Journal of Philosophy and Linguistics
Research Article Peer-review, Open Access

Social Constructionism as an Attack on Substance: Intimations from Aristotle

Asongwe Pride Tabifor [1]

Shang Nelson [2]

Abstract: This paper examines the prevailing evolution of social constructionism attack on substance in today's world, with a metaphysical response from Aristotle's notion of substance. The rise of social constructionism in contemporary philosophical discourse presents a challenge to classical metaphysical perspectives with its contingency of categories such as identity, knowledge and reality which turns to erode the notion of inherent essences and stable ontological structures. By this perspective, reality is perceived and shaped by social interactions. As far as Aristotle is concerned, *Ousia* (substance) is the fundamental reality that exists independently of all existence. It is used to understand the nature of reality, identity and existence. We examine through the lense of Aristotle, homosexuality, transgender and artificial being propounded by the social constructionists. As such, the objective of this paper is to reject the propaganda of social constructionism and to offer an alternative view to social constructionism, preserving a realist metaphysical response of substance while acknowledging the social dimension of human existence. How is social constructionism an attack on substance?

Keywords: Social Constructionism, Substance, Reality, Essence, Existence, LGBTQ+ Agenda.

[1] *Ph.D Research Fellow, The University of Bamenda*
[2] *The University of Bamenda*

Introduction

The technological way of life is seen as rich in styles and opportunities, pregnant with radical innovations and open to a promising future for social construction of reality. Social constructionism refers to the view that knowledge, meaning and reality are constructed through social interactions and agreements within a particular culture or society. It emphasizes that our understanding of the world is shaped by social context

in which we live rather than being an objective reflection of reality.[1] It changes the way we live, work, play, communicate, fight and love. It changes our everyday reality. Our reality is shaped by the different phenomenological encounters which require a hermeneutical interpretation. Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann observed that reality and knowledge are constructed through social interactions. In line with this, they aver that reality a quality appertaining to phenomena that we recognize as having a being independent of our own volition and knowledge as the certainty that phenomena are real. The fundamental problem of social construction can be trace back in history with the German sociologist and philosophers.[2] Our everyday reality appears pre-ordained, and structured by meanings that are independent of individual consciousness in the world. This is an indication that reality is not discovered but interpreted through social interactions, language and practice. Berger and Luckmann noted that "social order is not part of nature of things…social order exists only as a product of human activity."[3] Social order is not biologically pre-given or natural but it is a continuously produced human artifact.

In this article, our pivotal preoccupation is to state that substance is the backbone to reality. It denotes the underlying reality that gives existence and meaning to the world around us. However, in recent times, this notion has come under intense challenge and attack by social constructionists by arguing that reality (substance) is constructed through social interactions and agreements rather than objective and inherent existence. For instance, categories like gender or race are seen as socially constructed challenging Aristotle's idea of essentialism, where substance has inherent properties that define their nature. Aristotle views that the *Ousia* (which is translated as substance or essence, being or reality) is primarily substance which is fundamentally reality that exists independently or underlies all existence. It is considered the underlying reality that defines an entity.[4] In his opinion, "to be or not to be" is not the question.[5] Substance is an individual distinct entity with unique characteristics and has a fundamental nature or essence that defines its being.[6] If reality is constructed through social interactions and agreements, how then can substance have an objective existence independent of social context? From the question, one can deduce that the articles seek to critically examine the relevance of substance in contemporary society.

THE CHARACTER OF SUBSTANCE

Substance is the underlying reality. The thing which exists independently and not dependent on anything else for its existence[7] and unifies the whole into integrated parts[8] Aristotle notes that the word 'substance' is applied at least to four main objects, viz. the essence, the universal, the genus and the substratum. This term shows that substance is autonomous and works in line with reality. Substance is independent and does not require any other thing in order to exist. The concept of existence shows that substance possesses the *eidos* (essence) of a thing. Essence is the fundamental nature of a thing. The *ousia* is closely tied to essence. Substance actualizes its essence by fulfilling its purpose. This suggests that substance realizes its essence as its ultimate purpose or fulfilling a thing's nature. As such, a thing cannot exist without an essence. Indeed, the concept of existence has also undergone many changes over time. Existence means 'to be at hand,' 'to be present' in a materialistic and realistic sense, whether with or without the presence of a thing.[9] Aristotle justifies the need to know something about *ousia* quite differently.[10] Aristotle says "the term *being* is said in many ways, but with respect to some unique physis and not simply equivocally."[11] Thus *to be* must have a unity of its own kind. His task, thus, is now to

---

1. Peter Berger et Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Anchor Books, London, 1996, P. 2.
2. *Ibid*., P. 14.
3. *Ibid*, P. 70.
4. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII, 1, 1028a32-b2.
5. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII, X, 1029a5-12.
6. *Ibid.*,
7. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII.1, 1028a10-15
8. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII.3, 1029a5-10
9. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII. 1, 1028a10-15
10. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z 6, 144b4–11
11. *Ibid*.,

understand what this 'first and one' which Aristotle calls prote *ousia* really is, and this is the reason why *ousia* becomes the theme and why we have to raise the question of being. These four objects seem to each have the possibility of being the solution to the question of what substance truly is. His treatment of it shows that his preference of the object of substance is the essence which he will later on use interchangeably with the form.

