO No. 26, Series of 2017. Such a pattern points to the sad reality where women philosophers are pushed towards, if not intentionally placed at the margins as to the choice of philosophers to be discussed to students in the AB Philosophy Program under the CMO. With this seeming pattern of representation and choice inclined towards the philosophical gaze of male philosophers, the challenge to be more inclusive is apparent.

Having such a curriculum is a way by which a program becomes a practical venue to address gender and sexuality-related issues in collegiate education thereby promoting the protection of students and would-be graduates. This conforms with the advent of the Safe Spaces Act in the Philippines, where the “State recognizes that both men and women must have equality, security, and safety not only in private but also on the streets, public spaces, online, workplaces and educational and training institutions.”¹⁴ Gender responsiveness can be realized through the following: (1) respecting differences based on gender and acknowledging gender, age, ethnicity, language, disability, and religion, are all part of a learner’s identity; (2) enabling education structures, systems, and methodologies to be sensitive to all women and men, and ensures that gender parity in education is part of a wider strategy to advance gender equality in society; and (3) continuously evolving to close gaps on gender disparity and eradicate gender-based discrimination.¹⁵ Hence, a more gender-sensitive and gender-responsive curriculum seeks to make a learning environment and community safe and nurturing. It also calls for diversity as to the sources of learning materials as part of the whole spectrum of having an educational system that is inclusive, emancipating, and non-discriminatory. In teaching philosophy, epistemic justice in conjunction

¹⁴ “Safe Spaces Act,” Rep. Act No. 11313, (April 17, 2019) (Phil.), <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2019/04/17/republic-act-no-11313/>.

¹⁵ Gina A. Opiniano, “Introduction: Envisaging a More Gender-Responsive Philosophy,” *SURI* 9, no. 1 (2021): 1-13.

with social justice should take central roles in aiming for the desired competencies of the program graduates. Epistemic justice comes in as an inclusive approach in the whole process of knowledge production where people, regardless of sex, gender, race, or even religion, whether from the center or the periphery, are allowed to speak and listen to their pluriversal voices. Inclusive pedagogy supports the ends of epistemic justice, and it is here where good teaching comes in, that which considers inclusivity, diversity, and equality (which integrates equity). One concrete way of doing it is genderizing Philosophy education.

Philosophical Perspectives: Genderizing Philosophy as Gender Equity

To *genderize* is to reference a specific sex and gender in something. To genderize Philosophy, therefore, entails referencing female/women components in the facets of the academe. Deliberately, the term used is to genderize instead of degenderize the latter, entailing to eliminate any reference to a specific gender in something, such as a word, text, or act. In Philosophy, the current necessity is not to degenderize as there appears inequity in the representation of the sexes/genders.

Genderizing Philosophy is, hence, a form of equity, an affirmative action of preferentially including the female thinkers and their thoughts in the history of philosophy, as they should be. Genderizing Philosophy is part of the growing call for diversity and plurality. The growing recognition of diversity and plurality in education is welcome news for bell hooks (Gloria Jean Watkins).¹⁶ However, she also cautions that mere inclusion or representation in the curriculum or syllabus, although commendable in itself, does not automatically make classroom experience (or education in general) subversive and constructive in addressing oppression, domination, or unjust discrimination in education. For one, this may just be a superficial change. As Ron Scapp, in dialogue with bell hooks, states: "In philosophy classes today, work on race, ethnicity, and gender is used, but not in a subversive way. *It is simply used to update the curriculum*

¹⁶ bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 30.

superficially."¹⁷ Working towards an education that is truly inclusive, democratic, and liberatory (emancipatory) does not only consist of progressively changing *what* should be taught but should also include progressively changing *how* one should teach.

The advocacy to genderize Philosophy Education in the Philippines is intended as an intervention to cater to a more democratic, empowering, and liberatory (emancipatory) pedagogy in the general project of making education more inclusive, liberating, and empowering across genders and cultures. The world's schools, colleges, universities, and the active role taken by educators in the whole learning process, therefore have an important and urgent task: to cultivate in students the ability to see themselves as members of a heterogeneous nation (for all modern nations are heterogeneous), and a still more heterogeneous world, and to understand something of the history and character of the diverse groups that inhabit it.¹⁸ Genderizing Philosophy is intended as an intervention towards the pursuit of epistemic justice where there exists no discrimination against certain forms of knowledge production, including the absence of discrimination on account of race, culture, social background, sex, gender, sexuality and other factors of similar nature.

Good teaching requires teaching children to see how history is put together from sources and evidence of many kinds, to learn to evaluate evidence, and to learn how to evaluate one historical narrative against another.¹⁹ Good teaching should be facilitated by learning materials or even suggestive learning materials that are inclusive, liberating, emancipating, and empowering. Good teaching must give way to the inclusion of various learning sources from various authors across genders and even cultures.

