



Unit 530, Richville Corporate Tower, Madrigal Business Park, 1107 Alabang-Zapote Rd., Muntinlupa City
Metro Manila, Philippines Tel. No. (02) 7987-2833; 8256-6863; 0917-5419370
E-Mail: allianceforthefamily@gmail.com Website: www.alfi.org.ph

2 May 2023

DR. GINA O. GONONG

Undersecretary, Curriculum and Teaching (CT)
Department of Education (DepEd)

Subject: Feedback on the Araling Panlipunan Draft Revised Curriculum for Grade 10

Dear Usec. Gonong:

We understand that you have invited the public or interested stakeholders to review and provide feedback on the draft Shaping Papers and revised Curriculum Guides for Kindergarten to Grade 10.

We are attaching our feedback on the Araling Panlipunan Revised Curriculum for Grade 10.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our views.

Very truly yours,

MARIA CONCEPCION S. NOCHE
President

ANNA KRISTINA COSIO-VITASA
Information Director

Comments on the Araling Panlipunan Curriculum, Grade 10
Draft Revised Curriculum of DepEd

1. Our school system was established to provide a safe learning environment for all students. Today, however, our schools are about to become social laboratories where young students are taught radical gender ideas and encouraged to experiment with gender. This is a dangerous scheme that can lead to confusion, mental health problems and even irreversible bodily harm among children, as we have already seen in other countries. Must we follow their example and put our young Filipino students at risk of suffering the same fate? [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
2. Under the Araling Panlipunan Revised Curriculum for Grade 10, it will be taught that there are a number of genders that students must learn to respect (“paggalang sa iba’t-ibang kasarian”). The mere fact that the curriculum adopts its concept of gender from the Gender Theory/Gender Ideology is by itself problematic.
3. Under the Gender Theory/Gender Ideology, the assumption is that gender is a spectrum that is not necessarily linked to biological sex. It includes the gender category “non-binary,” which means something akin to unlimited gender choices. It consists of anything beyond the historic male-female binary understanding of gender. This can include new terms such as “transgender,” “nongender,” “polygender,” “agender,” “demigender,” “gender queer,” “gender fluid,” “pangender,” and so on and so forth. The list continues to grow despite not having any scientific basis. A new gender is added every so often based solely on feelings, imagination or whatever is trendy at the moment.
4. This Gender Theory speaks of a gradual process of denaturalization, that is, a move away from nature. It is predicated upon a precarious ideology that denies fundamental realities about human beings. It is a fictitious construct that defines gender as merely the product of historical and cultural conditioning. Gender would then become an individual decision, which can change as often as one wants. It fosters a personal identity and emotional intimacy that is radically divorced from reality — from the biological difference between male and female.
5. The Gender Theory was first introduced in the 1950s by controversial sexologist and psychologist, Dr. John Money. He was the one who coined the terms “gender roles” and “sexual orientation,” and popularized the term “gender identity.”^[6] Money asserted that gender can be removed from the realm of biology and that gender is learned (nurture) rather

than innate (nature). His famous experiment to support his theory, however, was later revealed to have been fundamentally flawed.

In 1966, the parents of twin boys sought Money's advice after one of their sons had a botched circumcision that left eight-month-old David Reimer (born Bruce Reimer) without a penis. Money convinced the baby's parents to transition him into a girl. He was reassigned to be raised as female and his name was changed from Bruce to Brenda. During childhood, Reimer was never told he was biologically male and regularly visited Money, who tracked the progress of his gender reassignment. Money published a number of papers to reinforce his theories on gender fluidity and to justify that gender identity is primarily learned.

However, Reimer later revealed that contrary to Money's reports — when living as Brenda, he did not identify as a girl. He said he had always felt that he was a boy and neither dresses nor female hormones made him feel female. He also revealed how Money abused him and his twin brother, who was also part of Money's research on sexual development and gender in children. Some of Money's "treatment sessions" included Money coercing the two children to simulate sexual acts on each other, which Money later photographed "for research purposes". Eventually, Reimer's parents told him the truth, and at the age of 15, he transitioned back into a boy, taking the name David. Reimer suffered severe depression throughout his life and finally committed suicide at the age of 38; his brother died at the age of 36 from an overdose.^[7]

Money's view of gender malleability became the popular view in the field as his initial report on Reimer was that the reassignment had been a success. However, this claim was disproved once the truth about Reimer came to light. In attempting to demonstrate that one's maleness or femaleness had no relationship to one's biological sex, Money only succeeded in proving the opposite. Nevertheless, Money's gender theory was adopted by mainstream psychology and continues to be the driving force of gender ideology to this day.