The Substratum of Substance

Aristotle, in the *Metaphysics,* devotes his treatment of subjecthood as substance. The idea has to do mostly with the relationship between substance and accidents. It brings out the fact that substance is that which underlies everything primarily and serves as a support for the accidents. The latter exist only because they bear a certain relation to substance and depend on it for their very existence. Through the notions of matter and form, Aristotle attempts a solution to what is truly substance. He holds that:

The substratum is that of which the other things are predicated, while it is itself not predicated of anything else. And so we must first determine the nature of this; for that which underlies a thing primarily is thought to be in the truest sense its substance. And in one sense matter is said to be of the nature of substratum, in another, shape, and in a third sense, the composite of these.[12]

Now, substratum is that which is neither said of nor in a subject, it aptly represents Aristotle's substance as primary in all senses. Thus, it stands beneath and determines its nature. This is because to define substance as "that which is not predicated of a subject, but of which all else is predicated,"[13] is not enough but still ambiguous. This is what he says: "It is agreed that there are some substances among sensible things, so that we must look first among these. For, it is an advantage to advance to that which is more intelligible."[14] In line with Aristotle, therefore, it is best to begin by looking at the composite of matter and form, the concrete thing.

Form as inherent to reality

The form is not only the shape of a thing, as was illustrated in Aristotle's example of the bronze statue in examining the validity and later the rejection of the composite as substance. If this were the case, the form will only be something external to the reality and will not truly testify to the thing in itself, to the ultimate substratum.[15] Form, therefore, is external as that which is given to the senses empirically and in experience in the like of shape when combined with matter. For example, the square shape of a box. More so, as substance, form is an intrinsic principle, not an element or elements of a thing, for, it is this that is the primary cause of its being. Aristotle explains:

As regards that which is compounded out of something so that the whole is one—not like a heap, however, but like a syllable, —the syllable is not its elements… The syllable, then, is something—not only its elements (the vowel and the consonant) but also something else; and the flesh is not only fire and earth or the hot and the cold, but also something else.

Since, then, that something must be either an element or composed of elements…it would seem that this is something, and not an element, and that it is the cause which makes *this* thing flesh and *that* a syllable. And similarly in other cases. And this is the substance of each thing; for this is the primary cause of its being…which is not an element but a principle.[16]

Regarding the nature of substance, therefore, it is the form that truly qualifies as substance *per se* and not the composite or the matter out of which things are made, because "if the form is prior to the matter and more real, it will be prior to the compound also for the same reason."[17] Two of the four objects that were

[12]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics,* VII, 3, 1028b35-1029a4.
[13]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics,* VII, 3, 1029a7.
[14]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics,* 1029a34.
[15]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics,* VII, 17, 1041b10.
[16]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics,* VII, 17, 1041b11-1042a1.
[17]. *Ibid.,* VII, 3, 1029a6.

presented in the *Metaphysics*, as possible ways of being substance have now been treated with the establishment of form or essence as primary substance.

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM

According to Berger and Luckmann, social construction of reality is the process whereby objective reality is rejected in order to create a new reality through human interactions. It challenges the notion of objectivity.[18] Constructionism is the process in which reality is created by the observer. A person creates reality by giving meaning to what he has observed. Our process of socialization leads us to particular reality which shapes our reality of the world. To speak about social construction, three parts are considered: What is it to be constructed, what is constructed and what constructs? Thus, reality and knowledge are socially constructed. The postmodernists took social constructionism to an extreme[19] by rejecting objective truth[20] and language which shaped our reality.[21] Postmodernists formulated the premise that no one true reality exists, knowledge or what we believe in is seen as an expression of language, values and beliefs of particular communities and the context in which one finds oneself. Consequently, social constructionism can be said to question that which is defined by humans or by a society to be reality.

