

Economic Globalization and the Manobo Peoples' Struggle for Social Justice

John Paul J. Petrola

Teaches Philosophy, University of San Agustin, Iloilo City Philippines

Abstract: *In this paper, I argue that the Manobos, being members of the Indigenous Peoples (IPs) in the Philippines, and as one of the most neglected and disrespected social groups in the country that have been subjected to exploitation, oppression, killings and land grabbing by the local and foreign companies engaged in mining and logging businesses and other forms of economic activity that affect the community of the indigenous people, the most that they could do is to struggle for the recognition of their human rights, ancestral domain, livelihood and freedom. Following Honneth in his theory of the struggle for recognition, I will attempt to show that the Manobos' feelings of injustice and disrespected by the agents of globalization drive them to struggle for social justice.*

Keywords: Recognition, Axel Honneth, Manobos, Social Justice, Indigenous Peoples (IPs)

1. Introduction

During the emergence of economic globalization, mining and logging companies, with the cooperation of local politicians and the elite, have triggered the marginalization of the Manobos and other indigenous communities in Mindanao. The Manobos, in particular, have suffered from massive land grabbing, militarization, killings, and other forms of human rights violations that have deeply disenfranchised them.

In the case of land grabbing, C and Alcantara and Sons Incorporated (Alsons), the biggest logging company operating in Talaingod, Davao del Norte, had taken huge parts of the Manobos' farmlands after having been granted permission by the government through the Industrial Forest Management Agreements (IFMA) in 1990 [1]. However, reports showed that Alsons had gone beyond the parameters stipulated in the license. One report explicitly said: "Alsons encroached into the Manobo territories when it initiated tree planting activities in Talaingod after the government approved its IFMA" [2]. Moreover, the mayor and vice mayor of Talaingod were Alsons' former chief operations officer and operations manager, respectively. This evidenced that mining and logging companies have been working closely with local elites and politicians in disenfranchising the Manobos through their illegal activities.

An agent of globalization, the military had established its presence in the Manobos' territory and the conduct of their military activities have marginalized the Manobos. Militarization resulted in the shutting down of schools ran by indigenous and church organizations, particularly in Bukidnon, Davao del Norte, and Surigao del Sur. As a result, hundreds of Manobos and other Lumad children have been denied access to education. In a report made by Socskargends Agenda, a broad multi-sectoral alliance in the region campaigning against large-scale mining, on December 2015 during the regional Lakbayan [3], it was noted that 9 out of 10 Lumad children had no access to formal schooling. This number was attributed to the fact that 87 Indigenous Lumad Schools in Mindanao suffered from various forms of military attacks, which in effect, stopped Lumad and Manobo children from going to school.

Moreover, the Manobos also experienced numerous extra-judicial killings and other human rights abuses which pushed them to become marginalized members of society. For one, Oplan Bayanihan, a government counter insurgency program aiming to neutralize communist guerilla groups, was used to arrest and kill without due process the Manobo tribal leaders and supporters who were campaigning against human rights and environmental violations. Some Manobo leaders were suspected of aiding the New People's Army (NPA) but military officials weren't able to present sufficient evidence proving such claim. The brutality of the killings was manifested in the murders of these individuals on September 1, 2015: Emerico Samarca, the executive director of Alternative Learning Center for Agricultural and Livelihood Development (ALCADEV); Dionel Campos, a leader of an indigenous group; and Datu Bello Sinzo, a tribal leader. Samarca was found hogtied, with a stab wound, his throat slit open inside a classroom; while Campos and Sinzo were killed in front of the members of the entire village in Lianga, Surigao del Sur [4]. Because of the culture of fear within the community, approximately 2,000 Manobos and other Lumad residents evacuated to Davao City to avoid further incidents of violence and brutality.

1.1 Objectives of the study

- 1) Present the current social conditions of the Manobo people in the Philippines;
- 2) Discuss various instances where the Manobos have been victims of injustice by the agents of globalization; and,
- 3) Provide analysis on how the Manobos' experiences of injustice drive them to struggle for social justice.

2. Literature Review

Let me begin my presentation on the Manobos with a short discussion of their historical background. This is necessary in order to know their situation before and after the infiltration of economic globalization in their community. John M. Garvan, one of the early scholars on the Manobos, argues that the term Manobo is believed to have originated from two words "man," which means "people," and "suba," a Hiligaynon term, which means "river." If we combine

these two terms, we can derive the words “river-man.” Thus, for Garvan, the term Manobo means river people [5].

