

A Gewirthian Analysis of the Rights of the LGBTQ+ in the Philippines

Yrein A. Canzon

Waseda University, Japan

canzonyrein21@akane.waseda.jp

Abstract

Politics is essential in ensuring the state's security to uphold the common interest and the rights of the people. This paper examines the current political climate amid the political conflicts that affect the LGBTQ+ community in the Philippines due to the disproportion among the interests and beliefs of the state and the people. As such, Gewirth propounded the Principle of Generic Consistency, which focused on the imposition of duties on individual agents to do an action out of respect for one's human rights. However, several thinkers contradicted the claim of Gewirth regarding the moral action of an individual, but I will expand on the analysis of Gewirth as to how any action of an individual does not limit the freedom of another and is a just metric. Meanwhile, an individual's oppressive tendencies and unjust actions toward the LGBTQ+ community damage and hinder the progress toward social recognition of such rights. This is why I aim to utilize Gewirth's analysis to show the possibilities for social justice and actualize a just society that respects and protects the human rights of a minority group in the Philippines.

Keywords: Politics, Principle of Generic Consistency, Human Rights, LGBTQ+ community, Alan Gewirth

INTRODUCTION

The rational standpoint of humanity represents the pinnacle of Alan Gewirth's moral philosophy. Gewirth posits that individuals possess the capacity to reason through their beliefs, values, and actions. Man has the capacity to recognize and protect one's basic moral rights and the importance of not doing any harm to another. Although, man often contradicts oneself due to the indulgence of one's desires without regard to the consequences interlaced with it. The premise of the

standpoint of man is that it is only from the rational standpoint that one can distinguish reasons from mere causes and can make valid moral judgments that require moral reasoning.¹ In particular, the rationality of man to make decisions that can affect the lives of other individuals is what distinguishes us from other beings. This then becomes the justification for providing a moral foundation of a man's rights and duties. From this standpoint, Gewirth presents a theory that redirects humans toward recognizing the importance of rationality and obligation in protecting human rights.

This paper serves as an exposition of Alan Gewirth's Principle of Generic Consistency (PGC), applied to state governance for the protection and liberation of LGBTQ+ rights in the Philippines. By utilizing his insights, this analysis aims to reconstruct the narrative of a just society—one that actively liberates oppressed minority groups. Through Gewirth's framework, the paper explores the potential for crafting policies that not only safeguard rights but also foster an inclusive environment where all individuals can thrive, free from discrimination and prejudice.² In doing so, I will present three perspectives to illustrate how Gewirth's philosophy explains the state of the Filipino LGBTQ+ community. I will articulate Gewirth's moral ideas and explore the struggles of the LGBTQ+ community in their quest for acceptance, recognition, and protection of their human rights. This exploration will provide a nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between moral philosophy and the tangible challenges faced by LGBTQ+ individuals in the Philippines, highlighting the role of Gewirth's principles in advocating for a more inclusive and just society.³ To opine, it is crucial to highlight the importance of freedom and rational autonomy in a just society to fully understand the political struggles that

¹ Alan Gewirth, *Reason and Morality* (University of Chicago Press, 1978), 3.

² The Principle of Generic Consistency, which states that all PPAs have claims (or "strong") to their freedom and well-being, Deryck Beyleveld, *The Dialectical Necessity of Morality* (Clarendon Press, 1991), 1.

³ Gewirth states that every agent must act in accordance with his or her own and all other agents' generic rights. Agents are required to both not to interfere with their recipients' freedom and well-being and at the same time assist those who are unable to secure these necessary goods.

oppress the human rights of LGBTQ+ individuals. Emphasizing these principles lays the groundwork for recognizing the potential for political change, justice, and liberation. By engaging with these fundamental values, we can pave the way for transformative approaches that address the inequalities and injustices faced by the LGBTQ+ community, thus fostering a more equitable society. In line with this, LGBTQ+ individuals in the country continue to face discrimination and oppression due to conservative views and ideals that overshadow the tide of time and impede radical progress. Despite societal advancements, many from the community still experience discrimination in their workplaces and within their own homes, including from family, relatives, friends, and acquaintances. This persistent prejudice underscores the urgent need for a shift in societal attitudes and reinforces the call for comprehensive policies that uphold the dignity and rights of LGBTQ+ individuals. This implies that effective laws and legislation can only be achieved through collective advocacy. Such advocacy becomes possible when the plights of the LGBTQ+ community are acknowledged, and individuals are not stigmatized for their differences. Recognition and respect for diversity are essential steps toward fostering an inclusive society where legislative changes can truly support and protect all citizens.⁴ At the status quo, majoritarian representation that promotes conservative ideologies dominates, leading to increased antagonization of minorities. This antagonization exacerbates the difficulties minorities face in securing necessary goods and exercising these goods for their own benefit. Specifically, there is a troubling normalization of violence and extremist values that depict the LGBTQ+ community as evil and wicked.

⁴ The varying forms of refusal to recognize the presence of queer people and acknowledge their discrimination constitute spaces of unfreedom. While they are evident in the public sphere, they are also deeply felt in intimate spaces such as the family and church. These spaces of unfreedom are also spaces of experienced restrictions, especially in the form of gender stereotypes and homonegativity. I think for this reason, this is because of the imposition of conservative ideals in one's household that one is deemed as a failure when one identifies as a homosexual. This belief is rooted in religious ideals that if you are a man, then you must portray that you are strong and masculine, and, on the other hand, if you are a woman, you must be gentle and feminine. Susan MacDougall, "Felt Unfreedom: Reflecting on Ethics and Gender in Jordan," *Ethnos* 86, no. 3, 510-529.

This results in systemic oppression and the progression of tyrannical practices, which further entrench the marginalization of vulnerable groups and obstruct their pursuit of justice and equality.⁵ This situation has led to resignation and subjugation under an unjust political system that lacks adequate laws and regulations to protect and promote the rights of LGBTQ+ individuals. This occurs despite the mandate in the 1987 constitution that aims to protect everyone's rights. The disparity between the constitutional promise and the reality experienced by LGBTQ+ individuals highlights a significant gap in enforcement and advocacy, underscoring the urgent need for comprehensive legal reforms and active enforcement to ensure that constitutional protections are fully realized for all citizens.⁶ In contrast, there is a pressing need for a government that prioritizes: (1) survival and protection, (2) basic needs and services, and (3) the liberty and welfare of its constituents. I argue that through Gewirth's Principle of Generic Consistency, we can pave the way for the reconstruction of political brigades and a constitutional sovereignty that truly represents the people, without tolerating political expeditions that exploit the vulnerability of the state and its people. With support from commentaries on Gewirth, such possibilities for political change and enhanced protection can be realized, moving beyond a utopian narrative towards actual political liberation and justification of the rights of the LGBTQ+ community. This

⁵ Utilization of power to punish LGBTQ+ individuals by imprisonment for same-sex activities and the lack of same-sex civil unions and marriages. Most of the time, they are denied access to employment, education, and health care because of their sexual orientation. A few cases of discrimination against the community: Back in June 2020, 20 LGBTQ+ protesters were arrested by the police force for the reason that what they were doing was prohibited by the law, i.e., protesting the implementation of the anti-terrorism bill. Another is the statement made by former President Rodrigo Duterte who has vilified some of his critics as bakla (i.e., the chairperson of the Commission of Human Rights and the U.S. ambassador of the Philippines). Even to the extent of claiming that he once identified as "bakla" but was able to cure himself from it; this propagates that being homosexual is a disease. This perception signifies the continuous oppression against the community because of conventional beliefs that are backed upon by political figures who are supposed to protect their people regardless of sex and gender orientation from violence and discrimination.