Social Constructs and Reality

A social construct is anything that exists by virtue of social interactions as opposed to objective reality. It is also considered as that which exists as an integral part of our society. It can represent an idea or notion that appears to be natural and obvious to people who accept it but may or may not represent reality, so it is at times considered largely as an artifice pertaining to a given society or community. The relationship between social construct and reality shape our understanding of reality through the following social constructs: gender roles and identities, racial and ethnic categories, social class and status, language and symbols and norms and values.[22] This implies that social constructs can challenge and change our understanding of nature[23] with its significant role in power dynamics.[24] Also, social reality in this context can only be created by virtue of our interactions in society. It influences our understanding of gender by shaping our expectations and norms around masculinity and femininity.[25] Gender is constantly created and recreated out of relational interaction, out of social life and social situation. It is the dominant force in our everyday activities and practices. It is a human construction that is dependent on those "doing gender". This creates symbolic interaction which is the source of identification. Such recognizes that the construction of reality through interaction occur between people, help to shape and influence individuals. As such, the repetition in everyday life of these actions and practices are becoming routinised.[26]

Daily life with social interaction

Berger and Luckman employ the phenomenological method to examine the reality of everyday life. To them, everyday life presents itself as a reality interpreted by men/women and subjectively meaningful to them as coherent world.[27] This reality is marked by consciousness either internally or externally. Multiple realities present themselves to us, the reality of everyday life is of the highest level. The reality of everyday life presents itself to me as an inter-subjective world, a world I share with others. Inter-

---

[18]. Peter Berger et Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, P. 18.
[19]. Jean Francois Lyotard, *The Postmodern Conditions: A Report on Knowledge*, Manchester University Press, England, 1984, P. 11.
[20]. Jacques Derrida, *Writing and difference*, The University of Chicago Press, London, 1967, P. 290.
[21]. Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Editions Gallimard, France, 1969, P. 21.
[22]. John Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1969, P. 125.
[23]. Anthony Giddens, *The Constitution of the Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, University of California Press, California, 1984, PP. 20-22.
[24]. Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, P. 8.
[25]. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, London, 1990, P. 2.
[26]. Catherine-Kelly Mason, *The Social Construction of Gender and Leadership and the Impact of these Paradoxical Constructs on the Lived Experience of Women CEO'S*, Ph.D Thesis, Maynooth University, October 2023, PP. 72-73.
[27]. *Ibid*., PP. 33-34.

subjective world differentiates the reality of everyday life from other realities. I exist in everyday life by interacting and communicating with others. The world of everyday life is structured spatially and temporally. It is the case whereby the reality of everyday life is shared with others.[28] Also, there is a question of how others themselves experience everyday life. The most important experience of others takes place in the face-to-face situation which is the prototypical case of social interaction. According to Berger and Luckman, knowledge is created by the interaction of individuals within the society. To them, the division of labour gives rise to experts knowledge in the society.[29] For an individual to be given the chance to focus on a particular path shows that he is subject to change and interpretations.[30]

Liquid Generation

The term liquid modernity explains a multiverse universe of things that are happening in the modern or contemporary society. The term liquidity presents a quality of liquids and gases in contradistinction to solidity which stands for a foreseeable and workable world or conventional world.[31] This involves an observation of a social change that desires to unseal the consequences of advanced social differentiation and estrangement[32] Fluids are bound to undergo continuous change in shape when subjected to such a stress that enables them to experience change.[33] The term modernity etymologically originates from the word modern which comes from the Latin word *modus* which means now or the present. It involves the positive probability of a new beginning on the basis of human autonomy and consciousness of the legitimacy of the present, the now.[34] This signifies a certain tension within the modern society for it finds itself in a process by which the society is in constant renewal of itself with the LGBTQ+ agenda.[35] Little or no agreement is established about its cultural features. Most often it is associated with the tendency of fragmentation of experience, commodification, rationalization of all aspects of life and a speeding up the speed of daily life.[36] To this effect, affiliates modernity with, the modes of social life and changes in Europe beginning from the 17th century, which to him became worldwide in their influence.[37] When Bauman makes reference to Theodore Adorno, he explains that the modern spirit promotes LGBTQ+ agenda.[38] The contemporary man wants new experiences every second, minute, hour and day of his life. This person does not want any repeated event, activities or experiences, he wants constant and fresh things with his experience of life. Thus, liquid modernity describes this altitude of the modern man where he experiences change like a liquid, new activities and things as stress subjects him to desire for a change. He or she abides by the new form of reality which rejects essentialism.

Gender as a Social Construct.

