

Never Again, Never Forget: Reconstructing Memories and Imagining Democracy in Post-Authoritarian Philippines

By

Ena-Kamila V. Guerrero

Submitted to

Central European University
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts

Supervisors

Prem Kumar Rajaram
Vlad Naumescu

Budapest, Hungary

2018

ABSTRACT

Philippine democracy has had a problematic past. The events that took place in 2017 with the burial of Ferdinand Marcos, the country's infamous dictator, with his son almost winning the vice presidential race at the 2016 National Elections raised a dilemma on how the country remembers and regards its authoritarian past. At present, Philippine President Duterte has not only praised the dictator but has shown authoritarian tendencies as well. In spite of this, his administration still managed to sustain its popularity. These events raise critical questions on how memories of an authoritarian past affect how non-state political actors participate in the process of democratic consolidation. This research explains how actors reconstruct memories of the Marcos regime to construct an ideal notion of democracy and make sense of its performance in the Philippines. This research shows how the social milieus shape the social and political ties, values, and beliefs of the respondents that eventually positioned their role during the dictatorship. The attitudes towards the past is also brought about by frustration over the post-Marcos administrations that failed to bring significant positive socio-economic and political outcomes. This research also shows that though the Post- Marcos and Anti-Marcos groups have non-clashing notions of ideal democracy and participate in similar forms of democratic participation, what sends them clashing are their political ties, values, and beliefs that undermine democratic consolidation.

In Memoriam

*For All Those Who Have Fallen in the Night
in the name of justice and democracy*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
I INTRODUCTION	1
II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
The Democracy the never was?	6
How to Make Sense of Democracy?.....	11
Trouble down memory lane	14
Theoretical Framework.....	16
III CONTRASTS	20
Contrasting Memories.....	20
Struggles and Resistance: Historical Narratives of Anti-Marcos Groups.....	20
Peace and Prosperity: Historical Claims of the Pro-Marcos Groups	26
Contrasting Milieus.....	29
Contrasting Interpretations of the Past.....	33
IV IMAGINING DEMOCRACY.....	39
The Ideal Democracy: Possibilities For Unity.....	40
Performance of Democracy: Irreconcilable Polarity.....	43
From Post-EDSA to pre-Duterte.....	43
Democracy and Duterte	45
Political Participation: Same Forms, Different Substance.....	50
The Pro-Marcoses: Alliances in Defense of a Memory	50
The Anti-Marcoses: In Honor of Those Who Have Fallen in the Night.....	53
V CONCLUSION.....	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	59

I INTRODUCTION

The Marcos regime started with the promise of progress. President Ferdinand Marcos declared martial law in 1972 to purge rebel forces and restore peace and order. His national project, the “New Society”, aimed to yield prosperity and advance national development. The apothegm of his regime, “Sa Ikauunlad ng Bayan, Disiplina ang Kailangan” (For the nation’s progress, discipline is the key), gained acceptance among the population. However, what predominantly unfolded was the opposite of what was promised. When martial law was declared, mass incarceration of activists and members of the opposition took place. In 1981, Amnesty International released a report of cases in thousands of the human rights violations performed by the military under his command. The regime was heavily marred by political repression, cronyism, plunder, corruption, economic crisis, and foreign debt leaving large discontent among the population (Rebullida 2006). The Marcos regime was ousted by the historical EDSA People Power Revolution on February 1986. Ferdinand Marcos together with his family fled the country and he was later exiled.

Transitioning states have to face the task of dealing with its authoritarian past (Aguilar and Humlebæk 2002). Post-authoritarian states have to mend nations left in turmoil. For one, it has to decide what to do with members of the past regime and how to render justice to the victims of its atrocities (De Brito, Enriquez, and Aguilar 2001). Second, it has to repeal authoritarian institutions and replace them with democratic ones (ibid). In the case of the Philippines, just after the authoritarian regime, the administration of Corazon “Cory” Aquino (1986-1992) was left with the daunting task of reinstating stability to a country left in economic, political, and moral disorder (Overholt 1986).

The administration of Corazon Aquino drafted a new constitution, the 1987 Philippine Constitution, which was ratified by 78 percent of the voters through a plebiscite (Velasco 2006). The 1987 Constitution restored the three branches government – the executive, legislative, and judiciary- along with the principles of checks and balance and separation of powers. Popular elections were restored, and a one-term limit on the president was provided under the constitution. The media was out of government control. Over 15,000 people’s organizations and nongovernment organization were also formed. The process of transition however, had been an arduous process. The new administration grappled with political elites, a more active civil society, and successive coup d’état from the military.

Another task that post-authoritarian countries have to confront with is their traumatic past. As explained by Paloma Aguilar and Carsten Humbæk (2002), “Governments in transitional periods have to decide what to do with the past while, at the same time, maintaining the political equilibrium among the various forces in order to stabilize the new democratic regime”. The Philippines began its transition in 1986, although it was able to reinstate its democratic institutions, the process towards democratic consolidation needs much work to be done. The Cory Aquino government exiled Ferdinand Marcos but rendered amnesty to members of the military who renounced their loyalty from his regime. Concessions were also made with some of the political and economic elites who want to be part of the new government.

States that were able to restore democratic institutions further have the task to “improve the overall quality of democracy” (Linz and Stepan 1996a), that is, from a stage of transition, states make an effort toward consolidating democracy. Democratic consolidation goes

beyond elections. For Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan (Linz and Stepan 1996a), consolidated democracy involves sustained and internalized democratic values, norms, and practices in all areas of social life. However, Linz and Stepan noted that this process is far from being smooth sailing and unidirectional. States undergoing this process have the possibility to backslide to undemocratic regimes. They explained that it may not be caused by gaps on the process itself but may be a result of “new dynamics” that the “democratic regime cannot solve”.

Democratic consolidation after the EDSA revolution did not easily take its roots. As explained, even though the Cory administration was able to set-up democratic structures, the process was met with a myriad of challenges coming from different actors. It has been 32 years since the fall of Marcos’ authoritarianism, but the regime left legacies that impede the country’s journey towards democracy. The remnants of the regime were made more pronounced last 2016. The unpopular memory of the Marcos regime remained to be unchallenged until a series of political events put into question how Filipinos, as a “democratic nation”, remember its authoritarian past.

It was during the country’s 2016 National Elections that challenged not only the Filipinos’ memory of authoritarianism but also the revolution that paved the way for its democratic transition. The son of Marcos, Ferdinand “Bongbong” Marcos Jr, almost won the vice-presidential race by a very close margin. There were controversies on his running due to his alleged complicity during his father’s administration. Despite his family history, he was still able to gather a staggering number of electoral votes. The 2016 National Elections also brought in president Rodrigo Duterte who, as early as his campaign, expressed respect and reverence to Ferdinand Marcos. Upon taking his seat, Duterte issued an order allowing

Marcos' interment to the Heroes' cemetery. This created a striking division between Filipinos and brought to the surface the abated narrative of the Marcos' one-man rule. The order garnered both protest and support thus prompted questions on how people regard its authoritarian past and consequently the democracy that was fought for by those martyred during the regime.

Groups protesting the interment of Marcos in the Heroes' cemetery questioned the grounds of the order. For the protestors, to venerate the "dictator" is to render a grave injustice not only to the victims of human rights violations committed under his regime but to the whole Filipino nation as national development could not have been hampered if not for the billions robbed from its public coffers, resulting in the country plunging into billions of debts that until today are being paid through taxpayers' money. On the other side, the supporters, the Marcos loyalists, saw the order fitting for their "apo" (grandfather), who for them, brought peace, order, and development to the nation through his vision of "New Society". The issue on Marcos' interment has died down, so are the protests, but Marcos loyalists continue to be active in social media advocating for Bongbong Marcos in the next presidential elections. They are also actively campaigning for the recount of his votes. They believe that there was cheating involved done by his opponent, therefore he is the true winner in the vice-presidential race.

The conflicting memories on the Marcos regime became an impetus for the country to confront and rethink how it has dealt this part of history. Narrating a traumatic past into its historical stream entails the processes of recollection and reconstruction where past and present experiences converse (Connerton 1989) and can be a messy process. Historical

narratives are susceptible to manipulation, it is also subject to power, as Cheryl Natzmer explains (Natzmer 2002).

The study aims to make sense the implications of historical revisionism to the democratic consolidation. It asks, *how does the Filipino's memory on authoritarianism influence the country's process towards democratic consolidation? Do the clashing memories on authoritarianism also influence how Filipinos understand democracy? How do memories inspire political projects?* In answering these questions, this research aims to understand how the construction of clashing memories are engendered. Uncovering the experiences of authoritarianism may lead to an understanding of democracy.

The thesis focuses on examining non-state political actors as they construct an imagined democracy. The process of imagining consists of their own construction of democracy as a normative concept, their assessment on its performance, and the motivations that underpin their participation in a political space. Through understanding this process, this study attempts to contribute to the literature of democratic consolidation. Most literature in this area are predominated by a statist approach that underlines the role of state structures and institutions. However, this thesis delves into the arena of political culture by investigating the how actors construct, attach meanings, and values democracy.

II LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature provides offers a picture of the Philippine democracy and discusses facets of its political landscape to understand the former. It is important to have a background knowledge on these topics to understand how Marcos was able to bolster his regime and how democratic consolidation is continuously undermined under the Duterte administration. The next section of the literature review lays down pertinent works on memory politics. The discussion attempts to explore how contesting memories arise and how memories are utilized to legitimize political projects and realize political interests. It will also present studies that have explored the relationship between memory and democracy. The section culminates through linking the three topics, Philippine politics, democracy, and memory, to a conceptual framework that sheds light to the research question. It also presents the idea of an “imagined democracy” that attempts describes how the respondents of the study construct their ideal notion of democracy and how they assess the state of Philippine democracy at present.

The Democracy the never was?

The Patron-Client relationship is one of, if not the, most predominant arrangement used to describe Philippine politics. The relationship is composed of two parties, “the power wielding patron” and the “dependent client”, with unequal socio-economic status (Lande, 1967). The dyadic relationship is underlined by interpersonal ties where the parties are involved in exchanges of favours (Quimpo, 2005). As Carl Lande (1967) had observed, political parties in the Philippines are more constituted and bounded “by networks of interpersonal alliances”, such as kinship ties, than political beliefs, values, and platforms.

According to Carl Lande, (cited in Kervliet, 1995), Patron-client relationships are composed of factions. Factions consists of constellations of families that form an alliance. At the center of a faction are the more prosperous families with less prosperous families at the periphery. The faction is also bonded, albeit less strongly, by marriage, compadre ties, and dyadic ties of “mutual” dependency. These ties, however, are far from enduring and are usually formed to achieve a common political interest (e.g. winning elections).

For Paul Hutchcroft and Joel Rocamora ((Hutchcroft and Rocamora 2003), patronage has arrested the maturity of political parties as agents of democracy. The composition of political parties, of weak allegiance of families, precludes democratic institutions to effectively distribute public goods. Access to public funds is used to perpetuate and consolidate patron-client relationships by generously rewarding political allies on the one hand and granting small incentives among less affluent clients on the other.

Ferdinand Marcos abused the patron-client arrangement to buttress his political agenda. Marcos expanded his client base to lower executive positions in cities and municipalities, in comparison with other presidents before his regime that relied on congressional representative at the national level (Hutchcroft and Rocamora 2003). The bailiwicks of Ferdinand Marcos and his wife Imelda Romualdez Marcos in Ilocos and Leyte respectively, were often recipients of state funds. On the other hand, many other parts of the Visayan region where his political rivals reside were “systematically starved and exploited” (Overholt 1986). Marcos also gave key positions to his relatives, compadres, and fellow Ilocanos (ibid, 1148).