"Education, in its broadest sense, is the means of social continuity of life."²⁰ In reaching quality progress or achievement, education needs gender equity. One in which Philosophy Education is seen to be able to respond to this understanding of education's purpose,

¹⁷ bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress*, 142. (emphasis added)

¹⁸ Martha Nussbaum, *Not For Profit* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 80.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 89.

²⁰ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930), 3.

a critical evaluation of how its history is presented and taught is deemed imperative. Genderizing Philosophy equates to addressing the tendency towards hyper-masculinity of Philosophy as may be observed in the curriculum, syllabi, or subjects/courses offered transcending to the classroom's lessons.

Genderizing Philosophy echoes the essence of gender equity where fairness and justice are considered in distributing benefits and responsibilities between women and men. Both genderizing and gender equity aim to give reasonable attention to the underrepresented, in this case, the women, towards achieving an equal leveling of the playing field. In genderizing philosophy, there is an anticipation of women philosophers' representation in the canon of philosophy or in the course syllabus, at the very least. Genderizing philosophy therefore means making room for Hypatia, Diotima, St. Hildegard of Bingen, Mary Wollstonecraft, Simone de Beauvoir, Edith Stein, Hedwig Conrad-Martius, Gargi Vachaknavi, Jin Jiang, Emerita Quito, Catherine Malabou, Martha Nausbaum, and realizing that there are many other women philosophers' philosophical contributions. Genderizing likewise means making room for the importance of feminist philosophy for the future of philosophical thinking, that feminism promises to improve not only the climate for women but also philosophical thinking itself. The primary call is for a proportional and reasonable representation that results in a certain degree of balance of rendition of rationalities and ontologies. It cannot be overemphasized that such representation improves the climate for both men and women in Philosophy, where both may flourish.

Initial steps to be considered in genderizing Philosophy may come in the form of improving awareness of the syllabi gender gap among stakeholders, most especially the faculty members. Significant in this proposed reform initiative is the recognition of the faculty members of the gap in order to advance the work that needs to be done. It is likewise deemed vital to quantify the extent to which female authors are represented (or not represented) in assigned course readings among courses. It is crucially important to focus on the undergraduate level, and specifically on introductory-level courses, since it has been shown that the biggest drop in the proportion of women in philosophy occurs between the introductory level and declaring a major (the authors know of no published work that has

systematically traced the drop-off rates of other minorities). By and large, improvement of the curriculum down the line of revisiting the syllabi is pivotal, and this has to be undertaken with both men and women involved in the process convinced that this should be a normative goal to improve the climate for women (and men) in Philosophy which in turn improves philosophical thinking in the classroom and beyond.

Policymakers, State agents, sovereign leaders, and institutions, most especially educational institutions, should always be on guard as to the seduction of succumbing to a patriarchal linguistic currency. Such linguistic currency that supports positions and claims for clarity, certainty, sameness, universality, or homogeneity must be exposed. The same ought to be challenged and subjected to constructive critique with their tendency to exclude, oppress, dominate, marginalize or patronize only the academic contributions of a particular group or class on account of their sex or gender. Much-needed actions have been gradually coming into fruition since 2020 towards the realization of a more gender-sensitive and gender responsive society this time from initiatives of some philosophy organizations in the Philippines. Philosophy organizations and associations in the Philippines are in the best position to influence philosophy education in the Philippines. These associations and organizations are essentially professional organizations where most of their members are faculty members, academicians or licensed professional teachers themselves who specialized in the field of Philosophy.

A more unified and visible stand as well as positions from these associations or organizations may help reach the corridors of powers before Department of Education, CHED, or the Philippine Congress. Getting the attention of these offices may establish the role of these associations and organizations may do to contribute in reviewing policies on philosophy education in the Philippines or even contribute in capacity building and trainings of teachers who are handling subjects in Good Manners and Right Conduct (GMRC), Values Education or Ethics Education.²¹ Much needed contribution may also come through the production of learning materials in the said subjects for use in the

²¹ "GMRC and Values Education Act," Rep. Act No. 11476, (June 25, 2020) (Phil.), <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2020/06/25/rep-public-act-no-11476/>.