Judith Butler suggests that gender is performed through repeated acts, gestures, and expressions, which reinforce and challenge societal norms.[39] To her, gender does not exist and only sex exists. There are zero gender and two sexes. We must reject this idea of gender. At such, gender is a scam.[40] Social

---

[28]. Peter Berger et Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, P. 43.
[29]. Peter Berger et Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, P. 45.
[30]. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962, P. 15.
[31]. Peter Beilharz, *Bauman And Heller: Two Views of Modernity And Culture",* IN *Comparative Literature: East & West*, 1(1), 2017, P. 54.
[32]. Raymond L.M Lee, Reinventing Modernity: *Reflexive Modernization Vs Liquid Modernity Vs Multiple Modernities*, in European Journal Of Social Theory. 9 (1), 2006, PP. 355-356.
[33]. *Ibid*., P. 355.
[34]. Gerard Deranty, *"Modernity"* IN The Blackwell Encyclopedia Of Sociology, G. Ritzer (ed.),Blackwell Publishing, 2007, P. 3068.
[35]. *Ibid*., P. 3068.
[36]. Nicolas Abercrombie Et Ali., *(*Eds*.), "Modernity"* in The Penguin Dictionary Of Sociology, Third Edition, Penguin Books, 1984, PP. 269-270.
[37]. Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences Of Modernity*, Stamford University Press, 1990, P. 1.
[38]. Zygmunt Bauman, *Lessons of the Holocaust,* 2012. [Online]Available on: https://www.Youtube.Com/Watch?V=EHeqz7ejo2c.
[39]. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, P. 13.
[40]. TikTok, the charlickirkshow, 18/03/2025, 8:00pm.

constructionism acknowledges that gender is not a fixed or binary concept, rather it is a complex and fluid spectrum.[41] It makes emphasis on constructed identity which can be seen as an undermining personal identity and autonomy, potentially leading to a loss of individual agency. To Chieh-Ling, personal life view is the social infrastructure of personhood which provides the backdrop within which personhood become possible.[42] So, personal identity is socially constructed.[43] It posits relativism which fosters moral confusion, moral clarity and decision-making.[44] Reality is constructed through social interactions, norms, and institutions. In this view, reality is not inherent, but rather negotiated and agreed upon by individuals within a social context.[45] As such, the concept of homosexuality as we understand it today is a relatively recent construction, dating back to the late 19th century. However, homosexuality has been perceived and constructed differently across cultures and historical periods, highlighting its social construction.[46] In the past, homosexuality was viewed as a mental illness or a medical condition, demonstrating how social constructionism can shape our understanding of human behavior. Social constructionism recognizes that homosexual identities are formed through social interactions, cultural norms, and power dynamics. Homosexuality challenges essentialism which posits that it is an inherent, biological trait. It emphasizes the role of power dynamics in shaping our understanding of homosexuality and the experiences of LGBTQ+ individuals.[47] This indicates that personal identity as socially constructed differs from the mind.[48]

By recognizing homosexuality as a social construct, social constructionism ignites strategies for social change, such as challenging discriminatory laws and promoting LGBTQ+ rights. By understanding homosexuality through the lens of social constructionism, we can better appreciate the complex interplay between social norms, power dynamics, and individual experiences that shape our understanding of human sexuality.[49] Similarly, transgender identity challenges traditional gender norms pointing the social construction of gender. Transgender people often perform and negotiate their gender identity through various means, such as clothing, makeup, and hormone therapy. Transgender individuals often resist and redefine traditional gender categories, creating new and complex understandings of gender. Social constructionism recognizes that transgender experiences are shaped by intersectional factors, such as race, class, and sexuality, which interact with power dynamics to influence individual experiences.[50] Social constructionism validates the experiences of transgender individuals, recognizing that their gender identity is real and legitimate and promotes a more inclusive understanding of gender. The construction of gender fights for social change such as promoting transgender rights and challenging discriminatory laws.[51]

AGAINST CONSTRUCTIONISM'S REJECTION OF ESSENCE

Social constructionists believe that things which are generally viewed as natural or normal in society, such as understandings of gender, race, class, and disability, are socially constructed, and consequently are not an accurate reflection of reality. Social constructs are often created within specific institutions and cultures and come to prominence in certain historical periods. They deny every reality and posit that it is socially constructed. Despite the views painted by the social constructionists, Aristotle in response that substance have inherent properties and essences that exist independently on social constructions.[52] With

---

[41]. Judith Lorber, *Paradoxes of Gender*, Yale University Press, New Heaven, 1994, P. 23.
[42]. Chieh-Ling Cheng, *The Social Construction of Personal Identity*, Ph.D, University of British Columbia, January 2023, 90.
[43]. *Ibid*., P. 102.
[44]. *Ibid*., P. 21.
[45]. Candace West et Don H. Zimmerman, *Doing Gender*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1987, P. 150.
[46]. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, P. 42.
[47]. Candace West et Don H. Zimmerman, *Doing Gender*, University of California Press, 1999, P. 127.
[48]. Chieh-Ling Cheng, *The Social Construction of Personal Identity*, 83.
[49]. Judith Lorber, *Paradoxes of Gender*, P. 17.
[50]. *Ibid*.,
[51]. Sandy Stone, "The Empire Strikes Back: A Post transsexual Manifesto", in *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, Durham, 1987, P. 152.
[52]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII, 3, 1029a5-10.