And unlike his predecessors, Marcos took patronage politics to unprecedented levels especially when he declared martial law. His regime exploited every resource of the state to augment his regime. According to Benedict Anderson (Hutchcroft and Rocamora 2003), instead of doing politics like old politicians did, Marcos used the national police as his private “security guards”, the Armed Forces of the Philippines as his own private army, and a “client Supreme Court” in place of “pliable local judges”. Government agencies such as the then Construction Development Corporation of the Philippines, was a “bloated, subsidized organ of patronage” (Overholt 1986).

With his political machine well fueled by a patrimonial state, Marcos was able to reinforce pre-existing political practices, albeit less pervasive before his regime, that stamped his presidency. His regime augmented these practices and continue to plague the landscape of Philippine politics until today. The discussion will focus on hyper-presidentialism and the culture of impunity. Other practices can still be enumerated, but for the sake of brevity, the discussion will be limited to these two.

In a hyper-presidential system, a president attempts to justify his actions and bypass the principle of checks and balances by invoking the separation of powers (Rose-Ackerman 2011). Hyper-presidentialism also explains how presidents take advantage of their residual powers, compromising the checks and balances. The power of the purse has been one the excesses the presidents have taken advantage of. In the 1935 Philippine Constitution, the executive power is vested in the president that endows him the authority to dispense funds. The president also shares powers in drafting and implementing the national budget. According to Patricio Abinales and Donna Amorsolo, “While congress voted appropriations, only the president could release the fund on which congressional patronage depends, giving

him leverage he would use to pass key legislation” (Tigno 2006) With this constitutional provisions, Marcos, without discretion, was able to exploit the public coffers to fund his re-election, as his presidential opponent remarked, he was “out-gooned, out-gunned, and out-gold” (Tigno 2006). Another power granted solely in the president is the power to declare martial law. This has radically overturned the separation of powers and checks and balance among the three branches and allowed Marcos to hold the presidential seat, unchecked, until 1986.

Alfred McCoy followed the career paths of Philippine Military Academy of Class 1971. The batch which, 18 months later, would be in the front line of carrying out orders under the direction of the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, Ferdinand Marcos. In the data he gathered, victims of human rights violations attributed to the military reached thousands- 3,257 killed, 35,000 tortured, and 70,000 incarcerated. The military wasn't persecuted and well shielded by their commander-in-chief. Ferdinand Marcos issued General Order No. 3 precluding the judiciary to touch any cases related to marital law. For Alfred McCoy (McCoy 2001), quoting Philippine historian Maris Diokno, impunity is the “entrenched legacy of martial law”. Even after Marcos, the lack of action to hold the military accountable has allowed impunity to deepen. The high political positions, in post-Marcos administration, held by the military officials who inflicted physical and mental torture and launched a series of coup d'états during the Cory Aquino administration, makes the Philippines a “example of extreme impunity” in comparison with its other post-authoritarian counterparts (McCoy 2001).

The three features that mark the two-decade presidency of Ferdinand Marcos (1965-1986) are still well entrenched in Philippine political life. The factionalism in patron-client relationship

is precipitated by his family today through the Marcos-Duterte Alliance. Rodrigo Duterte from the Southern Mindanao Region and the Marcoses from Northern Luzon region, each having their own kinship ties in the middle Visayan region, make an unsurmountable alliance. The Marcoses, help raised funds for Duterte during his presidential campaign. In return, Duterte allowed the interment of Ferdinand Marcos to the Heroes' Cemetery. Last 21 October 2017, presidential daughter Sara Duterte-Carpio launched a coalition called "Tapang at Malasakit Alliance for the Philippines" (Courage and Compassion Alliance for the Philippines), joining her at the stage was Ferdinand Marcos' daughter, Imee Marcos. Patron-client relationship has severely compromised democratic consolidation in the Philippines. The fragile political parties, instead of creating platforms that responds effectively the needs of its electorates, are oriented towards "particularistic goals" and "pork" (Hutchcroft and Rocamora 2003).

Hyper-presidentialism has compromised the principles of separation of powers and checks and balances. The president continues to hold the privilege of the power of the purse. This has made the loyalty of political parties unstable as loyalties shift to the winning party to access public funds. President Duterte was able to persuade the lower house and the supreme court to extend martial law in Southern Philippines. The president was left unchecked by the lower house and the supreme court from the rising reports of human rights violations in the area under martial law. Last May 2018, the judiciary, one again, was compromised by the ouster of chief justice Maria Lourdes Sereno through the efforts of the Duterte administration. The unseated chief justice voted counter to the interment of Marcos in the Heroes' cemetery as well as the declaration and extension of martial law in Mindanao.

The culture of impunity in the Philippines was at its apogee when Duterte issued an order allowing the interment of Ferdinand Marcos in the Heroes' Cemetery. For those who

protested the interment, a number of them victims of the regime's atrocities, it was a backlash for those whose lives were sacrificed in ending the dictatorship. Even after the regime, no high-ranking official of the military was punished for the thousands of cases of human rights violations. A similarity can be observed at the present administration in its "War on Drugs". The number of penalized police officers who committed human rights violations do not commensurate for the approximately 12,000 lives taken, without due process, in the name of "War on Drugs".

How to Make Sense of Democracy?

The labyrinth that this study attempts to make sense is the confrontation of the two clashing groups – the Pro-Marcoses and the Anti-Marcoses. Both exercised their political rights - freedom of expression and assembly – albeit not without tension and not without challenging the state of democracy in the Philippines. Furthermore, the conflict between the groups surfaces in several occasions that implicate the past and present. Aside from the interment of Ferdinand Marcos, the clashes also arise on the return of the Marcoses in national politics as well as on the measures and maneuver of the Duterte government – the "war on drugs", martial law in southern Mindanao, and the Charter Change to revise or amend the existing constitution. The Duterte administration has incited a stark division among Filipinos unseen from the past administrations.

Numerous studies in democracy across different fields have predominantly analyzed democracy at the institutional and structural macro level. Studies in the field of anthropology, sociology and political sciences have explored the dynamics between states, capitalism, neo-liberalism, and colonialism with different models and frameworks of democracy. The

turbulent character of democracy in the Philippines directs this study to center around the role of citizens and socio-cultural factors in analyzing democracy.

A book edited by Monica Ferrin and Hanspeter Kriesi published in 2016 provides data heavy quantitative studies on how civil society perceive democracy. The book, entitled “How Europeans View and Evaluate Democracy” explored on how contextual factors (economic, political, and social factors) and individual variables (socio-economic status, trust, belief) shaped how Europeans view democracy as a normative concept and evaluate its performance. The way in which they provided holistic dimensions (contextual factors, individual variables, normative view on democracy, evaluation of democracy’s performance) to examine democracy provides the researcher analytical tools to approach it. This study made use of these dimensions (i.e. normative and performative views on democracy) to understand people’s construction of democracy and to grasp their participation in democratic politics.

This research attempts to comprehend the existence of diverging attitudes towards the authoritarian image of Marcos and Duterte. In spite of the controversies of their administrations, both hold a strong pool of supporters. The strongman image that they project communicates a strong capability to impose “peace and order” in the country. The existence of both democratic and authoritarian inclinations among Filipinos problematizes the consolidation of democracy. Giovanna Maria Dora Dore’s (Dore 2014) work analyzed the citizens’ view on democracy in three countries of Asia. Citizens in Indonesia, Thailand, and Korea rely on their experiences in forming conceptions of democracy. These explains the distinctions on the themes on how citizens in these Asian democracies think about democracy. Indonesia and Korea had a more “substance-based” conception of democracy that emphasizes on the outcomes of democratic processes and institutions. Conversely, Thailand

has a more “procedural-based” conception of democracy that puts more emphasis on “electoral and constitutional procedures”. The study also located a nuance on the citizens’ view on democracy as it showed support to both democracy and authoritarian systems. In Indonesia, for every strongly democratic respondent, there are two strongly authoritarian respondents. In Thailand, there are three strongly authoritarian respondents for every strongly democratic respondent. In Korea, respondents with strongly authoritarian attitudes were three times more than those who have strong democratic attitudes. The findings of Dore point out the weak democratic political culture in these countries that could muddle with the consolidation of their democracy.

The works cited herein (Dore 2014; Ferrín and Kriesi 2016), demonstrate that configurations socio-cultural structures and individual experiences shape the views and attitudes of citizens towards democracy and eventually, their participation in a democratic polity. Furthermore, Dore (2014) reveals that pathways to democratic consolidation are unique for every country. Therefore, understanding the structural and individual dynamics in a country is critical in untangling the nuances in its democratic consolidation.

The present political landscape of the Philippines is a result of its historical experience and has shaped the consolidation of its democracy (Hutchcroft and Rocamora 2003). In light of the recent unfolding of events in its political scene (i.e. diverging memories and attitudes of citizens to an authoritarian past) how do we understand the views of the citizens on democracy? How do we speculate the participation the Pro-Marcos and Anti-Marcos groups undertake to forward their clashing political advocacies? The former supports the return of the Marcoses and backs-up the Duterte administration. The latter opposes the return of the Marcoses and criticizes the Duterte administration. How do we understand the views and

behavior of citizens against them having experienced an authoritarian past? To answer these questions, this research attempts to trace the historical experiences of individuals, through their memories, during the Marcos regime. This research suggests that to understand the present dynamics of democracy in the Philippines, one must locate the role played by its past, taking into account the critical role of its citizens.

Trouble down memory lane

There have been studies that explored the relationship between collective memory and democracy. However, their findings present a range of opposing variations. Barbara Misztal (2005) outlines the debates about the relationship between collective memory and democracy. The debates argued on the role of collective memory on whether it precludes or reinforce democracy. Arguments for the former claim that collective memory is not a prerequisite in facilitating democratic consolidation. Collective memory can also interrupt this process by reliving traumas and ideologies (i.e. fascism and socialism) that jeopardized societies before. The act of memorialization has normalizing and banalizing effects on how traumatic pasts are treated. Seeking to resolve these arguments, Misztal suggests that acts of remembering can still be relevant in consolidating democracy given certain conditions especially when done reflexively. When memories are treated critically and openly (when memories are open to interpretation and non-politized), it can spawn creative means that can facilitate democratic consolidation.

For Philip Brendese (2014), the process of democratization is a continuous work-in-progress where politics of memory interplay. Brendese elucidates how one comes into terms with the past, how memories are segregated and forgotten, and contribute to the shaping of a

democratic polity. The act of remembering and forgetting necessitates one to ask who is being privileged in these processes. Focusing on social amnesia, he speculates on the ways the act of silencing uncover power structures that undermine democratic consolidation. Social amnesia renders other memories invisible and functions to make people governable even with democratic institutions in place.

The study of Margaret Burchianti on the historical consciousness of the Mothers of Plaza de Mayo demonstrates that memories of past experiences can instigate active political participation. The solidarity among the mothers can be traced from their experiences during the military dictatorship in Argentina during the late 1970s. They all have children who were incarcerated, never to be found again. Through remembering their sons and daughters who were victimized by the dictatorship, the mothers surface these attenuated narratives that challenge that of the state. This study is crucial to this research as it shows how memories are linked to civil society participation in democratic politics.