⁶ Guarantees the right of every person to equal protection of the laws, without distinction or discrimination.

framework offers a robust foundation for crafting policies that are not only inclusive but also responsive to the specific needs and challenges faced by marginalized groups.

At this juncture, it is crucial to recognize the limitations of Gewirth's Principle of Generic Consistency to fully understand the intricacies and attributes of this moral principle. The shortcomings of this principle are threefold: (1) Individualistic Focus, the PGC is criticized for its individualistic approach, failing to consider the social and cultural contexts that influence why an individual acts in a certain way; (2) Excessive Burden on Individuals, it places a heavy burden of responsibility on individuals without considering the internal and external factors that affect their decision-making. This can be problematic as not all individuals may possess the same level of moral agency; and (3) Philosophical Misalignment, most philosophers who are unfamiliar with Gewirth's theory base their concept of rights on legal precedents rather than the philosophical underpinnings of PGC, leading to a misalignment with Gewirth's theoretical framework. However, these gaps do not diminish the importance of the PGC nor its potential to provide a framework for addressing social and political problems. These gaps can be bridged through ongoing critiques and the adaptive application of the Gewirthian framework to specific issues, enhancing its relevance and effectiveness. Consequently, the PGC serves as a valuable framework that can reduce inconsistencies in actions and laws within society. It acts as a supplementary tool to identify discrepancies in laws or regulations, helping to prevent the escalation of conflicts and crimes by providing a more coherent basis for evaluating and reforming legislation.

Moral Responsibility, Political Development, and Restoration of Human Rights

The Principle of Generic Consistency offers a framework that champions equal rights and opportunities for gender minorities (i.e., the LGBTQ+ community). This framework hinges on the universality of human rights and the moral obligations individuals carry. Gewirth emphasizes the recognition of each rational individual's moral agency

and insists that an agent must act according to their principles and moral responsibilities. This includes the ethical responsibility of an agent to act in a manner that does not impede the access of others to their human rights. Central to Gewirth's reasoning is the assertion that accessing fundamental necessities—such as food, shelter, employment, and healthcare—is essential for an individual to fully exercise and utilize their moral agency. He argues that adherence to this framework is critical to prevent the violation of human rights, linking it directly to his broader political, legal, and moral obligations. The overarching goal of the PGC is to establish a guiding principle that ensures everyone the freedom to pursue their goals and passions without interfering with the rights of others. Through this framework, Gewirth, alongside other political philosophers, posits that a just society is not only a theoretical possibility but an achievable reality. This perspective invites ongoing dialogue and adaptation of the PGC to ensure it effectively addresses the evolving needs and challenges faced by society, particularly for marginalized communities like the LGBTQ+.⁷

In his book *The Community of Rights*, Gewirth outlines three interconnected levels of frameworks created by the existence of human rights: political, legal, and moral. The first level, the political framework, involves the concept of political obligation. This concept underscores the duty of government agencies to protect and uphold the rights of their citizens. This obligation extends beyond mere legislative action; it requires active enforcement and the creation of policies that facilitate the realization of these rights in everyday life. The political framework sets the stage for how a government interacts with its citizens and the degree to which it prioritizes their welfare and rights in its governance practices.⁸ This means that governments must reform and enact laws that

⁷ Moral reasoning is an essential aspect to consider when examining political and social issues (i.e., the existence of political and social issues raises several moral questions). These questions hinge upon what constitutes as morally right or wrong about an action done by an individual. Neu highlights that morality is not simply a black- and-white perspective influenced by one's beliefs but has been shaped by the social institution they are in (Michael Neu, *Off the Fence: Morality, Politics, and Society* (New York: Routledge), 2017).

⁸ Gewirth, Alan, *The Community of Rights* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1996.

protect every citizen from harm and uphold their freedoms against any entity that seeks to inflict harm or conflict. Such legal frameworks are essential for ensuring that all individuals, regardless of their background or identity, can live safely and freely within society. This responsibility extends to actively combating discrimination, violence, and injustice in all forms, thereby fostering an environment where rights and liberties are not merely theoretical but are actively supported and defended by the state (i.e., wars). According to Gewirth, this political obligation is connected to the concept of the social contract theory.⁹ To opine, Gewirth establishes the notion that individuals must obey the law not merely for the sake of obedience, but with the awareness that they have a moral duty to fulfill. This involves respecting the potential negative impacts of one's actions on others. However, the idea of abiding by this principle in the manner Gewirth suggests may seem utopian, as it assumes a level of uniformity in thought and action that does not naturally occur among individuals. Each person thinks and acts differently, influenced by their unique experiences, values, and circumstances. This diversity can complicate the uniform application of moral duties as envisioned in Gewirth's framework, highlighting the challenge of translating such ideals into practical, real-world applications. They cannot be generalized that every individual will abide and think of their moral duty to the society. Second, the legal obligation to protect one's rights is posited by the existing international laws (e.g., the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women). According to Gewirth, agents are legally obligated to respect and protect the rights of others, irrespective of intersectionality or an individual's identity and classification. This obligation is inspired by the rule of law and addresses the potential for intensified violations of human dignity, rights, and suppression of freedom if not adhered to

⁹ The social contract theory elucidates that for a society to function properly, citizens must give up some of their rights and freedom to the government voluntarily in exchange for peace and order. To add up to this, Thomas Hobbes, in his book the "Leviathan" argues that humans are always in a state of war, which is why giving some of their rights and freedom will ensure that they will be granted safety and protection by the governing body (Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (London: Andrew Crooke), 1651).

properly. The way recipients might react to actions also shapes this legal framework, reinforcing the need for adherence. Additionally, Gewirth posits a moral obligation where agents must act in accordance with their moral duties and responsibilities toward others. This ensures that no rights are violated or tampered with, even if the actions do not breach any political or legal obligations. It rests upon the moral integrity of an agent to act rightly, not discriminating against recipients regardless of their economic or social status. Thus, the Gewirthian framework presents different dimensions that reflect the interconnectedness of the individual and the state. Each level mandates a distinct framework and understanding these roles as citizens enhances comprehension of the law. While Gewirth's views may suggest a utopian society where all functions seamlessly, his Principle of Generic Consistency (PGC) underscores the importance of individual autonomy. However, it emphasizes that such autonomy should not be exercised carelessly but should instead be utilized to uphold the human dignity and freedom of all rational beings. This framework not only champions individual rights but also underscores the collective responsibility to foster a just and equitable society. By emphasizing both personal liberties and communal duties, it encourages a holistic approach to human rights that integrates the well-being of all members of society. This dual focus is crucial for creating an environment where everyone can thrive and where the principles of fairness and justice are actively upheld.