regards to inherent nature, Aristotle believes that substances are not created through human interactions but rather they exist independently and are discoverable through reason and observation.[53] This shows that essences are not constructed. Our society has basically rejected essence and seeks to construct reality, knowledge and gender which is the core of this article. Let us examine the issue below;

The Issue of Essence

Hermetically, reality is given and not constructed as perceived by social constructionism Essence is the definition of a thing that brings to light the nature and purpose of a thing.[54] It is what makes a thing what it is and it is the beginning of a thing. Human sexuality and relations are part of essence and *telos*.[55] One cannot make the reality of a thing outside a thing; it has no separate existence outside its essence. According to Aristotle, the essence exists in the thing. The essence of a thing is inherent in our very nature of the substance in which we are in existence. But in today's reality, our essence is something else.[56] Essence has been challenged by social constructionists who state that reality and gender are socially constructed. This is a rejection of essence which defines a thing. This has pushed us to consider; homosexuality, bisexual, artificial beings and robots as a manifestations of social constructionism.

LGBTQ+ Agenda

Aristotle's philosophy might be interpreted in relation to modern LGBTQ+ issues particularly through the lens of his notion of substance, teleology (purpose), and ethics. Aristotle argues that all entities have a *telos* (purpose) inherent in their nature.[57] For living beings, this *telos* is tied to their biological function and ultimate flourishing. Aristotle views procreation as the natural end or *telos* of sexual activity, rooted in his biological reproduction in animals and humans. He considered marriage as an institution for raising children and sustaining the polis. This implies that human beings have natural inclination towards certain behaviours and relationship. So, LGBTQ+ relationships and identities are not in accordance with natural law.[58] Aristotle is against LGBTQ+ relationships because same-sex relationships or non-procreative unions might be seen as deviating from this natural purpose, since they do not directly fulfill the biological function of reproduction.[59] Practising such will lead to end of marriage and definitely the world. Humans are meant to keep the natural reproduction continuous so as to ensure that there should be no time in the world that humans will not exist.

The essence of a thing is that which is said to be per se. It is that which specifies a thing and makes it what it is. It is not everything that is a thing per se or that constitutes the essence of that thing. In some way, the essence of a thing is related to its definition. A thing is believed not to differ from its *substance* and the essence is described as the substance as Aristotle says.[60] If the ideas are separated from their essence, they will be unknowable and the essence will not exist because we know a thing only when we know its essence. Aristotle's hierarchical view of gender such as men as rational rulers, women as passive supporters rejects gender fluidity or transgender identities, which challenge fixed biological and social categories.[61] Human beings have specific substantial form that defines their sexuality and relationships.[62] Aristotle's metaphysics posits that every entity has an essence and accidents. For humans, he tied essence to rationality and biological form. Aristotle categorizes humans based on biological sex (male/female) as fixed categories with distinct roles. So, transgender or non-binary identities might be interpreted as conflicting with this essential nature of man.[63] His hylomorphic theory of matter + form defines one's

---

[53]. Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, II, 19, 100a10-20.
[54]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, V, 14, 1020a10-20.
[55]. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1, 7, 1097b20-30.
[56]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII, 17, 1041b11-1042a12
[57]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, V, 14, 1020a10-20
[58]. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1, 2, 1252b10-20.
[59]. Aristotle, *Politics*, Bk, 1
[60]. Aristotle *Metaphysics*, John Warrington (trans.), P. 175.
[61]. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1, 2, 1252b12-15
[62]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII, 3, 1029a5-10
[63]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII, 3, 1029a5-10

unchanging essence, dismissing the validity of gender transitions. Aristotle's ethics emphasizes moderation, with virtues lying between extremes. The purpose is happiness for all.[64] Sexual behavior should align with temperance, self control and societal norms. LGBTQ+ individuals should strive for temperance and self control in their relationships and desires.[65] When this is practised it will create an arena of love and friendship. His praise of friendship as superior to physical pleasure used to devalue romantic LGBTQ+ relationships as less rational.[66] LGBTQ+ families, which often challenge patriarchal structures, might be framed as destabilizing Aristotle's ideal social order. His emphasis on stability and tradition is a weapon used against progressive social change. Modern science rejects rigid teleology; evolution has no purpose and human behavior is shaped by complex biological, social, and individual factors. LGBTQ+ identities are natural variations observed across cultures and species. This is the problem with homosexuality as both gays and lesbians are gradually distorting their essence.