Philippines public educational system. This way of giving back to the nation and to communities is a way of showing to the nation the role that Philosophy may do in strengthening the moral fiber of Philippine society in an inclusive, gender-sensitive, and gender-responsive manner. It is worth noting, however, that there are already current initiatives from philosophy organizations and women academic philosophers in the Philippines that influence academic institutions to be more inclusive, gender-sensitive, and gender-responsive. One such group is the Women Doing Philosophy in the Philippines which was formed sometime in 2020. Since 2020, the group is slowly yet strongly building its network for the creation of safe spaces where women's philosophy voices in the Philippines are heard and valued, and their experiences witnessed and recognized, by fostering amity without fear of censure.²² Since the birth of the group, it has been there to work on supporting women from underrepresented regions, classes, and across genders and ethnicities, among others in the Philippines. It succeeds to provide platforms to discuss the works of women philosophers and promote their presence in the philosophy classroom through its Beyond the Ghetto project, among others. Likewise, the regular conduct of GAD Seminar/Webinar Workshop like the one spearheaded by the Philosophical Association of the Philippines (PAP) last 2021 is also seminal in furtherance of the need to create safe spaces be it online or offline.²³ Furthermore, the creation of the Gender and Inclusiveness Committee in the Union of Societies and Associations of Philosophy in the Philippines (USAPP) and the encouragement to its member organizations to create the same committee to sustain the efforts among philosophy circles across the country to be more gender-responsive and gender-sensitive. These are small yet necessary strides in addressing the call for gender mainstreaming in the field of Philosophy, and thereby contribute to the creation and promotion of a

²² See *The Women Doing Philosophy Group in the Philippines* (blog), *Blog of the APA*, <https://blog.apaonline.org/2021/03/02/the-women-doing-philosophy-group-in-the-philippines/>.

²³ See Facebook page of The Philosophical Association of the Philippines (PAP), Inc., <https://www.facebook.com/groups/PAP73/permalink/3813607108695914/?mibextid=oMANbw>.

nurturing, caring, and safe space be it in a physical space or an online space.

References

- bell hooks. *Teaching to Transgress*, 129-165. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Biana, Hazel. "A 'Gender Turn' in Philosophical Discourses in the Philippines." *Social Ethics Society Journal of Applied Philosophy*, Special Issue: Marginalized and Underrepresented Voices (2022): 108-127.
- Commission on Higher Education. "Ethics Preliminaries." <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Ethics.pdf>
- Commission on Higher Education. "Policies, Standards and Guidelines for the Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy Program (CMO 26, series of 2017)." <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-26-s-2017.pdf>.
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930.
- Facebook page of The Philosophical Association of the Philippines (PAP), <https://www.facebook.com/groups/PAP73/permalink/3813607108695914/?mibextid=oMANbw> Inc.
- Freeman, Lauren. "Creating Safe Spaces: Strategies for Confronting Implicit and Explicit Bias and Stereotype Threat in the Classroom." *APA Newsletter on Feminism and Philosophy* 13, no. 2 (2014), 3-12.
- "GMRC and Values Education Act." Rep. Act No. 11476, (June 25, 2020) (Phil.). <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2020/06/25/republic-act-no-11476/>.
- Haslanger, Sally. "Changing the Ideology and Culture of Philosophy: Not by Reason (Alone)." *Hypatia* 23, no. 2 (2008): 210-223.
- Nausbaum, Martha. *Not For Profit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Opiniano, Gina A. "Introduction: Envisaging a More Gender-Responsive Philosophy." *SURI* 9, no. 1 (2021): 1-13.

- Ringor, Blaise D. "She Will Crush Thy Head: Edith Stein's Emancipative Empathy as a Critical Voice against Neoliberalism in Education." *Social Ethics Society Journal of Applied Philosophy*, Special Issue: Marginalized and Underrepresented Voices (2022): 50-70.
- "Safe Spaces Act." Rep. Act No. 11313, (April 17, 2019) (Phil.). <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2019/04/17/republic-act-no-11313/>.
- Teodosio, Cassandra. "To Slay a Specter: On the Founding of the Women Doing Philosophy Group in the Philippines." *The Women Doing Philosophy Group in the Philippines* (blog), *Blog of the APA*, March 2, 2021. <https://blog.apaonline.org/2021/03/02/the-women-doing-philosophy-group-in-the-philippines/>.
- "The Magna Carta of Women." Rep. Act No. 9710, (August 14, 2009) (Phil.). <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2009/08/14/republic-act-no-9710/>.
- "The Value of Inclusive Education." *Open Society Foundations*, last modified May 2019. <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/explainers/value-inclusive-education>.
- The Women Doing Philosophy Group in the Philippines* (blog). *Blog of the APA*. <https://blog.apaonline.org/2021/03/02/the-women-doing-philosophy-group-in-the-philippines/>.
- Waldman, Katy. "What Is Philosophy's Problem With Women?." *Slate*, September 9, 2013. <https://slate.com/human-interest/2013/09/philosophy-has-a-woman-problem-lets-try-to-figure-out-why.html>.