Delving deeper, the individualistic approach of the PGC originates from Gewirth's agent-centered concept, which emphasizes the importance of an agent accepting certain rights to act freely. This involves a commitment to recognizing and avoiding the denial of another agent's rights, as such denial would contradict the logical implications of an agent's own rights. This framework underscores that by asserting one's rights, an agent logically commits to respecting those same rights for others, thereby fostering a mutual respect among all agents within the society. This approach not only protects individual autonomy but also promotes a coherent and consistent application of rights across different individuals and contexts. However, the application of the PGC can be analyzed through the evolution of individual freedom caused by the development of a society's social structures (e.g., modern-

state societies, contemporary movements, and evolving cultural ties). There is a shift to the dynamics towards the relationism between an individual, community, and justice (i.e., the promotion of challenging traditional views by shifting the focus on the adaptability of communal and societal relationships). Under the same breath, Vincent Samar follow Gewirth's exposition by writing an article entitled A Gewirthian Framework for Protecting the Basic Human Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) People. To Samar, the imperative to act in accordance with one's rights will prevent human rights violations such as those experienced by the LGBTQ+. The supporting premise of Samar is that there is constant widespread discrimination the LGBTQ+ have been subjected to, as Samar sees it, exposing how human rights can be rationally derived from the normative structure of human action using the dialectically necessary method. This is demonstrated by the need to recognize moral reasoning (i.e., individuals being enlightened to understand conflicts in a systematic manner). The totalizing task of paving a way to achieve social justice is to recognize the symptomatic of a pathology.¹⁰

Consequently, the different views as to whether the PGC, as a guiding moral principle, can assist in the restoration and protection of rights.¹¹ This framework requires an expounded discussion on whether the PGC's aims are realistic and achievable. To begin, some researchers challenge and criticize the moral aptitude and universality of the PGC.

¹⁰ Vincent Samar, "A Gewirthian Framework for Protecting the Basic Human Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) People." *Journal of Human Rights* 15, no. 3 (2016): 381-395, DOI: 10.1080/14754835.2016.1184262.

¹¹ One critic against Gewirth is from Richard Friedman and he claims that the PGC is flawed, since it has a flawed understanding on addressing the nature of rights. That rights are inherently connected and constructed which were influenced by social and historical contexts. While I do agree with the notion of the PGC being individualistic and that unfamiliar thinkers basing with the law instead of the PGC. The importance of the PGC is to hence and make individuals aware of their moral obligation in the society. The linear concept of Gewirth is that of self-fulfillment to happen then we must acknowledge how the rights and duties of every single individual are interconnected with one another. That interconnectedness must be nurtured to reach the point of achieving a just state (Richard B. Friedman, "The Basis of Human Rights: A Criticism of Gewirth's Theory," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 4, no. 1 (1974): 75-95).

For instance, Zimmerman argues that the PGC cannot adequately justify or solidify an agent's moral obligation to their recipient, as it primarily relies on rationality. He contends that rationality alone is a flawed basis for establishing human motivation, such as acting in accordance with the rights of one's recipients. As an example, Zimmerman points out that if a bully hits you, the PGC would argue that you should not retaliate in the same manner because such an action would inherently violate the bully's rights.¹² This perspective highlights a potential disconnect between rational moral obligations and instinctive or emotional human responses, suggesting that the PGC might not fully capture the complexities of human motivations and ethical behavior. Zimmerman further argues that the PGC's notion of morality can be inherently subjective. He contends that what is considered rational can vary significantly between individuals, influenced by their unique backgrounds, cultures, and personal experiences. This subjectivity can challenge the universality and applicability of the PGC, as moral judgments and obligations deemed rational by one might not be perceived the same way by another. This critique points to the need for a more nuanced understanding of morality that accommodates diverse perspectives and the complex interplay of rationality and emotion in ethical decision-making.¹³ This makes it unachievable to apply it as a

¹² *The Unintelligibility of Gewirth's Principle of Generic Consistency* by Michael Zimmerman (1981).

¹³ Unlike the principles and standards set in the society by the state and the people, it cannot be generalized as automatically right or wrong. There must be a discussion in the PGC as to what are the exemptions that must be considered before finalizing the judgment that what an individual did was a violation of their obligation. It is equally important to consider how moral judgments differ because of the differences in cultural background, education, personal experiences, and even ethnicity (i.e., subjective experiences)have a strong influence as to how an individual acts and thinks (Michael Zimmerman, *The Concept of Moral Obligation*, 81-99).

universal concept to justify the rational decision that an agent will make.¹⁴ I agree with the justification that the PGC needs a nuanced approach to solve the inadequacies of strengthening the protection of human rights (i.e., strengthening the obligation of each agent to respect and recognize the autonomy and freedom of their recipient). Zimmerman's criticism regarding the lack of contextualization in the Principle of Generic Consistency is particularly relevant when examining the moral beliefs and values of individuals who disagree with certain cultural and progressive ideals, such as the fluidity of gender. A primary example of this critique is the need to understand what shapes the moral beliefs of individuals who do not subscribe to the idea that gender is fluid. This inquiry involves examining and analyzing their rationality to discern why they perceive the concept of gender fluidity in a particular way. To address this, it is essential to consider the socio-cultural, educational, and personal experiences that influence an individual's perception and acceptance of gender identities. Understanding these factors can provide insight into the underlying reasons for their resistance or acceptance of progressive ideals. This approach not only helps in contextualizing their viewpoints but also in devising strategies that could foster dialogue and possibly shift perceptions. Engaging with these individuals' perspectives through education, open conversations, and exposure to diverse narratives can help bridge the gap between differing moral and cultural understandings, aiming for a more inclusive understanding of gender.