The term homosexuality is based on the Greek word *homos*, which means the same, and the Latin word *sexus*, meaning sex.[67] Thus, homosexuality literally means the same sex or the same sexuality.[68] Homosexuality is socially constructed. However, let us make a clear distinction between homosexual persons and gay persons. Homosexual persons are those who have homosexual orientation, while gay persons are those who are practising homosexual acts. Homosexual orientation includes both one's conscious physical attraction for members of one's own sex and the fantasizing that has preceded it for years. It is sometimes called the homosexual condition, and it is not consciously willed by the person. It would be more accurate to say that the person discovers it than that he chooses it. Sometimes this inclination or attraction is not recognized by the person, because unconsciously, he does not want to admit that he has homosexual inclination; it is either passive or active. By passive we mean that the person is not frequently in the act as compared to the person who is actively involved in the act. It is the nurture of the man who actively practices the act which, in turn, has become his nature. He or she cannot do without it. Also, there are individuals who have all the tendencies of a homosexual but are not active into the act of homosexuality. Such persons, we can say portray deeply seated homosexual tendencies and if care is not taken, they can become active or passive in the act of homosexuality.[69] Aristotle's teleology, essentialism, and ethics are a critique of LGBTQ+ inclusion. His emphasis on reason and flourishing ultimately supports societies where all individuals can thrive authentically.

Artificial Being and Robots

Aristotle's response to the creation of artificial beings is a potential violation of natural order. He holds that human creations can imitate nature but cannot replicate it perfectly. So, the creation of artificial beings and robots lacks inherent essence and *telos* of natural substances.[70] Every entity has a *telos* intrinsic to its nature. Artificial beings, as human-made creations lack a *telos* grounded in natural processes. Such creation of artificial beings and robots will not possess potentiality and actuality because they are programmed and designed.[71] The artificial beings and robots are not living organisms as self-organizing entities with souls. They are composed of matter but lacking the natural form.[72] Aristotle argues that reproduction is a natural act to perpetuate species. Artificial beings, not born of natural reproduction, could be seen as "unnatural" deviations. Roles or norms are constructed. This defines their inherent essence.[73] There should be the continuation of the world with humans and not with artificial beings and robots. If the creation of artificial beings and robots are promoted, maybe in the next century

64. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, V, 1-5, 1129a10-1130a30.
65. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, III,, 10-12, 1117b15-1119a20
66. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, VVIII,-IX, 1155a10-1127a15
67. John F. Harvey, *The Homosexual Person*, Ignatius Press, USA, 1959, P. 2.
68. Joseph Donceel, *Philosophical Anthropology*, Sheed and Ward, New York, 1967, P. 371.
69. John F. Harvey, *The Homosexual Person*, P. 31.
70. Aristotle, *Physics*, II, 8, 199a10-20.
71. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, IX, 1-9, 1045b20-1051a30
72. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII, 3, 1029a5-10.
73. *Ibid.*,

there will be no humans on earth due to the elimination of marriage between a man and a woman and definitely procreation. Our purpose of living is to reproduce humans through the natural processes. The question then is, can these artificial beings be virtuous in nature? The answer is No, this is because they cannot practice virtues. Robots lack intentionality or moral responsibility. For Aristotle, ethics requires *phronesis* (practical wisdom), which presupposes a soul capable of deliberation.[74] Despite that, modern science rejects fixed purposes in nature due to the fact that purpose is not intrinsic and creating artificial beings could be ethically neutral or even beneficial. But Peter Singer thinks that if artificial beings and robots can experience pleasure or happiness then they should be treated with respect and dignity.[75] Still, he advocates that if artificial beings and robots have cognitive abilities like self-awareness, rationality and sentience then they should be granted personhood and corresponding.[76] This view attacks that of Aristotle response on substance. Maritain fights against this social constructs idea by maintaining that "man's right to existence, personal freedom and the pursuit of the perfection of moral life belongs to natural law."[77] This means that reality is a given and man's freedom and responsibility has to be in line with the natural law.