What these studies also reveal is the thorny dynamics between social memory and democracy. One problem being, is the vulnerability of social memories to contestations such as the case of Chile where no census has been made on the state's actions under Pinochet (Natzmer 2002). As Cheryl Natzmer (2002) explains, "The ownership of memory is a question of power. Individuals and groups struggle over who has the right to represent the past and whose memories will become institutionalized". Paloma Aguilar and Carsten Humlebæk's work (Aguilar and Humlebæk 2002) on post Franco Spain reveals the conflict between cultural elites who want to "reintroduce the past" and the general population that wants to "leave the most painful memories of the past behind". The divided attitude towards

how the Franco regime captures the Spanish identity resulted to the weak if not adverse affiliation of some citizens to the “National Identity”.

Theoretical Framework

Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan (Linz and Stepan 1996b) define a consolidated democracy as a political regime where democracy is “the only game in town”. Furthermore, they posit that a consolidated democracy has three characteristics. First, significant no actor or groups attempts to secede from a state or establish a nondemocratic regime to achieve its own agenda. Second, in times of social, economic, or political crises, majority of the people believe that collective life must still be governed according to democratic parameters. Third, democracy is “routinized” and “internalized” by all actors in all aspects of “social, institutional, and even psychological life”. One of the conditions that Linz and Stepan argue for democratic consolidation to be realized is free and autonomous civil society that appreciates the institutions of a democracy. They define civil society as a space where groups and individual can freely engage with one another and articulate their interests.

The authors provide a helpful definition of a consolidated democracy where one can gauge the status of a political community. It is important to clarify that what the authors described is an outcome of a process. This research explores more on the process, the process of democratic consolidation that aims achieve the status that Linz and Stepan has described about. This research also focuses on an important component of that process – civil society. The definition provided by Linz and Stepan is inadequate to describe the dynamic behavior of actors in this study. Their definition is akin to the western conceptualization of a universal, liberal, and individualistic civil society the Chris Hann and Elizabeth Dunn (Hann and Dunn

1996) criticize about. This study follows their direction to explore civil society in the everydayness of social life by investigating their beliefs, values, and practices by taking a constructivist approach.

This research takes a constructivist view on civil society by zooming in to individual non-state political actors (from here, the term actors will be used for brevity). By non-state, it means to refer to actors that are not incorporated within the formal institution of the state (e.g. elected officials) but freely and openly engages with the state. A constructivist view of civil society captures actors who are not only capable of constructing a political order collectively but are also capable of interpreting it in way that are meaningful to their experiences. These actors can reconstruct ideologies and arrange their own set of values and beliefs, forming their own understanding of their world - what it is and what it should be. From this gestalt, they are able to assess what is right and what is wrong, what is democratic from what is not.

This research explores the role of memories in constructing realities. Individuals construct their realities and define their own concepts through what Karl Mannheim calls, the “inventory of experience” that “encompass all types of knowledge a person might acquire, that is, conceptual knowledge of word meanings, world knowledge, skills, as well as memories” (Conway 1997). Looking at autobiographical memories, Martin Conway (1997) also explains that the experiences gathered by the individuals through time shaped their conceptual knowledge. Moreover, he emphasized that the social group where the individual belongs has a stronger influence in identity formation than “biological or chronological criteria”.

Memories are socially mediated and continue to undergo the process of reconstruction. Aleida Assmann and Linda Shortt (Assmann and Shortt 2012) explore the dynamics between memories and political change. They posit that it is not the past itself that influences the present but the representations of the past that have been created within a “specific cultural frame and political constellation”. They also suggest that multiple memories of events can exist within a society where individual memories can clash with official narratives. Individual mentalities can be enduring in spite of political and social changes. But memories that have been silent can emerge when shifts provide the cultural frames where they can express these memories.

Benedict Anderson (1983) coined the term “Imagined Communities” to describe a nation as a community where its members will never have the chance to interact with each other face to face and may not be able to really get to know each other but a bond of communion and belonging captures the imagination of each member. In this sense, the word imagined connotes something that is constructed by the members belonging within the territory of the state. It may or may not be there, its objectivity is open to question, but the subjectivity of this social construction still instills what constitutes this community and how members within this community should behave and interact. Another scholar that explored the concept of the imagined and imagination is Chiara Boticci (2014). For Boticci, images are representations and they are central to what she calls the “imaginal” that balances between the imaging subject and the social context and the interaction between the two. Imagination, for her, is “the radical capacity to envisage things differently and construct alternative political projects”. In this project, an “Imagined Democracy” connotes a process of construction and reconstruction among members of civil society that may but may also not be guided by academic theoretical models on democracy. Individuals may be guided by ideals of

democracy, but their knowledge may also be limited thus they reinterpret this concept and perform democracy according to their mental construct of democracy. There is a question of whether the Philippines is indeed a democratic country, a transitioning country to democracy, or a failed democracy. To determine the status of the country as democracy or not is not the endeavor of this project. It is aimed at capturing how individuals construct their own image of democracy, in other words, democracy in this project is treated as a social construction that is created and recreated by the members within the polity. Furthermore, it captures this process of construction as highly contested and politicized.

In this study, democracy is also being explored as a product of the past and the present, a dialectic where the memory of the past and the present social context communicate. The research explores how the memory of the Marcos regime may shape an individual's view of what constitutes a democratic polity, how it should perform, and what should a citizen's role be in it. Furthermore, it also takes into account how the ongoing political dynamics, where democracy is perceived, can influence how one deals with the past- to remember, to forget, or to challenge it.

III CONTRASTS

This section aims to present the contrasting memories of the respondents on the Marcos regime. It then attempts to explain this contrasting by identifying the milieus that shaped their experiences, values, and beliefs. The role of social media, though already in the present, is important in reconstructing the memories of the Pro-Marcos group. Lastly, this chapters looks at the contrasting ways on how the respondent attach meanings and values to their past experiences. This section concurs with Maurice Halbwachs (Halbwachs 1992) articulation of socially mediated memories. This section argues that the construction and reconstruction of the past and the meanings attached to it are not only anchored on experiences of the past but are highly mediated by social milieus. It highlights the role of the subjective political views, beliefs, orientations, and loyalties that are engendered by subjective experiences and milieus that position the construction and shape the interpretation of memories. Furthermore, it portrays the politics of memories is not merely a result of state intervention but is produced by these contrasting realities and subjectivities and the assertion of these realities by the actors themselves.

Contrasting Memories

Struggles and Resistance: Historical Narratives of Anti-Marcos Groups

Jessica held a pleasant smile while sitting at the front row of the conference hall packed with students. She and another colleague from the “Bantayog ng Mga Bayani” were facilitating a talk on Human Rights among graduating students. The human rights violations during the

Marcos regime was covered by the talk. It was initiated by the school's president upon learning the results of the mock election conducted by the university way back during the 2016 Presidential and Vice-Presidential Elections. It came to the president's shock that Bongbong Marcos lead the vice-presidential race in the university. The talk was one of the efforts to remember the events of the regime. Jessica gave her testimony as a one of the human rights victims. She was a case of mistaken identity when she was taken by the military when she visited a friend's house. The house was raided, and she along with two other women were taken by the military without warrant of arrest. It was just her and her military captors in the vehicle. She was hand-cuffed and blind folded while her interrogators continuously asked her questions and pressed for answers. "Ikaw ay komunista" (You're a communist), came more as a statement that they want her to affirm. While the interrogation was going on, she was also being molested. After the interrogation where she also experienced sexual abuse in the safehouse, she was brought in military camp where she was detained. She wanted to file a rape case against her military captors, but her lawyers said that she has case: conspiracy to commit rebellion. Even though her case was eventually dropped, she wasn't immediately released due to the Presidential Commitment Order where the approval of the detainees to be released lies with the president. While in prison, she and other political detainees experienced detestable conditions. The prison has no proper ventilation. It was very hot and there were a lot of mosquitos. The food was not fit for any human to eat. She remembers a meal served to them where the fish had already rot because worms were already in it. Recalling the whole experience, she remarked, "You become humiliated, dehumanized as a person. They want to crush you. *Ganun yung ginagawa nila to the victims of Martial Law* (That's what they do to the victims of Martial Law)".

The story of Jessica is one among the four respondents who were detained during the Marcos regime. But being detained did not stop activists in carrying out their work. Father Elmer, as some still call him, was a former priest. He was arrested on December 13, 1974, two years after the declaration of Martial Law and was in prison most of its time. He can still remember the duration of his first arrest- five years, four months, and five days. He was released under the condition that he leave the country but returned one year after. He reconnected with the underground movement and was again arrested in 1982 and remained in prison until 1986. The first part was always intense, he recalled. He was continuously punched but not as severely tortured like other prisoners. His status as a well-known priest shielded him from the worst of tortures. They organized their first hunger strike with other political prisoners demanding the investigation of tortures. He was put into solitary confinement as a result. In prison, they were “literally busy”. They made handicrafts to generate income in support of their causes. They held educational discussions, organized more hunger strikes, and recorded songs as well. Even though in prison, it did not stop them from doing their activist work. According to Father Elmer, every political detainee knows that their primary duty is to get out of prison and rejoin the movement by whatever means, legally or illegally. He shared that they had an Escape Committee where a detainee will present his “escape plan”, together with a budget, and they would finance it. However, there were few success stories, he recalled. Jose, in comparison with Father Elmer, received very hard beating from his interrogators. He remembers the date when he was caught- 23 May 1973. He was at the urban poor community where he was serving when he was caught. Jose was then brought to the Police Intelligence Section, as he remembers the name, and was subjected to three days of what he called, “tactical interrogation”. He said the physical abuse was nothing compared to the psychological one, “Ang mabigat diyan yung mental torture Yung tututukan ka ng baril sa ulo mo, bibilingan ka ng tatlo, magsabi ka, o magturo ka, ituro mo yung mga kasama mo, pag

hindi ka nagturo, patay ka na. Tinindigan ko yung statement ko, ‘eh hindi ko nga alam kung nasaan yung mga kasama ko’. Binilangan ako ng tatlo tapos kinalabit yung baril”. (The mental torture was more intense. A gun would be pointed at your head, they will count to three, tell the truth, who else are with you, where are they, if you don’t tell them you’re dead. I stood by my statement, ‘I don’t know where my companions are’. They counted one to three then pulled the trigger). Fortunately, Jose lived to tell his story. When the interrogation was over, his interrogators offered him an opportunity to finish his studies. In exchange, he was become a civilian agent who would spy on activists. He declined the offer and was detained until June of 1974. Like Father Elmer, he continued activist work in prison. Together with other political detainees, they organized educational discussion on social issues, organized hunger strikes for better conditions in prison, and other activities for “rehabilitation” - planting, playing sports, and held Sunday masses.

All Anti-Marcos respondents interviewed have one thing in common- they all joined social movement organizations against the authoritarian regime. For Lorena, it was on January 26, 1970 where she had her “first baptism” in activism. This was moment was part of what is now known as the “First Quarter Storm” where students lead the nation in a series of protests on the Marcos regime. She was attending in the University of the Philippines in Los Baños (UPLB), the university’s campus at a provincial area, when Martial Law was declared. Open protests were already banned this time, so students came up with creative ways to show their dissent. One of them was the wearing of black ribbons. It was a custom to wear one to signify the death of a relative, this time, it symbolized the death of democracy. By 1974, student movements tried to reorganize and regain their strength. In UPLB, they restructured the student movement. They framed their organization as non-threatening and conducted activities that seem non-political but had underlying messages. Some of them were the

singing contests but with nationalist songs, quiz bee on current issues to raise social awareness, and the sports festival that sends the message of unity and solidarity. Underneath this open, what they call “legal”, organization is the underground movement. The open organization was an attempt to continue the struggle while hiding the underground movement. In 1976, Lorena became the Student Conference Chairperson. The Student Conference was the precursor to institutionalization of the Student Council, considered as the student body during that time. The Student Conference made it possible to hold elections for the first Student Council to have elected members by the students. According to Lorena, this was impressive given the circumstances of that time where the Freedom of Association was curtailed. Upon graduating from the university in 1977, she completely went underground and spent her time in organizing the masses. During this time, protests were getting stronger.