Can we ever deduce what's right or wrong? Can we confirm it with data? It's not obvious how you could. Many people believe that "you can't get an ought from an is." The conclusion is sometimes attributed to Hume, with a rationale similar to his

¹⁴ According to Zimmerman, the PGC fails to provide a sufficient framework for an individual's moral obligation. The PGC automatically assumes the universal needs and desires that should be protected by both the individual and their recipient. However, Gewirth fails to provide a clear narrative as to what are the needs and desires of these individuals that are of utmost importance. I affirm Zimmerman's claim since there are actions that require one to violate the rights of others (e.g., self-defense). To put it simply, when a person's life is at risk they make an action that may harm the other individual, e.g., when you are being robbed or bullied by your classmate (*Ibid.*, 81-99).

argument that reason must be a slave to the passions. “Tis not contrary to reason,” he famously wrote, “to prefer the destruction of the whole world to the scratching of my finger.”¹⁵

Rationality, therefore, is the ability to think and reason logically which involves being able to critically examine and be aware of one’s beliefs and actions. Under the same breath, rationality guides an individual to achieve one’s desires and goals. This is to mitigate the gap of the PGC and strengthen its foundation of generic duty, i.e., grounds for evaluating the moral obligation of an individual. Hence, specifying the necessary conditions of the principle and providing a framework as to how one will evaluate an action done out of their safety and well-being will clarify the pitfalls of the PGC.¹⁶

Moreover, an important aspect of Gewirth’s PGC is his critique on utilitarianism which he engaged with in his book, *Human Rights: Essays on Justification and Applications*.¹⁷ Baron (1985) points out that Gewirth’s PGC is an abstract idea that does not have a clear standing and moral grounding to transform into a pragmatic solution to address social issues, from discrimination to gender minorities, as well as international and national conflicts, to name a few. The same criticism is shared with Zimmerman regarding the application of the PGC (i.e., there are inherent barriers that make it impossible to apply the principle since it is an open-ended theory). Although moral obligations are a must to respect the human rights of everyone, there is a lack of nuance as to how this will be effectively followed and applied for an agent to do what is right when dealing with their recipients, either in a direct or indirect circumstance. However, Gewirth emphasizes that the PGC is not an alternative to utilitarianism in providing a basis for the moral

¹⁵ Michael Huemer, *Rationality and Irrationality*, 11.

¹⁶ Differentiating certain actions and experiences of an individual (i.e., what led to them prioritizing their safety and well-being in this certain situation). Likewise, in the derivation of the conditions of the PGC, should not enclose that there is no middle ground to access why the action took place (i.e., individuals have subjective perceptions influenced by their subjective experiences).

¹⁷ Alan Gewirth, *Human Rights: Essays on Justification and Applications* (University of Chicago Press, 1982).

high ground of an agent's obligation. Gewirth highlights three main elements in the PGC, (1) necessary good or action-needs of individuals, (2) rights as individuals' moral property in fulfilling these needs, and (3) duties of other individuals or government to act or to forbear with a view to securing these rights.¹⁸ The main difference between the two concepts is that the PGC is hinged on the egalitarian framework, which highlights the importance of providing an equal basis and prescriptivist, i.e., agents must act in a certain way and avoid acting upon impulse that will distort one's rights and general freedom. Utilitarianism is focused on maximizing utility which bears the responsibility that an individual must act in accordance with where most individuals will benefit more. It is essential to consider that the PGC is different from utilitarianism since the PGC seeks to establish a framework that standardizes how an agent thinks and acts (i.e., awareness of one's social and moral obligation to the community and their recipients).¹⁹ In an article by Gewirth entitled *Human Rights as Grounds for Duties: Synopsis of an Argument*, he defends that the PGC is a guiding principle that directs human action to abide by a universal standard which indicates if an action will not tamper with the freedom and well-being of their recipient's.²⁰

This standpoint of Gewirth is indirectly criticized with the article of Hayry where he established a framework which can be summarized into threefold: (a) the PGC is centered around the moral obligation of an agent and disregards the characterization of the role of social and political structures which can contribute to the influence human behavior (i.e., This characterization can defend the PGC by claiming that moral intuition is not inherent to human nature, rather is imposed by institutions), (b) the PGC places a premium on the agents to always act in accordance with their rational autonomy, and there is a tendency

¹⁸ Alan Gewirth, *Human Rights: Essays on Justification and Applications* (University of Chicago Press, 1982), 155.

¹⁹ For example, (1) imprisoning someone can be a positive utility for society but a utility loss for the one imprisoned and (2) having rights for minorities is a utility plus for minorities and a utility constant for everyone else

²⁰ Alan Gewirth, "Human Rights as Grounds for Duties: Synopsis of an Argument," *Social Theory and Practice* 1, no. 1 (1971): 1-23.

that it will result in a more complex individualistic approach rather than a holistic one, and (c) human behavior should not be explained simply as if person A acts in accordance of X then it will automatically result to respecting person B's freedom and autonomy which will result to scenario Y will result in the expected ethical framework that the PGC is curtailed to do so.²¹ At the status quo, the social and political climates vary significantly across countries, and Harry astutely observes that the answers provided by the Principle of Generic Consistency (PGC) should not be constrained to a black-and-white spectrum. This observation is crucial because some agents have been inherently exposed to ideas that might be deemed inappropriate or offensive by certain groups of people. The critical question, then, for the PGC is how to reconcile these differences effectively. Moreover, it is essential to explore the innate limitations of the principle to ensure that it can still safeguard individual rights at the end of the day. To address these challenges, the PGC needs to incorporate a more flexible and context-sensitive approach. This adaptation would involve considering the cultural, social, and historical contexts that shape individuals' perspectives and actions. The principle should also provide guidelines on engaging in constructive dialogue and education to bridge differences and promote understanding. Furthermore, it should define clear boundaries to ensure that the protection of individual rights does not compromise the rights of others. By refining its approach in these ways, the PGC can become a more effective tool for navigating the complex interplay of diverse values and rights in a globalized world.