The Issue of Existence

Aristotle's concept of substance stipulates the inherent essence of a thing which defines its existence.[78] It emphasizes on the human nature with their sexual orientation and gender identity. Such must go in line with the law of nature.[79] The bold of contention is on the fact that existence precedes essence which suggests that human beings exist first and later develop their essence through their experiences and choices. This perspective is more incline to LGBTQ+ individuals. It supports the LGBTQ+ agenda. Kierkegaard criticizes Hegel for trying to capture all of reality in his system of thought, but losing in the process, the most important element.[80] To exist for Kierkegaard implies being a certain kind of individual, an individual who strives, who considers alternatives, who chooses and who above all, makes a commitment.[81] Sexual acts have natural ends because it is for procreation. Same-sex relationships, which do not fulfill this biological *telos*, might be deemed contrary to nature. The social role links virtue to fulfilling natural social roles such as husband and wife, citizen. Non-procreative relationships could be misread as failing to contribute to the continuity of the polis. So, if existence precedes essence, LGBTQ+ identities are valid self-expressions. Love, intimacy, and partnership are purposes defined by individuals, not biology. Simone De Beauvoir asserts that lesbians are humans who are hormonally imbalanced is erroneous; for there is nothing as faulty as to think that lesbianism is erroneous. Sexuality, she affirms, is not determined by anatomical destiny. It is socially constructed. There are two types of lesbians: those who try to act like men and feminine ones who are afraid of men. Whatever the type, it is a way of bringing about women's erotic freedom.[82] Homosexuality for a married woman is one attempt, among others, to reconcile her autonomy with the submissiveness of her flesh. And if nature is invoked, it could be said that every woman is naturally homosexual. The lesbian is characterized simply by her refusal of the male and her preference for feminine flesh.[83]

The starting point of Aristotle's position of the individual human offspring is his idea that the male is the active principle, the efficient cause[84], and the female provides only the material as a potential and passive contribution to the offspring's formation. It is the male parent who provides the semen. The active

---

[74]. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, III,, 10-12, 1117b15-1119a20
[75]. Peter Singer, *Practical Ethics*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1993, PP. 13-14.
[76]. Peter Singer, *Rethinking Life and Death: The Collapse of Our Traditional Ethics*, St. Martin's Press, 1994, P. 85.
[77]. Jacques Maritain, *Natural Law*, St Augustine Press, London, 2001, P. 63.
[78]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, VII, 3, 1029a5-10
[79]. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, V, 14, 1020a10-20
[80]. Lewis Mumford, *The Condition of Man*, Harcout Brace Jovanovick inc., New York, 1973, P. 278.
[81]. Julius Khan, *Integrated Philosophy*, White House Edited Press, Bamenda, 2014, P. 204.
[82]. Martin Buber, *I and You*, 133-135.
[83]. Martin Buber, *I and You*, Walter Kaufmann (trans.), T. and T. Clark, 134.
[84] Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, V. 2, 1013a25-1013b15.

principle, the *pneuma*, resides inside the semen. This form is an instrumental agent, "That which comes from the generating parents is called the seminal fluid, being that which first has in it the principle of generation in the case of all animals whose nature it is to unite."[85] This implies that both the male and female do contribute something which when combined, is in potency of developing into an offspring. "Semen is that which has in it the principles from both united parents, as the first mixture from which arises the union of male and female, be it a fetus or an ovum, for these already have in them that which comes from both."[86] And it is this composite the woman carries within her until the appropriate time for delivery**.** The male and female principles are the origins of generation, the former as containing the efficient cause of generation, the latter the material of it. For it is just because the semen is secreted from the two sexes, the secretion taking place in them and from them, that they are first principles of generation. Semen is a certain kind of residue;[87] it is a useful residue;[88] it is a useful residue of ultimate nutriment.[89] For by a male animal we mean that which generates in another, and by a female, that which generates in itself.[90] Aristotle's philosophical theory of reproduction begins with two fundamental observations. In the first place, a male partner is needed to initiate the process. Secondly, pregnancy starts when menstruation stops. Situating these within the frame work of his theory of causality, he concludes that the male is the efficient cause and the female is the material cause in the process of generation. The reason which Aristotle posits for defining the male as the efficient cause is that he possesses within him, in the semen, an active force which acts on the female menstrual blood and gives it form. It is precisely because the male is the efficient cause that the female, though she has within her the material for the generation of the offspring, cannot reproduce by herself. Thus, a male counterpart is of utmost necessity for the development of an embryo in all animal species existing in two sexes, male and female

CONCLUSION

In the contemporary world which keeps advancing as days go by, different schools of thought keep on appearing with their different views about life. Science seems to be the sole provider of all that man needs with the various forms of technological advancements. In this article, our target was to reject the propaganda of social constructionism and to offer an alternative view to social constructionism, preserving a realist metaphysical response of substance while acknowledging the social dimension of human existence as stated in the objective. The article answers the question, how is social constructionism an attack of substance? Social constructionism is a necessary correction to essentialism and objectivism as it highlights the importance of context and power relations in shaping reality. It is a tool for social critique and transformation creating a new path by attacking the fact that reality is given and not constructed. Despite that, Aristotle offers profound insights as far as substance and human life is concerned. His notion of substance presents to us that substance has the nature of a thing with all its telos. Reality is given and not constructed. In the process to accomplish this, we made use of two fundamental issues established by Aristotle: essentialism and natural law. The two are the fundamental identity of humans in the world. In the process of generation of the human individual, the teaching of social constructionism does not provide the basis of knowledge validation and consolidation in spite her attack and rejection of substance.