Unlike Lorena who easily joined the movement, Fernando had a gradual process of being oriented to and eventually joined activism. He was in grade school when Ferdinand Marcos declared martial law. He too still remembers their television turning blank, remembers the speech of Marcos’ declaration of martial law, and remembers too, the attempted assassination to Imelda Marcos. Looking back at the things he saw, he called them propaganda. But back then, he did not take them seriously. He first joined a theatre group where they always perform a theatrical rendition on the life of Jesus Christ but with a “contemporary” interpretation. One time, they portrayed Christ as a humble farmer. And on another performance, during a scene when Mary was cradling the body of the dead Christ, the actress playing the Holy Mother, suddenly cried out a statement condemning militarization before the light was turned out. It took a few more years before he entered the movement. He was in college when students protested the selling of the university. The following year, the student leaders who organized the protest was barred from enrolling. Fernando campaigned for the

university to let them enroll and eventually, was given permission. According to Fernando, he got “hooked” when he realized that he was good in campaigning. From there, a student activist oriented him to the movement. He joined the League of Filipino Students (LFS), then later on became the chair of the organization in the university, then headed provincial and regional chapters, and finally became the chair at the national level. He came to near death experience on 21 October 1985 in what he named, the “Taft Avenue Massacre”. The alliance of activists organized a three-day march to support the campaign of the farmers. A night before heading to Manila, the capital of the Philippines, they heard the head of the Western Police District on the radio warning them not come, or else there will be trouble. Undaunted by the threat, they pushed on. They were along Taft Avenue when Fernando saw a commotion then he heard the sound of police sirens, then the sound of gun shots. He claimed that their group wasn’t exchanging fires with the police for they did not possess any firearms. People were running but some bodies were left on the street. They wanted to go back and help the others, especially the old farmers but the bombardment of gun shots prevented them. He was watching a friend, Dante, when he saw a gun hit his head. Fernando at that time was a provincial chair of LFS and Dante was the vice chair. They wanted to pick up his body, but the police forces were still firing at the activists. Luckily a media group took him to the nearest hospital. Dante died five days later. Fernando continued to share his experience in retrospect, “Pag ngayon nga, pag tinitinganan ko yung mula sa kanto na yun, ng Liwasang Bonifacio, ang lapit nun. Pero nung panahon na yun,andang tanda ko, parang ang layo. Tumatakbo ako pero parang hindi ako umaabante... That’s the closest. Kasi it could have been me”. (When I’m looking at that street corner of Liwasang Bonifacio, it’s close to where we were. But back then, I clearly remember, it felt so far. I was running but it was as if I wasn’t moving forward. That’s the closest. Because it could have been me). From then on, they planned nothing but bring down the regime. For him, it was too much, and he was ready

to give his life, “Kasi sobra na eh... marami pang nangyari all over the county: detentions, arrests, warrantless arrests, pinapatay, disappeared. So kami nun, parang eto na yun... Laban nalang. You might get killed, you might get arrested, you might get disappeared, pero lalaban tayo”. (Because it was too much... there were a lot of things happening all over the country: detentions, arrests, warrantless arrests, killings, disappeared. So for us, this was it... Just fight. You might get killed, you might get arrested, you might get disappeared, but we will fight).

Peace and Prosperity: Historical Claims of the Pro-Marcos Groups

For the Pro-Marcoses, their “Apo Lakay” (respected elder), as what they call him especially his fellow Ilocanos, know him as the “best president” that the Philippines has ever had. The brilliance of Ferdinand Marcos’ is unmatched among those who came before and after his presidency. Even the Anti-Marcoses recognize the capability of his mind. Marcos was so brilliant that he did not only topped the Bar Exam in Law, but also orchestrated a shift in the political order. As Father Elmer commented, “there was one thing everyone agrees on, Marcos was very brilliant... he was so brilliant, he could construct a legal philosophical framework”. Pro-Marcoses also admire their Apo Lakay for his speeches. The late president does not read but speaks directly from his mind, and as most of the respondents said, “galing sa puso”, (from the heart). For them, Apo Lakay can do not evil. In spite of his brilliance and status, he remained humble. One respondent shared her encounter with the president when she was in grade school. Irene recounted that their parish prepared a red carpet for the president to walk on. Ferdinand Marcos, however, instead of strolling at center, walked at side of the pulpits instead. “Napaka simpleng tao niya” (He was a very simple man), she added. Ferdinand has a pure heart. Petrina said, “napaka buti ni presidente” (the president is

very kind). Others describe him as kind and humble. As Dorothy described the president, “Mababang loob siya sa mga mahihirap, pang-masa talaga siya. Kaya mahal siya ng tao... Pang-masa siya. Pang masa talaga yung ugali niya tsaka naa-adapt niya yung sarili niya sa mga mahihirap.” (He is very down to earth with the poor, he is really for the masses. That’s why people love him. He is for the masses and he is able to adapt himself with the poor). For Nancy, her Apo Lakay was someone who loved the poor, loves the Filipinos, and will never betray them. The Pro-Marcos respondents also asserted that the president was a veteran who fought side by side with his fellow Filipinos during World War II. Nancy claimed that her father was with Marcos during the war thus a real hero worthy to be buried in the Heroes’ Cemetery. They dismissed the corruption allegations on the president. He was already rich when he became president because his mother, “Doña Josefa”, came from a wealthy family. He also accumulated his wealth through his profession of being a lawyer. The president had also nothing to do with the human rights violations reported under his regime. Dorothy defended that it was not the president himself who did those violations. There were people in the military who are responsible. Besides these accusations were just mudslinging from the opposition to break his regime.

Dorothy remembers free “nutribun” and Klim milk being distributed in schools during recess time when the clock strikes at 9:00 in the morning. Each student is to bring her or his utensils where the food would be placed. Petrina recalls trucks of military carrying soldiers that distributed goods such as rice, milk, oats, and canned goods for the poor. For them, the Marcos regime was a time of bounty and Marcos was the benevolent giver. They also remember that the government provides free movie screenings in vacant areas. One of the films was “Pinagbuklod ng Langit” (Heaven’s Fate), a biographical film about the Marcoses. The respondents also claim that during the time of Marcos, the prices of commodities were

very cheap. Even though two of them worked in jobs with low paying salaries, they claimed that they didn't starve because the prices of food were very cheap. Two social welfare projects under the Marcos regime continuously came up during the interviews – Kadiwa and Masagana 99. According to the respondents, Kadiwa is a program where the Marcoses bought goods and sold it for a lower price to make it affordable for the poor. Just recently, the daughter of Marcos, Governor Imee Marcos, called for the revival of the Kadiwa market system. The Masagana 99, on the other hand, is a program that catered to the needs of the farmers. Through this program, farmers were given free seeds and fertilizers. In connection with this, farmers were also awarded free land through CLOA (Certificate of Land Ownership) which was part of the regime's Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program. Ferdinand Marcos also paid attention in developing the quality of education. Dorothy pressed that education in the University of the Philippines was free because of Marcos. The quality of education in public schools was unmatched by private schools because the best teachers were at the former. Marcos also constructed numerous school buildings that until now are still being used.

“Napaka ganda ang martial law” (martial law is very good), claims Irene. It was very peaceful, and the rate of crimes was low. The respondents praised martial law for the peace and order that it brought to the country. They remember the strict implementation of curfew where at a certain time (respondents differed on the time of the curfew), no one is allowed to be outside. As Petrina recalled, that if one had been to a late-night party, it is advisable to just stay in a friend's house else, because the police will catch you and you will spend a night in jail. Drunkards were also caught but were released the following morning. According to the respondents, during the time of Marcos, the law is followed. Alvin claimed that one cannot just cross the street if the green light for pedestrians is still off. Another thing that the

respondents praised about Martial Law is the zero cases of rape as well as drug addiction. According to Alvin, Petrina, and Dorothy, those who committed rape received a death penalty through “Silya Elektriya” (Execution through Electrocutation). One interesting claim is that told by Petrina. According to her, during Martial Law, short skirts and shorts were not allowed because it was believed to be the cause of rape. The police have a cutting blade in hand to rip stitches of the seams of the garments to make it longer.

Contrasting Milieus

The agents that shaped the social and political views of the respondents must be noted. During interviews, the respondents included in their narratives the role of specific people in shaping their views. For the Anti-Marcos groups, the role of their Catholic values and convictions pushed them in taking a stand against Martial Law. Some of them said that they cannot remain silent at a time like this. Some of them rhetorically asked, “*Mananahimik nalang ba tayo?*” (Will we be silent?). Their faith taught them what is just and righteous. For them being a Christian and performing the duties of a Christian do not stop in Martial Law. According to Father Elmer, for him and some Catholic members who joined the movement, it was an imperative of their faith. Father Elmer together with other church people from different denominations formed the Christians For National Liberation (CNL). Jessica has always been a member of the Catholic church and was also a member of CNL. In the late 1970’s she became a church worker and was organizing the communities of their parish. During the course of her work, she encountered liberation theology and began to study it, “Nag-aral din ako ng liberation theology. Dahil sa liberation theology ang mahalaga duon, ituturo mo yung kahalagaahan ng tao... mahalaga ang tao, kailangan ginagalang, inuunawa, kinakalinga, may compassion ka, may humility ka, peace and harmony with them” (I also

studied liberation theology. In liberation theology, it's essential that you teach the importance of human beings... they are important, need to be respected, understood, care for, you have compassion, humility, peace, and harmony with them). She also taught liberation theology in schools, teaching students the centrality of loving one's fellow and one's country. Joining CNL, studying, and teaching liberation theology, she claimed, allowed her to expand activist work. Aside from CNL, there were also other religious organizations that challenged the Marcos regime such as the Student Christian Movement of the Philippines (SCMP) that was also instrumental in forming CNL, and Student Catholic Action. Lorena and her brother, a victim of extra-judicial killing, were members of the latter. However, the case was not the same to two Pro-Marcos respondents. They expressed distaste on the Roman Catholic Church when its leader, Cardinal Sin, called out to the people to go to EDSA in order to protect the soldiers who rebelled against the Marcos regime. Nancy was in dismay and said that Catholic priests should not be involved in politics.

Parents, especially fathers, also showed strong influence among some of the respondents of both Anti-Marcos and Pro-Marcos groups. Even the role of the family is significant for both groups, the values and beliefs that they learned still differed. The Anti-Marcos respondents also showed the influence of family. For Lorena, her father and her brother groomed her to the student activist that she was. Her father was a veteran soldier during World War II. After the war, her father started a grocery. He was among the pioneer businessman who started from scratch. The war left the country in ruins thus the sense of nation-building was very strong. With this background her father raised them with a strong sense of love for country. Socio-political issues were openly discussed in the family, they would even talk about it during dinner. These discussions raised a sense of social awareness among the siblings. Lorena's brother, Emmanuel was a student in Ateneo de Manila University where several

activists also rose up. He was a brilliant student and student organizer. He had charisma that united people together. Emmanuel was a member of Tulong Dunong, an organization in Ateneo that help children in poor communities prepare for scholarship applications in universities. He also harnessed National Union of Student in the Philippines (NUSP), an alliance of student bodies and governments, to serve the community. Emmanuel's involvement in student activism was carried through the rest of his siblings. Their house would often be turned to a headquarters for student meetings and gatherings. He taught them to be open and accommodating. They would also host educational discussions on social issues where she and her siblings would also join in. Emmanuel was a well-known student leader and activist. Lorena showed me several books telling his story. In 1982, Emmanuel was captured by the military and then was later executed.