As such the question "What course of action should be taken to secure the path towards protecting such rights through the PGC?" is an important aspect to discuss in this paper. Going back, the PGC aims to establish a moral framework as a primary reasoning for an acceptable

²¹ Matt Harry, "Is Gewirth's Principle of Generic Consistency Inherently Moralizing?," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 58, no. 1 (1998): 115-125.

action to take place.²² Under the same guise, Gewirth mentions that communities have certain rights, and everyone has their own role to fulfill.²³ Gewirth (1996) argues that communities have the right and obligation to protect their members from any conflict and harm (i.e., protection-based policy). In addition, he explains that there is a need for collective action to promote the freedom and well-being of the whole community.²⁴ In a work titled *Collective Illusions*, it is said that most people believe something to be true, even if it is wrong because your public image and private image has an inflection towards one another.²⁵ This can be a gap in the study toward the application of the Gewirthian thought in showing how legislative and grassroots progress has been ineffective for years.²⁶ Since the moral reasoning of an individual is largely influenced by their surroundings, family, friends, and personal experiences, that is to say, it becomes difficult to impose that an individual must examine their action before its execution. Parameters must be set to quantify and strengthen the PGC, such as determining what actions should be taken in specific cases, for example, Gewirth's drowning scenario. What limitations must an individual observe? Should the individual present at the scene be held morally responsible if one of the drowning victims is not saved in time? Hence, a nuanced approach

²² A framework that provides that an action that an individual makes must also be acceptable for another (i.e., it will not cause any harm and conflict). According to Gewirth, the concept of human rights thus entails a mutualist and egalitarian universality: each human must respect the rights of all the others, so there must be a mutual sharing of the benefits of rights and the burdens of duties (Alan Gewirth, *Community of Rights*, 6).

²³ *The same concept* with the social contract theory.

²⁴ Alan Gewirth, "The Community of Rights," *Social Philosophy and Policy* 13, no. 2 (1996): 85-108.

²⁵ Todd Rose, *Collective Illusions: Conformity, Complicity, and the Science of Why We Make Bad Decisions* (New York: Currency 2021).

²⁶ Todd examines how individuals conform to the decision of the majority even if they believe that it is not true. This then become harmful to the society because of the conformity that is not based on reasoning happens (i.e., formation of echo chambers and the increase of biased-based reasoning). Similarly, he elucidates that there is a tendency for individuals to be complicit if the outcome is based on their own self-interest and even scenarios where they become pressured by the group, i.e., they do not want to be excluded from the group.

to the PGC is necessary to address the complexities of an individual's actions and the unique circumstances that may arise. Although Gewirth mentions that the moral principles an individual possesses are not arbitrary, the goal of the PGC is to offer a framework that mitigates the conflict between freedom and social responsibility.²⁷ “The principle of human rights requires corresponding mutualist structural pattern of society that affect the comparative possession of freedom and well-being among different social groups or classes.”²⁸

Gewirth elucidates that everyone must be treated regardless of differences. Since an egalitarian society constitutes that there is no social hierarchy and there should be an equal distribution of resources among the people. However, individuals often prioritize their self-interest over the welfare of others and their action may result to the reduction of the level of goods of their recipients.²⁹ Gewirth claims, “Persons often learn what morally justified rights they have to some X only by comparing their treatment or holding as to X with how other persons are treated or have holding of X.”³⁰

This passage is under the same breath as Howard Zinn's claim that history can be better understood when we take it in from the point of view of the marginalized. We understand the challenges they experience when we try to imagine ourselves in their shoes.³¹ He elucidates that utilizing and understanding the experiences and perspectives of marginalized groups can assist in challenging dominant narratives in the society.³² Likewise, he emphasized that the

²⁷ Alan Gewirth, “The Rationality of Rights and Duties,” *The Philosophical Quarterly* 26, no. 104 (1976), 241-245.

²⁸ Alan Gewirth, *The Community of Rights*, 71.

²⁹ Often associated with social justice.

³⁰ Alan Gewirth, *Community of Rights*, 73.

³¹ According to Zinn, this can help inform political decisions that will address current and potential problems that affect the marginalized.

³² Similar to Gewirth's claim, individuals often understand what are the difficulties that another individual face when they examine the situation using another's perspective.

role of resistance and social movements assist in debunking dominant narratives.³³ This is through challenging power structures to respond and act to the demands of the marginalized (i.e., based on Gewirth's claim that it is not merely that A must do some X to B and B must do some X to A; the nature of the "X" is vitally important).³⁴

To opine, at status quo, there are several social movements across the globe that are focused on a certain societal problem that they want to address (e.g., Civil Rights Movement, Women's Suffrage Movement, LGBTQ+ Rights Movements, and the Arab Spring Movement). These movements arise from the unfair power dynamics that happen at status quo (i.e., unequal, and oppressive treatment without proper laws to protect them. Inequality and limitation of one's action through unjust measures and lack of laws that address existing, and potential problems leads to the increase of structural barriers in the society). Like Ranciere, *On the Shores of Politics*, where he claims that political participation in the society would require the willingness of an individual to contend and challenge political institutions. Without this willingness, success against these institutions will be marginal since unity and engagement through dialogue is a must. He highlights that political activism requires creativity which is hinged on the imagination of what the future can be after the deconstruction of dominant narratives. Hence, there is the importance of the mutuality of rights, as both duty

³³ Without mass movements of ordinary people, there is no hope for changing the institutions and policies that perpetuate injustice and inequality (Howard Zinn and David Barsamian. *Howard Zinn, and David Barsamian in Conversation on History and Politics*, 30). That is why one of the actions to be done to ensure the rights of the Filipino LGBTQ+ the government, and to make sure that they will hear the plights of the marginalized. Based on Zinn's passage that movement have b is to challenge brought about change by raising the voices of the marginalized and forcing those in power to confront the realities of injustice and inequality (Howard Zinn and David Barsamian, *Conversation on History and Politics*, 30).

³⁴ Alan Gewirth, *Community of Rights*, 75.

bears and respondents.³⁵ Acknowledging the mutuality of rights leads to the assumption that individuals have the knowledge about the gravity of their responsibility. That is why, there is the need for dialogue and debate, Neu elucidates that an engaging dialogue that focuses on dismantling power structure would assist in understanding the essence of cooperation. Cooperation towards reaching a consensus between groups who do not share the same ideals and views. To opine, the different perceptions towards the LGBTQ+ community created a divide which led to the offshoot and delay of the implementation of laws in the Philippines. Hence, a need for a consensus and that of moral leadership inspired by Neu's analysis in *Off the Fence: Morality, Politics, and Society*. This means that political institutions have the moral obligation to construct ethical and moral goals.³⁶ These goals are important to identify the grassroot problems from the different communities in the country. This is to address the concerns of marginalized groups and what are the inherent laws that need to be passed to alleviate their plights and to advocate for their interests. Systemic injustices will not dismantle on their own, but a collective action must take place. A collective action that addresses the inequalities in society, and as the PGC instructs that individuals are morally responsible for their actions. To elucidate, right as claims as Gewirth highlights is not just merely a condition that they must respect. But it is part of the social contract that they agreed upon (i.e., the agreement to respect everyone's claim rights in the society). That through this agreement, individuals can exercise their agency and the capacity to make choices that does not harm another. Hence, this is a responsibility from the PGC that includes not restricting one's recipient from their own access to their freedom and well-being.