6. The notion that gender is something an individual can choose at his or her own whim is very dangerous, that the American College of Pediatricians (ACPeds) had come out to reject all policies that conditioned children to accept as normal a life of subjective, chemical and surgical impersonation of the opposite sex. "Facts – not ideology – determine reality," they asserted. "Human sexuality is binary by design with the obvious purpose being the reproduction and flourishing of our species. This principle is self-evident. The rare disorders of sex development are all medically identifiable deviations from the sexual binary norm, and are rightly recognized as disorders of human design."

ACPeds further explained that "no one is born with an awareness of themselves as male or female. This awareness develops over time and, like all developmental processes, may be derailed by a child's subjective perceptions, relationships, and adverse experiences from

infancy forward. People who identify as ‘feeling like the opposite sex’ or ‘somewhere in between’ do not comprise a third sex. They remain biological men or biological women.”

These people, however, may be suffering from an objective psychological problem called “gender dysphoria.” Gender dysphoria (GD), formerly listed as Gender Identity Disorder (GID), is a recognized mental disorder in the most recent edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association (DSM-5). According to the DSM-5, as many as 98% of gender-confused boys and 88% of gender-confused girls eventually accept their biological sex after naturally passing through puberty. The psychodynamic and social learning theories of GD/GID have never been disproved.^[8]

7. Apart from the fact that gender theory is based on ideology rather than science, it also goes against the teaching of various religions practiced in our country. Incorporating it into the school curriculum constitutes a violation of religious freedom and belief where this gender ideology is rejected by the Catholic Church as well as many Christian denominations, Muslims, etc.
8. It also leads to the erosion of parental rights as primary educators of their children. It is primarily within the family that children can learn to recognize the beauty of sexual difference. This parental right and duty cannot be delegated or usurped by others.

Must our schools and law enforcement be leveraged to divide our families, even separating parents from children because of these unfounded and radical gender ideas?

9. The Alliance for the Family Foundation Philippines, Inc. (“ALFI”) supports the need to educate children and young people to respect every person in their particularity and difference, so that no one should suffer bullying, violence, insults or unjust discrimination based on their specific characteristics (such as special needs, race, religion, sexual tendencies, etc.)

Unfortunately, including gender ideology in the DepEd curriculum in the manner indicated seeks to legitimize a progressive sexual orthodoxy on the next generation. Infusing this unscientifically founded ideology into education would harm children’s minds, bodies, and their relationships with their families. It would harm children’s minds by promoting the concept that gender identity is fluid and that one can “transition” from one sex to the other. It is an anthropological disorientation that will only lead to further distress, confusion and even greater crisis amongst our youth.

It will also eventually penalize people who think, speak, or act on their own religious, moral, and/or scientific beliefs that there are two sexes or that marriage is between a man and a woman.

10. ALFI challenges the inclusion of this gender ideology in the Araling Panlipunan revised curriculum for Grade 10. For the aforementioned reasons, ALFI believes that the inclusion will be detrimental to the best interest of our school children and our youth and a great disservice to the constitutional mandate for educational institutions to “teach the rights and duties of citizenship, strengthen ethical and spiritual values, (and) develop moral character and personal discipline.”

References:

1. Greene, Jay P. (June 2022). “Puberty Blockers, Cross-Sex Hormones, and Youth Suicide”. The Heritage Foundation. <https://www.heritage.org/gender/report/puberty-blockers-cross-sex-hormones-and-youth-suicide>
2. Buttons, Christina. (September 2022). “Detransitioner Chloe Cole Gives Powerful Testimony Against ‘Gender-Affirming Care’ At Capitol”. The Daily Wire. <https://www.dailywire.com/news/detransitioner-chloe-cole-gives-powerful-testimony-against-gender-affirming-care-at-white-house>
3. “Science, the Transgender Phenomenon, and the Young”. <https://youtu.be/DWbxIFC0Q2o>
4. “Irreversible Damage?” <https://youtu.be/fSKQfATa-1I>
5. "Trans Study Claiming To Debunk ‘Social-Contagion’ Theory – Proves The Opposite". The Daily Wire. <https://bit.ly/3R0fGBk>
6. Ehrhardt, Anke A. (August 2007). "John Money, PhD". The Journal of Sex Research. 44 (3): 223–224. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00224490701580741>
7. Gaetano, Phil, "David Reimer and John Money Gender Reassignment Controversy: The John/Joan Case". Embryo Project Encyclopedia (2017-11-15). ISSN: 1940-5030 <http://embryo.asu.edu/handle/10776/13009>
8. “Gender Ideology Harms Children - American College of Pediatricians” https://acpeds.org/assets/imported/9.14.17-Gender-Ideology-Harms-Children_updated-MC.pdf
Also available here: <https://alfi.org.ph/2017/10/gender-ideology-harms-children-2/>