Among the six Pro-Marcos respondents, three of them were daughters of military men. One respondent, on the other hand, was a daughter of a farmer who benefited from Masagana 99. Their fathers openly expressed how impressed they were with Marcos. They would also discuss in the family the projects and accomplishments of Marcos. Ivy's father, who a cabeza de barangay, provided her with an explanation when soldiers were deployed in their area, "magulo na kasi anak" (it has become chaotic, child). During that time, rebel groups were getting stronger in the area. Her father reasoned that the presence of soldiers was necessary to keep things under control. When military forces occupied the area, her father opened his house for some of them to stay in. Ivy expressed the respect she has for her father and explained his influence on her. She described him as a very honest and very straight man, "natuto kami sa kanya" (we learned from him). She further added, "Nakuha ko yung ugali ng father ko (I adopted that characteristics of my

father), how to be disciplined, how to manage the family... disciplinarian ang father ko (my father was a disciplinarian). I really salute him, and I salute also the family of Marcos”.

For one respondent whose parents were neither affiliated with the military or a beneficiary of Masagana 99, the slogan of the Marcos regime, “*Para sa ikauunlad ng Bayan, Disiplina ang Kailangan*” (For the country’s development, discipline is the key), was strikingly reflected by the characteristics of her mother. Petrina was very beautiful when she was young, as seen from the pictures hanging on her wall. She passed the screening of “Bb. Pilipinas” (Ms. Philippines), the country’s most prestigious beauty pageant. A letter was sent to her saying that she had to wear swimsuits for the pageant. This enraged, according to her, her conservative mother and cut her hair so she wouldn’t be able to join. She said laughingly, “*Parang Marcos din yang nanay ko*” (My mother was like Marcos) but showed appreciation on how she was raised, “*in a way, maganda din naman yung ginawa ni mother... yun din yung nagustuhan ko kay President Marcos*” (In a way, what my mother did was good... this was also what I liked about President Marcos). The image of her mother as a disciplinarian was very much reflected by the president’s iron hand.

Social media has been pivotal in the reconstruction of memories among Pro-Marcos group. Facebook, a social media service provider, has been a repertoire of information for the Pro-Marcoses and a site of contesting the memories between the two groups. All respondents in the Pro-Marcos group are members of Facebook groups supporting the Duterte and the Marcoses. Dorothy, the founder of *Marcos Defenders Worldwide Unlimited*, acquires her information on the Marcos regime from social media, “Binabasa ko yung mga comments, nalilibang ako at nadadagdag yung kaalaman ko. Sa comments lang, may mga comments sila na hindi ko alam na nalalaman ko dahil sa comments nila. Sa mga members mismo, dun ako

natututo din. Malaki ang natututunan ko sa mga members” (When I read the comments, I enjoy it, in addition my knowledge expands. Through the comments, they post something that I do not know and only learn through their comments. I learn from the members themselves. I learn a lot from them). She said that a lot of articles are also shared by other Pro-Marcos Facebook groups. Videos containing information on the regime can be found in YouTube, a video-sharing website. Through the sharing of articles and videos and posting of comments, social media becomes a site where knowledge on the Marcos regime are exchanged. These exchanges mediate and reconstruct the memories of the Pro-Marcos groups. For Dorothy, information in social media is more accurate as a source of information than news from mainstream media and history books that she claims, have been tampered by the Aquino government for their propaganda. Alvin also claimed accuracy as well as dependability of social media. He explained that news in mainstream media are influenced by “oligarchs” thus can be twisted. In social media, a citizen can post a video clip immediately allowing the news to spread faster without being edited.

Contrasting Interpretations of the Past

The case of the Philippines is closely similar to the Chile’s. Cherly Natzmer (Natzmer 2002) described Chile as “likened to two nations sharing the same territory, but divided by ideological chasms and opposing memories of the past”. Authoritarianism under Pinochet had its supporters as well as dissenters, each having their own judgement on the regime. Ferdinand Marcos has his allies and supporters. He also had strong oppositions coming from political elites and mass movement organizations. It will be brash to say that the Marcos regime is “all evil” for even the Anti-Marcos groups, during the interviews, also recognized the

contributions of the regime. Thus, it matters to consider the events that made more impact among the respondents.

This section highlights the role of subjectivity in interpreting memories. The interpretation of memories is contingent on the configuration of three factors. First is the impact on the respondent, relative to their position in the regime. Second are the milieus that molded their values, beliefs, political ties, and orientations. Third is the aftermath of regime. The disparate experiences of the respondents mattered significantly in the emergence of disparate memories. However, their understanding and interpretations of those experiences are mediated by the actors and institutions around them. The new administration affected how they value and think about their experiences from the past regime.

The two groups have significantly disparate memories on the Marcos regime. These memories are the partly a result of their social and political position within the regime. These also affected the respondents different. The Pro-Marcos groups did not experience the atrocities of the state military forces. Their memories underline the material goods distributed by the regime – the free bread and milk in public schools, the ration of rice and canned goods, and the benefits experienced by their fathers who served in the military. The Anti-Marcos groups, on the other hand, first handedly experienced state repression- the warrantless arrests, the different forms of abuses, and the violent dispersal of activists during mass mobilizations. They also experienced the grief of losing loved ones- Lorena her brother, and Fernando his friend. Dante wasn't the only friend that Fernando lost during the Marcos regime. He said that the names of some of his friends are now etched on the “Wall of Remembrance” of the Bantayog ng Mga Bayani (Monument for Heroes), a memorial for the martyrs and heroes who fought against the dictatorship.

The impact of the Marcos regime also made a distinction on how the respondents relay their memories. Pro-Marcos groups relay their memories in fragments. Their accounts are more topical than chronological though there is an effort to do the latter. They describe instances without organizing them into a timeline. They describe images or instances like Marcos as a president, implementation of curfew, and the benefits and projects of the regime. They can enumerate the projects of the regime but do not organize them chronologically. They also rarely position their personal experience against the wider historical events of the Marcos regime. The Pro-Marcos group, though they differ in their economic statuses during the regime, did not have any experience connected directly to the regime that significantly created changes in their lives. They lived a “normal” life in comparison to the Anti-Marcos groups who directly experienced state repression.

The Anti-Marcoses were able to tell more cohesive narratives such as their life in prison, the day of their capture until the time of their release. Other Anti-Marcos respondents were able to narrate how they got involved in activism until their retirement from the movement. Their life in the movement has brought striking experiences- losing loved ones, fearing for one’s life, near death experiences – that made the memories deeply embedded in their life history. The Anti-Marcoses can articulate more the emotional and cognitive processes that was occurring within them at a certain moment. Strong emotions were stirred when they were telling their stories- emotions of grief, agitation, and even excitement. For some, they remember assessing the consequences of joining the movement. They were not only assessing their odds of getting detained, or worse, killed, but they were also calculating the how events would unfold in relation to the actions (i.e. rallies and mobilizations) taken by the movement.

The experiences of the respondents vary but are not excluded from each other's realities. Pro-Marcos respondents Dorothy, Irene, and Alvin are aware of the human rights accusations on the regime. They are also aware of the rebellions across the country. At the same time, the Anti-Marcos groups admire Marcos for having vision for the country and the social programs and projects that could have benefited the country if properly implemented. The congruent experiences mediated by the meanings they attached to such events. For the Pro-Marcos group, martial law is necessary and beneficial to curb rebellions wreaking havoc in the country. For the Anti-Marcos group, martial law aggravated the already existing insurgencies engendered by social unrest since Marcos' first presidency in 1965.

The different meanings they attach to these events are mediated by the different actors and institutions that shape their life. The church and the family had a significant role in molding the values and beliefs that shaped their interpretations of the Marcos regime. These influences were active during the regime's years and they continue to shape how respondents make sense of the past at present. This can be observed through the anti-communist sentiment of the Pro-Marcos group. As commented by Dorothy on martial law, it is the best thing that happened to the Philippines because it prevented the from turning to communism. Marxist ideology was strong at that time among activists and is the ideology that underpinned most of the movements. During the interview, Dorothy cautioned the researcher not to join left leaning movements. She condemns, for her, the communist ideology that they carry. Nancy also views activists and rallies negatively. For her, they are sources of disorder. This may be traced to their patriarchs who were members of the military that treat communism as a threat and were trained to curb communist insurgency (McCoy 2012).

The murder of Benigno “Ninoy” Aquino Jr, is one of the significant events during the Marcos regime, if not its climax. Ninoy Aquino was in the senate when he was incarcerated upon the declaration of martial law. He was in the senate, leader of the opposition, and one of the, if not most, staunchest critiques of the regime. He was exiled to the United States but secretly came back. Ninoy was shot just a few moments after stepping down from the plane. For the Anti-Marcoses, the death of Ninoy Aquino was the spark that enraged the Filipinos who were still silent. It was the trigger that engendered the formation of more movements such as the “Justice for Ninoy, Justice For All” movement. On the side of the Pro-Marcoses, the use of Ninoy’s death was downright repulsive. It was out-and-out the exposure of the malevolence of the groups that was trying to bring down Marcos. The “yellow-tards” or “oligarchs” as they call them. It was the instrumentalization of the dead to press their political agenda.

The meanings and value they attach to their experiences are reinterpreted to what came after the Marcos regime. Right after Marcos, Filipinos awaited the changes that would be instigated by the new Cory Aquino administration. Both Pro-Marcos and Anti-Marcos groups found that the administration failed to bring in fundamental reforms that will serve as impetus for national development. The Cory Administration restored formal democracy through the 1987 Philippine Constitution but the fruits of democracy- better quality of life for all – remained only true for the elites that served the new administration. The administration had several setbacks that frustrated the respondents. Father Elmer elucidated the aftermath of the EDSA revolution by using Mary’s Magnificat as his framework. In the passage, she pointed out four things - put down the mighty, lift the lowly, fill the hungry, and sent away the rich empty. As he explained:

Number one, the mighty had been put down from his throne, it happened, celebrate. Will the lowly be lifted up? Baka, kasi mas may chance na ma-lifted up kesa yun pinapatay sila. Pero baka naman ang papalit lang sa one mighty is

competing mightys tapos yung lowly, they are reduced to which mighty they want to rule over them. That's why when it came out, popular democracy. The rich was sent away empty, kako, samlang! Not empty, maraming dala-dala and majority stayed behind, switched side, so they still control, so the poor are still waiting for good things. (Number one, the mighty had been put down from his throne, it happened, celebrate. Will the lowly be lifted up? Maybe, there's a higher chance instead of them being killed. However, what if the one might would just be replaced by competing "mightys" and the lowly would just be reduced to choosing which among the "mightys" they want to rule over them? That's why what came out of EDSA was popular democracy. The rich was sent away empty, far from! They were not empty, they carried away so much and majority stayed behind, switched sides, so they still control, so the poor are still waiting for good things)

The failure of the Cory Aquino administration made the Pro-Marcoses more nostalgic of the life they had during the Marcos regime. Comparing the regime to the Post-EDSA administrations, Dorothy said that employees had more benefits. An employee can also advance to a fully employed status where he or she can avail these benefits. The Pro-Marcoses wish that they could bring back the past regime therefore, they are very motivated to bring the Marcoses back in national politics and are very supportive of president Duterte for his resemblance of governance to Ferdinand Marcos'. They believe that he will carry out the projects left by their Apo Lakay.