³⁵ The mutuality of human rights involves that everyone always has, as a matter of principle, the right to be treated in the appropriate way when one has the need, and the duty to act in accord with the right when circumstances arise that require such action and when one has the ability to do so, this ability including consideration of cost to oneself (Alan Gewirth, *Community of Rights*, 76).

³⁶ Neu, Michael, *Off the Fence: Morality, Politics, and Society* (New York: Routledge), 2019.

Conflicts and Moral Justifications of Human Rights

Gender is not a white-and-black spectrum of what can be considered morally acceptable in a diversified community that has developed through the tide of time. The LGBTQ+ community in the Philippines symbolizes the struggle toward representation and breaking cultural barriers to pave way for the acceptance and inclusion. With the ongoing process of passing the SOGIE Equality Bill in Congress,³⁷ there is a need to acknowledge the struggles that the LGBTQ+ community in the Philippines is experiencing, these include their hardships (i.e., discrimination, and equal access to goods and services).³⁸ The reason why it is not a black-and-white spectrum is that even if there are improvements in how people view the plights of these minorities, it is not the same for every member of the LGBTQ+ community (i.e., some individuals often face discrimination, not just on how they are treated by their peers or classmates but can also exist in terms of

³⁷ The SOGIE bill is still being reviewed in the Philippine Congress. It has been handed to the Committee on Women, Children, Family Relations, and Gender Equality as of March 2023. It has received multiple backlashes from conservative and religious groups and politicians for over a decade (Philippine LGBT Chamber of Commerce, *What is the SOGIE Equality Bill?* Accessed March 3, 2023. <https://www.phlgbtchamber.com/sogie-equality-bill/>).

³⁸ In a survey conducted by Rainbow Rights Projects, 77% of LGBTQ+ individuals in the Philippines reported experiencing discrimination, harassment, or violence based on their sexual orientation or gender identity (Rainbow Rights Projects. *Being LGBT in Asia: The Philippines Country Report*. ASEAN SOGIE Caucus, 2014, 24). However, there are multiple improvements of the LGBTQ+ situation in the Philippines. Highlighting the passage of several anti-discrimination laws, increased representation in the media, the progress of the passing of the SOGIE Equality Bill, and the growing support during Filipino pride parades. Although there is still a long way for the Filipino LGBTQ+ to be at par with the rights of heterosexuals but the positive change in the country serves as a hope for liberation.

accessing healthcare and employment).³⁹ Although there have been improvements in the status quo, such as the existence of pride parades and initiatives such as De La Salle University allowing LGBTQ+ students to dress according to their gender identity, these changes do not signify full recognition of the LGBTQ+ community in the country. There remain significant legal, political, and social challenges that hinder the complete acknowledgment and protection of their rights. For instance, despite these progressive steps, comprehensive anti-discrimination laws are often lacking, and societal acceptance varies widely. This disparity can lead to inconsistencies in how LGBTQ+ rights are respected across different regions and sectors. Legal frameworks may not sufficiently protect against discrimination in employment, housing, and healthcare, and political support can be sporadic, influenced by prevailing cultural attitudes and the political climate. To move toward full recognition and protection of LGBTQ+ rights, a multi-faceted approach is necessary. This should include enacting and enforcing comprehensive anti-discrimination laws, educating the public to foster acceptance, and understanding, and empowering the LGBTQ+ community through supportive policies and practices (i.e., the deconstruction of institutions and practices that directly contradicts the policies and practices that aim for co-existence). Only through concerted efforts across all levels of society can true equality and recognition be achieved for the LGBTQ+

³⁹ LGBTQ+ individuals can be refused from applying for a job because of bigotry and discrimination ideals as some employers hold. The caveat here is that it is not the same for every region and community in the Philippines (i.e., some communities do not have anti-discrimination laws that protect LGBTQ+ in the workplace). This is reaffirmed by the article of Dacanay (2017), which explains that there is a lack of policies protecting the LGBTQ+ in the workplace (i.e., protection from harassment, prejudice, and oppression which has been backed by statements coming from LGBTQ employees in various companies in the Philippines). Dacanay identifies that conservatism and religious beliefs combined with the lack of policies to protect them have exacerbated the threat and inaccessibility of LGBTQ+ employees compared to their heterosexual counterparts (J. M. Dacanay, In the shadow of equality: A study of Philippine workplaces' policies on LGBTQ employees," *Kasarinlan: Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 32, no. 2, 62-90).

population.⁴⁰ But it at least signifies that there is an improvement towards the acceptance and recognition of the LGBTQ+ rights in the Philippines.⁴¹ The PGC can be applied to recognize the rights of the LGBTQ+ community and to bestow them the same privileges as their heterosexual counterparts possess. The framework in achieving social justice for the LGBTQ+ community in the Philippines can be explained in threefold: (1) The recognition of LGBTQ+ rights such as the existence of discourse regarding the implementation of protection against discrimination, and the existence of pride parades is progress that should be celebrated. However, even if these milestones have been reached, it does not mean that the plights and struggles of the community goes beyond the benefits of right to citizenship (i.e., access to education and work).⁴² The PGC instills that the community must be granted recognition and every right that the majority have (i.e., recognizing their right to legal marriage and adoption, full access to healthcare (i.e., LGBTQ+ related illness, and protections from gender-based discrimination), (2) Anti-

⁴⁰ Although there are issues that the LGBTQ+ community experience that some members do not experience, i.e., some may come from a privileged background or the successful passage of ordinances in their community. This does not mean it is a general scenario for every LGBTQ+ member in the country. There is still the need to acknowledge the current issues they face, for example, legal discrimination wherein, even if there are municipalities that have passed anti-discrimination laws (e.g., Quezon City, Davao City, and Baguio), same-sex marriage is still illegal and frowned upon in the country. The right to legally change their gender identity (i.e., transgender individuals have trouble accessing gender-affirming surgery since there are little to no laws in the country). It is also not as accessible compared to countries such as the United States of America, India, and Thailand.

⁴¹ A similar reading from Katy Steinmetz (2014) discusses how the trans movement has greater power in the pop-culture but conservatives have greater power in the political sphere in the US. Therefore, cancelling people is easier after a transphobic statement in the mainstream culture but passing trans-protection rights is impossible in congress. Likewise in the Philippine scenario, there is an increasing support for the movement, however, there are still existing barriers that prevent the community from achieving full recognition.

⁴² This does not generalize that the majority of LGBTQ+ individuals in the Philippines do not have access to education since there are LGBTQ+ teachers, supervisors, and students at status quo. But this claim means that a portion of LGBTQ+ individuals suffer from inaccessibility through various form of discrimination (i.e., verbal abuse, cyberbullying, and exclusion).