References

1. **Aristotle**, *Categories*, E. M. Edghill (Trans.), eBooks, Adelaide, 2007.
2. _____, *Metaphysics*, Jonathan Barnes (Ed.), Cambridge University Press, Edinburgh, 1995.
3. _____, *Nicomachean Ethics*, W. D Rose (Trans.), Batoche Books, Kitchener, 1999.

[85]. Aristotle, *De Generatione Animalium*,I, 18, 724b14-20.
[86]. Aristotle, *De Generatione Animalium*,I, 18, 724b14-20.
[87]. Aristotle, *De Generatione Animalium*, 725a3–4.
[88]. *Ibid.*, I, 18, 725a11.
[89]. *Ibid*., I, 18, 725a12–13, 726a26–9.
[90]. *Ibid.*, I, 2, 716a19-31.

4. _____, *Physics*, Robin Waterfield (Trans.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.
5. _____, *The Politics*, E. BARKER (Trans.), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1946.
6. **Abercrombie** Nicolas *Et Al., (*Eds*.), "Modernity"* in The Penguin Dictionary Of Sociology, Third Edition, Penguin Books, 1984.
7. **Bauman** Zygmunt, *Lessons of the Holocaust,* 2012. [Online]Available on: https://www.Youtube.Com/Watch?V =EHeqz7ejo2c.
8. **Beilharz** Peter, 'Bauman and Heller: Two Views of Modernity And Culture*",* IN *Comparative Literature: East & West*, 1(1), 2017.
9. **Berger** Peter et **Luckmann** Thomas, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge,* Anchor Books, London, 1996.
10. **Butler** Judith, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, London, 1990.
11. **Cheng** Chieh-Ling, *The Social Construction of Personal Identity,* Ph.D, University of British Columbia, January 2023.
12. **Deranty** Gerard, *"Modernity"* IN The Blackwell Encyclopedia Of Sociology, G. Ritzer (ed.),Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
13. **Derrida** Jacques, *Writing and difference*, The University of Chicago Press, London, 1967.
14. **Donceel** Joseph, *Philosophical Anthropology*, Sheed and Ward, New York, 1967.
15. **Foucault** Michel, *The Archaeology of Knowledge,* Editions Gallimard, France, 1969.
16. **Giddens** Anthony, *The Consequences Of Modernity*, Stamford University Press, 1990.
17. _____, *The Constitution of the Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, University of California Press, California, 1984.
18. **Harvey** John F., *The Homosexual Person*, Ignatius Press, USA, 1959, P. 2.
19. **Khan** Julius, *Integrated Philosophy*, White House Edited Press, Bamenda, 2014.
20. **Kuhn** Thomas S., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.
21. **Lee** Raymond L.M, Reinventing Modernity: *Reflexive Modernization Vs Liquid Modernity Vs Multiple Modernities,* in European Journal Of Social Theory. 9 (1), 2006.
22. **Lorber** Judith, *Paradoxes of Gender,* Yale University Press, New Heaven, 1994.
23. **Lyotard** Jean Francois, *The Postmodern Conditions: A Report on Knowledge*, Manchester University Press, England, 1984.
24. **Maritain** Jacques, *Natural Law*, St Augustine Press, London, 2001.
25. **Mason** Catherine-Kelly, *The Social Construction of Gender and Leadership and the Impact of these Paradoxical Constructs on the Lived Experience of Women CEO'S,* Ph.D Thesis, **Maynooth** University, October 2023.
26. **Mumford** Lewis, *The Condition of Man*, Harcout Brace Jovanovick inc., New York, 1973.
27. **Searle** John, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1969.
28. **Singer** Peter, *Practical Ethics*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1993.
29. _____, *Rethinking Life and Death: The Collapse of Our Traditional Ethics*, St. Martin's Press, 1994.

30. **Stone** Sandy, “The Empire Strikes Back: A Post transsexual Manifesto”, in *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, Durham, 1987.
31. **TikTok**, the charlickirkshow, 18/03/2025, 8:00pm.
32. **West** Candace et Zimmerman Don H., *Doing Gender*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1987.