The assessment of the new administration was hinged on the experiences of the past. For the Anti-Marcoses, the new was a spill over of the past. Elite politics continue to dominate the state while ordinary masses continue to live in poverty. Most of the Anti-Marcos respondents said that the Cory Administration was "sayang", a missed opportunity. It was a time where substantive democracy could have been instigated, where democracy could transcend from mere elections to a reformed political culture and an equitable distribution of economic goods. On the other hand, there was a sharp contrast of the old and the new for the Pro-Marcoses. The Cory Aquino administration for them was the country's fall from glory. They claimed that the value of the Philippine peso decreased, and the country began to lag behind

other Asian countries. From the interviews, one can sense the anger of Pro-Marcos respondents towards the Aquinos and towards the actors that participated in the EDSA revolution. Thus, instead of feeling proud for what others regard as the Philippines' glorious moment, where Filipinos showed the world their love for democracy, the Pro-Marcos group loath, if not curse, the EDSA revolution.

IV IMAGINING DEMOCRACY

This paper explores how the supporters and critics of the Marcos regime imagine democracy in the Philippines. This process of imagination is qualified in three aspects- their views on ideal democracy, their assessment on its performance, and their participation to different political activities. The conceptions of the respondent on ideal democracy harmoniously form, creating openings for consolidating democracy. However, they are severely polarized in their assessment of democracy, particularly on its performance in the Duterte administration. Their political participation is divided by their clashing political projects. The influence of memories on the Marcos regime can be observed. However, their incongruencies are also shaped by their wider experience on Philippine political dynamics and by their opposing political ties, values, and beliefs. Groups agree on what democracy should be but there is a chasm on how they assess an image, practice, or symbol to be democratic or undemocratic. These incongruences raise a challenge on the country's democratic consolidation.

The Ideal Democracy: Possibilities For Unity

The Anti-Marcos and Pro-Marcos groups' ideal constructs of democracy were non-clashing. Though they differ on what underlines their ideal notion of democracy, they were nevertheless complementary. The ideal constructs of democracy are framed in existing academic models of democracy to guide the analysis of this section. The derived themes on the groups' ideal view on democracy approximate the models of liberal, economic, and participatory democracy.

The most ideal conception of democracy falls under the model of liberal democracy. The components of liberal democracy that emerged from the respondents revolve around constraint and balance of political authority, rule of law, and equal protection of rights (Diamond 1999). Anti-Marcos respondents affirmed the existence of the three main branches of the government- executive, legislative, and judiciary- and the principle of checks and balance that must be ingrained to it. Another anti-Marcos respondent assert the law must be implemented effectively in a democracy. More pro-Marcoses stressed the exercise of freedom in rights in a democracy namely the practice of freedom of speech and expression, free will and right to suffrage. They also stressed that these rights must be equally applied to all citizens. They disdain the discriminatory treatment between unequal classes and asserts that individuals must be accorded with freedom no matter their social standing. For Alvin, freedom is for all and even the president cannot curtail that freedom.

Economic democracy is defined by Stein Ringen ((Ringen 2004) as, more than the distribution of income and satisfaction of consumption needs, having the structures to curb inequalities in economic power. An anti-Marcos asserted that economic benefit should not be concentrated among a few elites but should be distributed among all citizens. A pro-Marcos

stressed the availability of adequate paying jobs in the country so that people won't have to depend on the government and work in overseas. For Nancy, the absence of poverty is the ideal picture of a democratic polity, "Umasenso sa magandang buhay nahindi na tayo pumunta sa ibang bansa. Lahat tayo, nagtrabaho dito, hindi tayo naghihirap sa ibang bansa na makapag-alila" (Have a prosperous life so that we won't have to go overseas. We all work here so that we won't suffer being enslaved in other countries). Another said that those conducting businesses in the Philippines must be Filipinos so that they may fully experience the benefit of their own resources.

Frank Hendriks (Hendriks 2010) describes participatory democracy as a bottom-up interaction among members to be involved in making and implementing decisions in the public domain. It is "examining decisions together, finding solutions together taking decisions together, following up on decision together". Most anti-Marcos groups went for this model of democracy. For Fernando and Father Elmer, there must be venues where citizens can engage with the state to come up with agreements on how "we will live our lives". Father Elmer further elucidated that in a democracy there are "at least two components: your would-be leaders and your citizens. Then the rest are the conditions where they can engage freely and effectively interact with each other". He also underscored the centrality of developing community leaders especially among the youth. Since their involvement in activism during the Marcos regime, Father Elmer and Fernando have had continuous involvement with grassroot movements. Pro-Marcos Nancy states that it is important to cooperate with the government and listen to the president.

Another theme that emerged among the respondents is the values and responsibilities that citizens must have in a democracy. Both pro and anti-Marcos groups agreed that the exercise

of freedom and rights is not absolute, there must be limits. For Jessica, the exercise of democratic rights and freedom must center on the respect for humanity. Bearing her background on liberation theology, democracy for her is “the person is free to do anything, as long as no one is being hurt. Walang nasasaktan ang isip, nasasaktan physically, nasasaktan ang emotion, nasasaktan ang kahit ano sa pagkatao ng tao. No humiliation, no degradation. May respect, may pagmamahal, may pagka humility ka, human ka mag-treat, naiintindihan mo yung tao” (the person is free to do anything, as long as no one is being hurt. No one is hurt mentally, hurt physically, hurt emotionally, and hurts the humanity of the person. No humiliation, no degradation. There is respect, love humility, humane treatment, understanding of a person). Among the respondents, Jessica has the most traumatic experience of martial law. This experience may have deepened her value for human dignity thus making it central in a democracy. Lorena upheld that the value of democracy “is a society serving for the common good. Encouraging the best of its people, for the common good, not only for its people but for the world community”. It also means having the “godly values of truth, justice, and righteousness”. The ideal notion of Lorena asserts her Christian background as well as her experience in student polity. Pro-Marcos Dorothy held the importance of having dignity and principles while Irene, also a pro-Marcos, asserted that democracy must be protected and fought for. Alvin argued that discipline is essential for democracy, “Kung walang disiplina sa sarili mo, hindi magagawa ang pagka-democratic ng mga Pilipino” (If you don’t have discipline within yourself, it’s impossible for Filipinos to have democracy). His statement recalls the slogan of the Marcos regime, “*Para sa ikaunlad ng Bayan, Disiplina ang Kailangan*” (For the country’s development, discipline is the key).

There are models of democracy that are more predominant in one group than the other. Most views of pro-Marcoses lean toward liberal democracy as most of the themes that emerged

from the respondents emphasized on the freedom to exercise civic and political rights. The anti-Marcoses, on the other hand, also lean toward liberal democracy but emphasize on the structures that limit state power. The ideal concept of democracy among the Anti-Marcoses inclines on participatory democracy that goes beyond elections and stresses the active engagement of citizens with the state. It is also observed that anti-Marcoses have an added value to democracy that regards the centrality of humans - the values that they must have and how they must be valued. Possibilities for the respondents to share an agreement are opened-up through their shared views on ideal democracy. A working democratic polity may be grounded based on their agreements on how democracy should be.

Performance of Democracy: Irreconcilable Polarity

From Post-EDSA to pre-Duterte

Most of the respondents on both sides place a negative assessment on the performance of Philippine democracy. The result of the assessment is attributed to defects in democratic structures and to an elite dominated state. Dorothy called-out the efficiency of the justice system, justice stops when money talks. According to her, instead of the court justices being non-partisan, they are easily bribed. The deficiency of representative institution was one of the respondents' disappointments. The system of elections is also highly criticized because of the rampant practice of cheating. Pro-Marcoses expressed their agitation on the "loss" of Bongbong Marcos in the vice-presidential elections, claiming that he was cheated by the other party. According to Michael, an anti-Marcos, "democracy does not work because the very instrument of democracy, yung representation ng mga tao sa (the representation of the people in) congress are not doing their jobs. They don't even know what their jobs are. Michael talked about the issues in the Philippines that representatives should address by

passing laws. He also referenced a congressman who gave a talk about Human Rights but gave an inaccurate remark on the Commission of Human Rights, the government arm created to check police and military abuses.

The most stirring critique in representative democracy is attributed to the respondent's agitation on elites that have dominated Philippine politics. Respondents referred to traditional politicians, political dynasties and for the pro-Marcoses, the "oligarchs". For Petrina, a pro-Marcos, she lamented the lack of solidarity of government leaders with the people who only think of their own interests. As Nancy's comment on the politicians goes, "Parang wala nang nag-iisip para iahon. Puro politics nalang ginagawa nila, puro labanan nalang sila. Hanggang salita nalang sila, wala naman silang pagbabago. Mga politiko, puro sila-sila kaya paano sila makakapag-isip?" (It's like, no one is thinking how to raise [the Philippines], all they do is politics and fight with each other. All talk but they don't do any changes. All the politicians, all they think of is themselves so how can they think [to raise the country]?). These respondents are fed up with politicians who place their political interest before the country. For them, they are too engrossed with politicking and in dealing with their political opponents than in finding ways to develop the country. The anti-Marcoses share the sentiments of the other group. "Ruled by a few" was Michael's description of congress, asserting that it was "ruled by the representatives of the rich to perpetuate their position in society. Very few are really for the masses". Jose articulated his perception on the dynamics of the country's elite dominated state,

"Walang demokrasya sa ating bansa dahil ang nangingibabaw sa ating bansa ay yung mga elite. Yung mga nasa gobyerno, halimbawa, sa kongreso, ay di anuyan, mga kapitalista, o kaya ay mga landlord. Siyempre, gagawa sila ng batas ayon sa kanilang interes. Hanggang senado, hanggang presidente. Wala namang presidente na galing talaga sa common people. Yung presidente, nagmula yan sa mayayamang pamilya o hindi man sa mayayamang pamilya ay may suporta ng malalaking negosyante. Tulad ni Duterte, ang sumuporta nan, sina Henry Sy...

Kaya pano gagawa si Duterte ng batas para sa mamamayan kung kokontra to sa mga interes ng nagbigay sa kanya ng pondo nung panahon ng eleksyon. Kaya walang demokrasya. Ginagamit lang nila yung demokrasya ma-legitimize yung pag-upo nila sa pwesto... so anong demokasya?" (The country has no democracy because the interest of elite dominates. Those in the government, for example, are capitalists or if not, are landlords. Of course, they will pass laws according to their interests. Up to the senate, up to the president. No president has been really from the common people. The president came from a wealthy family or has the support of big businessmen. Like Duterte, who was supported by Henry Sy.. So how will Duterte pass laws for the masses that will run counter to the interests of those who funded his campaign last elections? So there's no democracy. They use democracy to legitimize their positions... so what democracy?)

A government dominated by self-interested elites wreak havoc to the country's questionable, if not non-existent, democracy. Though the respondents share different economic backgrounds, they share the same perception on democracy's malfunction to distribute political and economic power. It is also important to note that their assessment of democracy's performance was based on their experiences and on their ideal construct of democracy. For example, Nancy's ideal construct of democracy is concerned with economic democracy. One of her sentiments on democracy's performance is its failure to provide adequate paying jobs and is exasperated by chronic poverty in the country.