Discrimination, and (3) Awareness. By adhering to these principles, the PGC offers a robust framework for advancing the rights and acceptance of the LGBTQ+ community, emphasizing the need for comprehensive legal protections, societal awareness, and equal recognition under the law. These steps are fundamental for moving towards a more just and inclusive society.

To opine, the existence of conservative values, and the generalization that because they have obtained a small section of progressive ideals manifested through tolerance leads to a slippery slope assumption that the conditions of the community are no longer deemed as an oppressed group. The PGC provides a valuable framework for advocating the rights of the LGBTQ+ community, particularly in conservative settings. By grounding the conversation in universal principles of human rights and moral consistency, the PGC offers a structured way for the community to articulate why they are deserving of the rights they seek. It enables a dialogue that goes beyond mere demands, framing their rights as inherent and aligned with the broader principles that govern ethical human interactions. Utilizing the PGC, advocates can effectively humanize the LGBTQ+ community, showcasing that their rights are not special privileges but basic necessities that uphold their dignity as individuals. This approach is especially powerful in conservative countries where traditional views often obscure the understanding of LGBTQ+ issues. By emphasizing common human values and the universal need for dignity, justice, and equality, the PGC can help bridge gaps in understanding and foster a more inclusive atmosphere. This strategic framing makes it possible to engage more constructively with opponents and skeptics, using the principled basis of the PGC to explain the fundamental reasons why the LGBTQ+ community's rights should be recognized and protected. Such an approach not only advocates for rights but also educates and shifts public perception, potentially leading to more progressive societal norms. Hence, the Principle of Generic Consistency (PGC) supports the liberation and recognition of all rights for the LGBTQ+ community. This framework advocates for societal acceptance of changes that ensure everyone is treated equally and has access to all rights and opportunities, regardless of sexual orientation. The PGC emphasizes

that rights should be universally respected and protected, promoting an inclusive environment where all individuals can freely express their identities and enjoy the same privileges and legal protections. This commitment to equality and justice is fundamental to building a fair and progressive society.⁴³

Moreover, the individualistic justice exemplified in the Principle of Generic Consistency (PGC) highlights the importance of an individual's dignity and autonomy. In the context of the LGBTQ+ community, this means not discriminating based on gender or sexual orientation. The PGC underscores the significance of equal rights and the protection of all agents within society. Gewirth's framework challenges traditional norms and values that promote discrimination against LGBTQ+ members, potentially leading to significant changes in the legal and policy dynamics of a society. This could include the recognition of same-sex relationships, improvements in healthcare services, and consistent implementation of anti-discrimination policies. Furthermore, the PGC can be used to challenge traditional norms, such as the binary view of gender identity as solely male or female. It establishes a framework for pursuing personal happiness and fulfillment, where an LGBTQ+ individual can envision their life flourishing—for example, being able to marry and dismantling the fear of exclusion. Another related aspect is that the PGC posits that suppressing someone's rights because of their sexual orientation constitutes discrimination, which is contrary to the values of equality and fairness promoted in Filipino culture. This connects with the concept of civil liberties, asserting that individuals have an inherent right to the freedoms afforded to them in society, including the right to exercise freedom and equality.⁴⁴ That is to say that it aims to evolve into something that accommodates other

⁴³ This means that the LGBTQ+ community deserve to be awarded with equal rights like their heterosexual counterparts.

⁴⁴ Similar to Ranciere's book *On the Shores of Politics*, aims for individuals to act and become engaged to political activism in their society. Political activism is important to challenge power structures that promote structures of inequality. This activism prioritizes engagement with these structures and individuals who have a different perspective to come up with a common solution (Jacques Rancière, *On the Shores of Politics* (Verso), 2007.)

concerns and not just basic civil and political liberties. With this, the dominance of the discourse, and the constant exchange of ideas, liberal feminism for example has been able to be more intersectional.⁴⁵

Simply put, it has been able to accommodate under the framework of reform nuances such as black lives, class struggle, racism, discrimination, and gender minorities. It has also supported reforms in other forms of gender-based discourses like for example respecting women's autonomy of their bodies through legislation that prioritizes birth control or legislation that has childcare or legal abortion. Improving quotas in legislations, analyze the inadequacies of previous gender-based policies and provide insights as well as suggestions for political reformation of said policies strengthen and establish political and civil liberties. It is a necessary human right to access other liberties, in the global arena. This highlights the consequences of having an unjust political system that lacks laws and regulations to protect and promote the rights of women and even when there is the mandate of the protection of everyone's rights. In contrast, there needs to be the existence of a government which prioritizes: (1) survival and protect the notion (2) basic needs and services, and (3) liberty and welfare of its constituents. The prevailing circumstances however has resulted to the continued existence of gender-based discrimination and oppression which is evident because of the arbitrary views and ideals that overshadows radical progress as such there are still those from the community who are discriminated in the workplace and at their own home. This implies that we need laws, legislations, and we will only get that through a collective promotion that is possible when the plights of the women community are acknowledged.

CONCLUSION

In sum, the overarching aim of this paper is to provide a moral and ethical framework that can facilitate progress for the status of the LGBTQ+ community in the Philippines. Alan Gewirth's Principle of

⁴⁵ This can also be used to defend and explain the intricacies that the LGBTQ+ community experiences worldwide.

Generic Consistency offers a fresh perspective and supplementary material for addressing the moral obligations of individuals within a state—specifically, acting in accordance with moral law to foster a just society. This framework establishes that acts of discrimination against individuals are indefensible, and no amount of justification can reverse the impact on its victims.

As a principled argument, the PGC promotes coherence and consistency in individual actions as a strategy to raise awareness about these inconsistencies and to scrutinize existing laws. This is crucial for protecting state constituents from violence and preserving their rights, including autonomy, freedom, and well-being. Utilizing Gewirth's Principle of Generic Consistency as the primary analysis in this thesis, it is concluded that the principle helps determine whether an agent's actions align with universal moral principles. This analysis assesses the effects of an agent's actions on their recipients, considering if the same actions were reciprocated. Moreover, this framework is not only applicable to individual decision-making but also serves as a tool to evaluate the consistency of laws. For example, it can be used to check if similar laws passed in various regions of the country are based on the same principles and enforce similar sanctions. This approach helps to avoid confusion in the implementation and interpretation of laws, such as the anti-discrimination laws passed in different regions of the Philippines. Inconsistencies in these laws can lead to legal ambiguities and inefficiencies, thereby failing to protect the rights of those harmed and restricting their access to legal recourse.

Thus, the PGC asserts that we must adhere to universal moral principles, emphasizing the importance of safeguarding and upholding the rights of individuals and their recipients. Additionally, employing the Gewirthian framework is vital for elucidating the challenges faced by the LGBTQ+ community in the Philippines. The PGC can challenge societal barriers and discriminatory policies, aiding in identifying regulatory inconsistencies that hinder access to legal recourse and the protection of rights.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bauhn, Per. "Gewirthian Positive Duties Reconsidered." In *Johanssonian Investigations: Essays in Honour of Ingvar Johansson on His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by Christer Svennerlind, Jan Almäng, and Rögnvaldur Ingthorsson, 1st ed., 81–95. De Gruyter, 2013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvbkjxwd.8>.
- Bauhn, Per. "The Gewirthian Duty to Rescue." *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 10, no. 1 (2007): 49–63. doi: 10.1007/s10677-006-9038-1.
- Beyleveld, Deryck. "The Principle of Generic Consistency as the Supreme Principle of Human Rights." *Human Rights Rev* 13, (2012): 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12142-011-0210-2>.
- Beyleveld, Deryck. *The Dialectical Necessity of Morality: An Analysis and Defense of Alan Gewirth's Argument to the Principle of Generic Consistency*. University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Cohen, Stephen. "Gewirth's Rationalism: Who Is a Moral Agent?" *Ethics* 89, no. 2 (1979): 179–90. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2380028>.
- Cragg, Wesley. "Ethics, Enlightened Self-interest, and the Corporate Responsibility to Respect Human Rights: A Critical Look at the Justificatory Foundations of the UN Framework." *Business Ethics Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (2012): 9–36. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23223697>.
- Floro, Jayson, and Rianne Umali. "A Review of Bullying and Homophobic Discrimination Against Filipino LGBTQ Youth." *Kasarinlan: Philippine Journal of Third World Studies* 35, no. 1 (2020): pp. 76–105.
- Freeman, Michael. "The Philosophical Foundations of Human Rights." *Human Rights Quarterly* 16, no. 3 (1994): 491–514. <https://doi.org/10.2307/762434>.

Friedman, Richard B. "The Basis of Human Rights: A Criticism of Gewirth's Theory." *Nomos* 23 (1981): 148–57. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24219091>.

Gewirth, Alan. *Human Rights Essays on Justification and Applications*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

_____. *Reason and Morality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

_____. *Self-Fulfillment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

_____. *The Community of Rights*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Gewirth, Alan. "Can Utilitarianism Justify Any Moral Rights?" *Nomos* 24 (1982): 158–93. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24219450>.

_____. *Democracy and the Problem of Free Speech*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1998, 3.

_____. *Human Rights: Essays on Justification and Applications*. University of Chicago Press, 155-156.

_____. "The Basis and Content of Human Rights." *Nomos* 23 (1981): 119–147. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24219090>.

_____. "The Rationality of Rights and Duties." *The Philosophical Quarterly* 26, no. 104 (1976): 241-245.

_____. "Why There Are Human Rights." *Social Theory and Practice* 11, no. 2 (1985): 235–48. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23559758>.

Hermosa, Janet. *Health Needs and Health Care Experiences of Filipino Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Persons: A Review of the Literature*.

- MacDougall, Susan. "Felt Unfreedom: Reflecting on Ethics and Gender in Jordan." *Ethnos* 86, no. 3 (2019): 510-529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00141844.2019.1668449>.
- Mack, Eric. "Gewirth's Principle of Generic Consistency: Its Scope and Limits." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 44, no. 2 (1983): 207-227. doi: 10.2307/2107713.
- McKeon, Richard. "Discussion and Resolution in Political Conflicts." *Ethics* 54, no. 4 (1944): 235-62. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2988738>.
- Miles, Jennifer, and Laura Dawson. "The Art of Social Justice." *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* 34 (2012): 2-8. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/humjsoarel.34.2>.
- Montaña, Robert. "The Gewirthian Principle of Generic Consistency as a Foundation for Human Fulfillment: Unveiling a Rational Path for Moral and Political Hope." *Kritike* 3, no. 1 (2009): 31.
- Montaña, Robert. *Thomistic Ethics: A Beacon in the Contemporary Moral Landscape*, 2011, 21.
- Neu, Michael. *Series: Off the Fence: Morality, Politics, and Society*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2017.
- Nussbaum, Martha. "Capabilities and Social Justice." *International Studies Review* 4, no. 2 (2002): 123-35. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3186357>.
- Pons, Bo Fox. "A Rawlsian Revitalization of Gewirth's Normative Structure for Action." *Stance: An International Undergraduate Philosophy Journal* 4, no. 1 (2011) :79-89. <https://doi.org/10.33043/S.4.1.79-89>.
- Ramgotra, Manjeet. "Beyond Individualism: Freedom, Sociability and Justice." *ISRF*. Accessed September 23, 2021. <https://www.isrf.org/2021/09/23/beyond-individualism-freedom-sociability-and-justice/>.

- Ranciere, Jacques. *On the Shores of Politics*. London: New York: Verso, 2007.
- Regis, Edward. "Gewirth on Rights." *The Journal of Philosophy* 78, no. 12 (1981): 786–94. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2026249>.
- Rose, Todd. *Collective Illusions: How Narratives of Power and Punishment Shape Our Understanding of Success*. New York: HarperOne, 2021.
- Samar, Vincent. "A Gewirthian Framework for Protecting the Basic Human Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) People." *Journal of Human Rights* 15, no. 3 (2016): 381-395. doi: 10.1080/14754835.2016.1184262.
- Schrock, Thomas S. "The Rights to Punish and Resist Punishment in Hobbes's Leviathan." *The Western Political Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (1991): 853-90. Accessed August 28, 2021.
- Singer, Marcus G. "On Gewirth's Derivation of the Principle of Generic Consistency." *Ethics* 95, no. 2 (1985): 297–301. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2380343>.
- Zinn, Howard, and David Barsamian. *Conversations on History and Politics*. Harper Perennial, 2006.
- Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2005.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Yrein Canzon holds an undergraduate degree in Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy from one of the oldest universities in Asia, the University of Santo Tomas. Her primary research interests in the field of Philosophy include Gewirthian, Political, and Feminist Philosophy. Yrein is a decorated debater and adjudicator who has participated in both national and international tournament. Some of her notable tournaments include the Philippine Intercollegiate Debating Championship, Uhuru Worlds, and the Asian Schools Debating Championship. She was the former President of the official debate varsity of the University of Santo Tomas, The Thomasian Debaters Council.

She is currently pursuing her master's degree at Waseda University's Graduate School of Social Sciences under the Global Society Research program, focusing on International Relations. Her research focuses on the challenges and experiences of Japanese-Filipino children. Her goal is to aid in improving legal policies and provide solutions for the challenges that Japanese-Filipino children experience. Some of her research interest in the field of International Relations include cultural anthropology, hybrid peacebuilding, war memories, and conflict resolution.