Democracy and Duterte

Even though the anti-Marcoses and pro-Marcoses express the same disdain on the issues pressing Philippine democracy, their perception on who the problematic elites are is divided across their political loyalties. The pro-Marcoses support the administration of Duterte and campaigns for Bongbong Marcos for vice-presidency. The anti-Marcoses on the other hand, are apprehensive of Duterte because of his authoritarian tendencies. The respondents are divided among issues on the initiatives of the current administration to amend the constitution, on Duterte's declaration of martial law in southern Mindanao, and on his approach to address the drug problem in the Philippines. The perception on these issues

reveal sharp incongruence between the group's political lines, values, and beliefs. It must be noted that these issues were selected due its relevance on democracy and its resemblance to the Marcos regime. The initiative to amend the constitution and martial law brings in issues on the balance of power as president Duterte persuades the legislative and the judiciary to support his actions. The "War on Drugs" brings in issues of accountability, adherence to due process and rule of law, as well as respect to civil and political rights. The first two issues mentioned were serious controversies during the presidency of Ferdinand Marcos. Raising these to the respondents also aims to investigate if the memories of the Marcos regime influence their assessment on the issues.

Any effort to amend or ratify the constitution creates anxiety among Filipinos. This can also be traced to the Marcos regime. Philippine political scientist Olivia Caoili (Caoili 2006) unfolds the events that took place on Marcos' manipulation to change the constitution allowing him to extend his seat on power. The 1935 Philippine Constitution did not allow Ferdinand Marcos to run for another term. On 1971, he convened a Constitutional Convention to draft a new law. Marcos declared martial law in 1972, abolished congress, allowing him to formulate the new constitution according to his own liking. The initiatives of the Duterte administration to amend the 1987 Philippine Constitution was well supported and advocated by pro-Marcos respondents. Dorothy is in full agreement of the president's initiative. She commented that the 1987 Constitution was controlled by the "oligarchs", referring to Cory Aquino and her elite "cronies". She blames the constitution for the country's failed justice system. Nancy said that we should not cross the president and instead support him with his projects. She fully trusts that the president will be able to do his job. The pro-Marcoses also believe that the proposed shift from a unitary to a federal form of political organization will help the Filipinos to be united and will result to better governance.

While anti-Marcos groups agree that the 1987 Constitution needs to be changed, they are skeptical of the process, the proposed changes, and the people who will take charge of changing the law. Far from sharing the optimism of the pro-Marcoses on the proposed shift to federalism and changing the form of political organization will not address the issues of the country. They don't expect that it will bring positive changes given the people involved in the process, as Felix states, "Yung efforts to amend the constitution are being undertaken by the same, by a congress na hanggang ngayon domindado padin ng mga dinastiyang pangpolitika" (The efforts to amend the constitution are being undertaken by the same [people], by a congress that until now are still dominated by political dynasties). The stand of the two groups are underpinned by different factors. The pro-Marcoses agreement on the amendment is driven by their political ties to Duterte and their belief that this government can bring the changes that the past administrations failed to do. On the other hand, anti-Marcoses are informed by the larger perception of elite dominated politics in the Philippines goes as far back as the Marcos regime.

The declaration of martial law in Mindanao was due to a terrorist attack in the city of Marawi. For the pro-Marcoses, the move of the president is "logical" because of the insurgency. Alvin explained that president Duterte had the right to declare martial law because of the attack. If the government did not order it, terrorism might spread to the other parts of the country or else, "we will lose our freedom". Ivy's view agrees with Alvin's that it was the right thing to do. She explained that Mindanao has been long plagued by abuses, killings, robbery, kidnapping, et cetera. She believed that martial law was the answer to solve these problems, "pag may martial law, nababawasan po ang krimen at nadidisciplina ang mga tao na sumunod sa ikabubuti ng karamihan" (when there's martial law, crimes decrease, and people are being disciplined to go according to what is beneficial for all). Ivy's claim

references back to her experiences in Mindanao when Ferdinand Marcos declared martial law. Her father justified the order believing that it is necessary to curb the insurgencies back then. On the other hand, anti-Marcoses question the necessity of declaration in Mindanao. Moreover, their reference to Ferdinand Marcos' martial law is striking. Felix, a lawyer, was dismayed at the Supreme Court for allowing the declaration. He remarked that it was the return of dictatorship where the Supreme Court obeyed the whims of the president. Jose speculated whether the declaration of martial law in Mindanao is a testing ground to bring it to the national level. For Father Elmer, his biggest fear is "that it would lead to the kind of abuses, and that is the bigger memory... Anyone of us who comes with martial law, parang hot potato yan (it's like a hot potato), the most we could do is reluctantly tolerate it". The trauma of anti-Marcos respondents on the Ferdinand Marcos' martial law resulted to speculations and anxiety.

Respondents also differ on their opinions on "War on Drugs", the Duterte administration's effort to end the prevalence of illegal drugs in the Philippines. The "War on Drugs" has caused controversies due to cases of human rights violations and the lack of due process to individuals suspected to be involved in the drug industry. The pro-Marcoses believe that the illegal drug industry is the root cause of criminality in the country. Dorothy claimed that "robbery, rape, killings... ang ugat niya drugs kaya okay lang sakin mapatay na sila lahat" (robbery, rape, killings... the root cause of that is drugs so its okay for me them all to be killed). Petrina denied the human rights violations thrown at the administration saying that these are just accusations, a form of mudslinging by the "enemy" to bring him down. Alvin praised the efforts of the president describing it as "napakaganda, isa sa pinakamagandang nagawa ng administrasyon" (Excellent, one of the best accomplishments of the administration). He also mentioned that drug addiction was minimal during the presidency of

Ferdinand Marcos and contrasted it to the presidency of Nonoy Aquino where there was rampant use of drugs and high level of criminality. The issue on the “War on Drugs” brought in nostalgia for the pro-Marcoses, attributing the very low cases of criminality and drug related problems to the Marcos’ martial law. On the other hand, the anti-Marcoses question the “realness” of the “War on Drugs”, suspecting that the problem was blown out of proportion. They do agree that the drug industry is a problem in the Philippines, but they raise doubts on its effectivity to resolve the problem. As Father Elmer said, the solution to the problem has a problem as well. They question why is that those targeted by police killings are the “small fishes”, most of them coming from urban poor communities, while there haven’t been any “large fishes”, referring to the drug lords who run the industry. Others comment that the ‘War on Drugs’ will not address either the problems of drugs or criminality. Jose argued the drug issue is entrenched on severe poverty. Felix strongly stated that the “War on Drugs” is a campaign that does not respect human rights, adding that it diverts the masses from the basic problem- the control of the country’s wealth within the hands of the few.

The assessment on democracy’s performance post-EDSA and before the Duterte administration crystallizes the frustration of the respondents discussed in the previous chapter. The statements of both groups suggest the failure of the institutionalization of representative democracy. The structures (i.e. congress) that are supposed to represent the interest of the citizens are taken over by the self-serving interests of elites. However, there appeared to be an opposing assessment of democracy’s performance upon the start of the Duterte administration. The two groups are extremely polarized on their views. Their consistently opposing attitudes are not only informed by their memories from the Marcos. Their “inventory of experience” from post-EDSA and the wider dynamics of Philippine

politics shape their assessment of democracy's performance. The groups diverge on their beliefs on the country's root problems and the ways on how to solve them. The pro-Marcoses believe that the proposed shift to federalism will bring in unity by repealing the 1987 Constitution while the anti-Marcoses doubt that it will address the country's fundamental problems and fear that it may be used by elites in pursuing their interests. The pro-Marcoses believe that the root cause of criminality is the illegal drug industry and a total war against drugs with the use of violence will instill fear among criminals and deter them from committing crimes. For the anti-Marcoses, the questionable prevalence of illegal drugs is a manifestation of deeply rooted economic problems of poverty and inequality. Their political attitude towards authority is also different. However, deliberating more on their attitude, pro-Marcoses are disgruntled on the administrations from Cory Aquino until Noynoy Aquino but showed positivity towards the Duterte administration. In contrast, the attitude of the anti-Marcoses remain to be consistently critical and deliberative throughout the past and present administrations. Furthermore, the reasons why pro-Marcoses support Duterte, because his ties with the Marcoses and his likeness to the old strongman are the also reasons that repel and distance anti-Marcoses from the current administration. Possibilities for consolidating democracy in the Philippines has been foiled by contradictory assessments on issues pressing democracy under the Duterte administration.

Political Participation: Same Forms, Different Substance

The Pro-Marcoses: Alliances in Defense of a Memory

Most of the pro-Marcos groups belong the "Marcos Defenders Worldwide Unlimited" (MDWU), a group that, according to its social media page,

“...aims to protect the image of the Marcos' against the demonic propaganda of Aquino family, their coalition, and other political groups that negatively influenced the minds of the entire Filipino race... we believe that we can be a great nation once again vis a vis FERDINAND MARCOS JR's leadership”

Dorothy founded the group in 2014. She started to be active in social media in 2012 to support the senatorial campaign of Bongbong Marcos. As of this writing, the group has 36,450 members in its social media page. She's very happy with the membership of the group. It inspires her as well as her members actively sharing posts and comments on the group's page. However, Dorothy tried to leave the group several times because of some “issues” but others would persuade her to come back. Aside from being the founder of MDWU, she also has alliances with other groups supporting the Duterte and the Marcoses. They support president Duterte's daughter and Bongbong Marcos' sister for the upcoming senatorial elections. The groups and alliances organize and join rallies and assemblies. Their advocacies center on recounting of Bongbong's votes, pushing for federalism, and Duterte's “Revolutionary Government”, known to the supporters as martial law.

Ivy and Nancy are also members of MDWU. Ivy joined the group because of its link to Bongbong Marcos. She pushes the recounting of votes for the vice presidency because she believes that Bongbong truly won the elections. Ivy said she's there to fight for the truth. Nancy was a member of other groups that supported Duterte and Marcos, but they died down. Nancy is not active in social media. She is very visible in the campaigns for Bongbong Marcos' recount. They have a tent set-up in front of the Supreme Court at the country's capital as part of their campaign. Often, she would bring food out of her own pocket to share with the members. Nancy is not well-off, she does odd jobs, but she shares what she can to her fellow Marcos loyalists. She also frequently joins rallies for Duterte and Bongbong organized by other groups and alliances, which sometimes gets her in trouble with her group. She does it voluntarily even without the group's permission. She defended by saying, “Kaya

nga may rally, kailangan mong suportahan. Kaya nandiyan ka sa Bongbong Marcos kasi sumusuporta ka, volunteer ka... Sarili ko to, volunteer ako. Ganun ko kamahal ang Marcos. Mahal na mahal ko ang Marcos paglaban ko” The reason for the rally is because they need your support. The reason why you’re with Bongbong Marcos is because you’re supporting him, you’re a volunteer... this is my own decision, I’m a volunteer. That is how much I love the Marcoses. I love the Marcoses so much, I will fight for them).

Alvin is also a founder of another group called “Kilusang Agila Alliance for the Philippines” (Eagle Movement for the Philippines) that also supports the Duterte-Marcos alliance. Alvin formed the group to support “Tatay Digong” (Father Digong), a nickname that refers to president Duterte. His political participation, however, is confined to blogging and managing the group’s social media account. He does not join rallies for he believes that the government is efficient in carrying out its responsibilities. Alvin sees the importance of his work in raising the consciousness of the Filipinos to the truth. For him, posting news articles on the group is a way of educating the Filipinos on current issues. Petrina is the moderator of the group’s social medial page. As a moderator, she removes posts that “bash” Duterte and attack the memory of Marcos then removes or blocks the perpetrator from the group. Unlike Alvin, she joins rallies and assemblies. She attended the launching of “Tapang at Malasakit” (Courage and Compassion), an alliance formed by president Duterte’s daughter in support for his administration. In their social media page, both groups are active in “correcting” information on the Marcoses. They also reveal exposés on the Cory and Noynoy Aquino administrations. The news articles posted in their pages are traced to “news” websites such as the “Duterte News Stream”, “Tatay Duterte News”, and “DU30 News”.

The Anti-Marcoses: In Honor of Those Who Have Fallen in the Night

Felix is one of conveners of the “Movement Against Tyranny” in the Southern Tagalog Region of Luzon. The movement was launched last September 2017 and mostly conducts symposiums on human rights in reaction to the cases of violations in Duterte’s “War in Drugs”. The movement aims to keep in check the “tyrannical” tendency of the Duterte administration. They see the patterns of hyper-presidentialism in president Duterte with that of Ferdinand Marcos. Duterte’s “persuasion” of congress and supreme court justice together with his callous approach on the “War on Drugs” approximate the return of a one-man rule with an iron hand. Felix is driven by the need to raise awareness among Filipinos, to enlighten them of the problems in the current administration with the hope that the people they reach out will do something about the situation in their own small way. Jose is also part of the movement. He does the legwork of coordinating with other grass root organizations to consolidate their alliance.

Most of the anti-Marcos respondents are volunteers of “Bantayog ng Mga Bayani” (Monument to the Heroes), “a memorial center honoring those individuals who lived and died in defiance of the repressive regime that ruled over the Philippines from 1972 to 1986” as indicated in the organization’s website. It is founded by a group of families and individuals, some are relatives of those “who sacrificed their lives” in resisting martial law. At the landscape of the center is long black granite wall where the names of the “martyrs and heroes” of martial law are etched. Each anti-Marcos respondent personally knows several names carved on the “Wall of Remembrance”. The organization also houses a museum where a timeline containing the events of martial law are posted. Lorena and Jessica are among the members who help establish the museum. Sometimes, when they have time, they volunteer to tour the visitors around. Fernando also volunteers in the touring occasionally. Lorena,

together with Father Elmer, are current members of the organization's Board of Trustees. Aside from the museum, the Bantayog also houses a library and an archive containing newspaper articles, documents and reports on the Marcos regime. Some of them are records of human rights violations under the regime. The staff of the Bantayog are a little anxious these days with the current discourse on the memory of martial; thus, they are working as fast as they could to digitize all their records. They have also tightened the security around the center. Bantayog also has a research committee that gathers information on the martyrs to be put up in the "Wall of Remembrance". It's a tedious process. Establishing the background of an individual may take several months or years. Fernando also volunteers in the process especially when a name is suspected to be from their province. He also once initiated and did the legwork of fact finding information for a martyr. The Bantayog also has a pool of volunteer speakers who go to educational institutions, mostly in universities to give a talk on the Marcos regime. Jessica and Michael often speak in front of high school or university students to share their firsthand experience on martial law. However, Jessica is saddened because some of those who experienced the same abuse as hers are afraid to speak. They are afraid of their families disowning them once they learn the abuse that they have gone through. She wished that more survivors like her would have the courage to share their testimonies. With the recent turn-out of events in the country, with the efforts to revise a historical narrative, they realize the significance of their work.

With the recent events to revise the historical narrative on the Marcos regime, Lorena strongly realized the importance of Bantayog. For her, Bantayog "stands to speak the truth" as it embodies the struggles of the Filipinos in resisting martial law. It embodies the values of the Filipino people. That when truth is attacked, when the integrity of the nation and of the

Filipinos are attacked, the Bantayog inspires the Filipinos as people to not allow these things to happen.

Fernando recognizes the role of the Bantayog in keeping the memories of the martial law. He warns about the risk of forgetting especially, forgetting that there are people who died under that regime. Elsa, a board member of Bantayog, saw the importance of the organization in honoring those who died to “defend democracy, at the expense of their young lives”. It was only fitting that there is a monument to remember the efforts and sacrifices “that these young people went through” for the future generations. Michael sees his volunteer work in Bantayog as a way of honoring his friends whose names are carved on the “Wall of Remembrance”. For Michael, when he speaks in front of the youth to share his story, he honors his friends and makes alive in the hearts of people what they fought for – national democracy. As the interview draws near to a conclusion, Michael remarks, “We are engaged in a struggle for national democracy”.

The underpinning values that motivate the groups participate to in different political projects are no less different. Both claimed to fight for the good for the country. Both vowed to fight for the truth. However, they have opposing beliefs on what is true, specifically on what is true about the Marcos regime. Both groups hold firmly to their memories on the Marcos regime. Their strongly held memories motivate them to partake in different political projects. The pro-Marcoses aim to rewrite, if not “re-right”, the historical narrative on the Marcos regime that have been demonized by the past administrations specifically, of the two Aquino administrations. A video posted in the social media pages of pro-Marcos groups proclaimed the Marcos regime as the “true democracy”. The anti-Marcoses too are holding on to their memories. They recognize the challenge of historical revisionism posted by Marcos loyalists.

More important for them, for the anti-Marcos group, is the honoring and remembering of those whose lives have been sacrificed in the name of “national democracy”.

V CONCLUSION

Investigating the how individuals remember the Marcos regime uncovered the layers of socially mediated memories. The construction and reconstruction of memories are continuous exchanges between the past and the present. Memories are constituted not only by firsthand experiences but by the milieus that provide the social framed to interpret them at the moment of experience. These milieus are powerful in shaping the values and beliefs of individuals that allow the integrity of memories to endure. The pro-Marcoses, even though lacking memories on the regime that left a strong impact, was able to maintain a consistent outline of their historical claims. Even though some details may change across time as they expose themselves to the information in social media, they also go through a process of selection, accepting those that say good about the Marcos regime and rejects those that taint its image. Thus, the clashing memories between the groups are also clashes of interpretations of the past and furthermore, clashes of the values and beliefs that they have acquired in the past and continue to hold at present. Moreover, the conflict on meanings attached to the past is carried through by how they make sense of the present.

It is not only the memories on the Marcos regime that influenced their assessment on Philippine democracy their participation within its political space. Their “inventory of experience” is constituted by their experience post-Marcos regime along with their whole experience of frustration and disillusionment on the dynamics of Philippines politics. The polarization of the two groups can be traced to their political ties, particularly among pro-Marcoses who have maintained a longstanding loyalty to their patron. This also pinpoints gaps on the patron-client framework. The case of the pro-Marcoses illustrate that the clients

cannot be reduced to economic rational actors whose loyalty can be exchanged by material goods. The pro-Marcoses exhibit genuine loyalty that has lasted for three decades and the goods that they expect in return are not merely self-seeking. Their loyalty to Marcos is also maintained by their hopes and dreams not only for themselves but for nation, to see it in its glory. Though the political projects of the pro and anti-Marcoses clash, they still are motivated by something common- their frustration of the past and their hopes for the future.

The process of imagining democracy in the Philippines may be problematic given the polarized views of the respondents on how they make sense of democracy. The legacy of Marcos has not only left a nation that does not have a consensus on its authoritarian past, but also left a polarized nation in understanding its present furthermore, divided on the solutions to move on towards a better future. Following the definition of Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, of a consolidated democracy, the Philippines is far from attaining this status. Aside from deficient democratic institutions, the opinions reveal inclinations to support nondemocratic practices especially in response to political crisis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aguilar, Paloma, and Casrten Humlebæk. 2002. "Collective Memory and National Identity in the Spanish Democracy: The Legacies of Francoism and the Civil War," Special Issue: Images of a Contested Past, 14: 121–54.
- Assmann, Aleida, and Linda Shortt, eds. 2012. *Memory and Political Change*. New Jersey: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Caoili, Olivia. 2006. "The Philippine Legislature: The Martial Law Period." In *Philippine Politics and Governance: An Introduction*, edited by Noel Morada and Teresa S. Encarnacion Tadem, 279–97. Quezon City, Philippines: Univeristy of the Philippines Press.
- Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Conway, Martin. 1997. "The Inventory of Experience: Memory and Identity." In *Collective Memory of Political Events" Social Psychological Perspective*, edited by James Pennebaker, Dario Paez, and Bernard Rime. New Jersey: Psychology Press.
- De Brito, Alexandra Barahona, Carmen Enriquez, and Paloma Aguilar. 2001. "The Politics of Memory and Democratization." In *The Politics of Memory: Transitional Justice in Democratizing Sociaties*, edited by Alexandra Barahona De Brito, Carmen Enriquez, and Paloma Aguilar, 1–39. Oxford University Press.
- Diamond, Larry. 1999. *Developingn Democracy: Toward Consolidation*. London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dore, Giovanna Maria Dora. 2014. "Democracy Is Not the Only Game in Town! Democratic and Authoritarian Attitudes in Indonesia, Korea, and Thailand." In *Incomplete Democracies in the Asia-Pacific: Evidence from Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, and Thailand*, edited by Giovanna Maria Dora Dore, Jae Ku, and Karl Jackson, 13–62. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ferrín, Mónica, and Hanspeter Kriesi, eds. 2016. *How Europeans View and Evaluate Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992. *On Collective Memory*. United States of America: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hann, Chris, and Elizabeth Dunn, eds. 1996. *Civil Society: Challenging Western Models*. London: Routledge.
- Hendriks, Frank. 2010. *Vital Democracy: A Theory of Democracy in Action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hutchcroft, Paul, and Joel Rocamora. 2003. "Strong Demands and Weak Institutions: The Origins and Evolution of the Democratic Deficit in the Philippines" 3: 259–252.
- Linz, Juan J., and Alfred C. Stepan. 1996a. *Problems of Democratic Transittion and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communit Europe*. London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 1996b. "Toward Consolidated Democracies." *Journal of Democracy* 7 (2): 14–33. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.1996.0031>.
- McCoy, Alfred W. 2001. "Dark Legacy: Human Rights under the Marcos Regime." In *Memory, Truth Telling, and the Pursuit of Justice: A Conference on the Legacies of the Marcos Dictatorship*, 129–44. Quezon City, Philippines: Office of Research and Publications Loyola School, Ateneo de Manila University.
- . 2012. *Torture and Impunity: The U.S. Doctrine of Coercive Interrogation*. University of Wisconsin Pres.
- Natzmer, Cheryl. 2002. "Remembering and Forgetting: Creative Expression and Reconciliation in Post-Pinochet Chile." In *Social Memory and Hisotry: Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Jacob Climo and Maria Cattell, 141–79. California: Altamira Press.
- Overholt, William. 1986. "The Rise and Fall of Ferdinand Marcos" 26: 1137–63.
- Rebullida, Maria Lourdes. 2006. "The Executive: Martial Law, Authoritarian Constitutionalism, and the Marcos Admnistration." In *Philippine Politics and Governance: An Introduction*, edited

- by Noel Morada and Teresa S. Encarnacion Tadem, 153–77. Quezon City, Philippines: Univeristy of the Philippines Press.
- Ringen, Stein. 2004. “A Distributional Theory of Economic Democracy” 11: 18–40.
- Rose-Ackerman, Susan. 2011. “Hyper-Presidentialism: Separation of Powers without Checks and Balances in Argentina and the Philippines,” Faculty Scholarship Series., .
- Tigno, George. 2006. “Electoral and Party Politics in Postwar Period.” In *Philippine Politics and Governance: An Introduction*, edited by Noel Morada and Teresa S. Encarnacion Tadem, 53–75. Quezon City, Philippines: Univeristy of the Philippines Press.
- Velasco, Renato. 2006. “Parties, Elections, and Democratization in Post-Martial Law Philippines.” In *Philippine Politics and Governance: An Introduction*, edited by Noel Morada and Teresa S. Encarnacion Tadem, 97–115. Quezon City, Philippines: Univeristy of the Philippines Press.