According to the National Commission for Culture and Arts (NCCA), the Manobos as one of the Lumad (native) groups in Mindanao are considered the largest indigenous groups in southern Philippines with the most number of sub-groups. Moreover, the NCCA writes that in the 1994 national census, out of 2.1 million lumads, 36 percent or 749, 042 of which are Manobos occupying the core areas of Sarangani, Agusan, Bukidnon, Surigao del Sur, Misamis Oriental, Davao provinces, and North and South Cotabato [6]. Lydia Mary De Leon claims that most of the Manobos could be found in the mountain areas, hillsides, plateaus, and river valleys [7].

The narrative of the Manobos’ oral tradition tells us that the Manobo tribe originated from two brothers named Tabunaway and Mamalu. They both lived in the creek Banobo which flowed to Pulangi River, which is near the location of the present-day Cotabato City in Mindanao. The history of the Manobos is said to be closely linked with the coming of Islam in Mindanao in the 14th century [8]. Roughly five and half centuries ago, Institute for Autonomy and Governance (IAG) claims that there was a strong movement of converting the natives in Mindanao into Islam, including the tribes led by brothers Tabunaway and Mamalu. However, only Mamalu’s group was converted to Islam and later became the Maguindanao tribe. On the other hand, Tabunaway’s group rejected Islam and fled towards Pulangi River. Tabunaway’s group scattered in some parts of Mindanao and branched into different sub-groups. Yet, these sub-groups preserved their indigenous beliefs and practices, and retained the name Banobo, which ultimately became Manobo [9].

The Dulangan Manobo is one of the two Manobo sub-groups. Some organizations have classified these sub-groups according to the place where they settled. The Karagatan Manobos sub-group live in the coastal areas, while the Dulangan Manobos settled in the mountain areas of Sultan Kudarat. Datu Enggol Kasila, a Dulangan Manobo tribal mayor, in one of my interviews with him, defines the word “Dulangan” as a description of the Manobos’ brave character. The Dulangan Manobo communities are mostly found in the areas of Sultan Kudarat in South Cotabato in Mindanao, particularly in the municipalities of Lebak, Bagumbayan, Kalamansig, Senator Ninoy Aquino, Palembang and Esperanza [10].

It is believed that the identity of the Manobos is so dependent on their beliefs and practices which are incorporated on their customary laws. Since these customary laws have natural and religious basis, all of the Manobos’ actions, social dealings, and philosophy are in accordance with these established customs. For example, the Manobos’ system of governance, which has been established even before the colonizers came to the Philippines, has a strong influence on their customary laws, particularly in giving high respect to their elders. According to their system of governance, the title of being a Manobo chieftain belongs only to one person, who is recognized as the stronger and wiser member in the clan [11]. For Garvan and Domingo,

this means that the chieftain could not just impose sanctions to anyone whenever he wants, but his judgment must pass through the consent of the more influential members of the clan, particularly of the elders. Garvan noticed that in the Manoboland’s system of government, the elders are always respected and being consulted regarding the decisions on the matters involving disputes among members of the tribe [12].

Garvan noted that the Manobos don’t have constituted judicial authority, as well as the definite system of laws. Likewise, there are no established courts and no system of punishments, such as imprisonment and tortures that are imposed upon the offenders. Moreover, Garvan contends that the Manobo’s legal system tends to consider all violations as civil and not as criminal wrongs, which means that if one offended even one person, the relative of the offended party may kill the offender [12]. Rather, the Manobo system of law, as Harland Kerr argues, is founded on the principle of retention, preservation, and devolution of property. Thus, if one has disrespected the customary traditions and violated other member’s rights, the wrongdoer shall pay the victim either by blood or material one. The affected member, together with her family and relatives, shall seek compensation from the offender, and if not given, the offended party orders the killing of the offender, or takes justice on his own hands and kills his opponent [13].

Kerr notes that the desire for revenge or the revenge system is recognized in the Manoboland [13]. However, according to Kaliwat Theater Collective, Inc. (KTC), in most Manobo sub-groups, the system of revenge and killings are avoided. In these sub-groups, as KTC noted, if the offender could not afford to pay the *tamok* (damages), the chieftain would provide some part of the payment or ask the members of the community to help raise the *tamok* so that the dispute will be immediately settled. Thus, it will avoid more conflicts that will harm more people [14].

In terms of the Manobo’s laws on land ownership, Garvan argues that property rights on their ancestral lands are strictly observed. Ownership of large tracts of land is considered communal, particularly of a certain family, wherein they are given all the rights to utilize them for farming and other purposes. However, those people who are in good terms with the family are given rights to settle and use the land [15]. In this sense, Karl Gaspar, who is a famous scholar on the Manobos, shared same observation with Garvan. According to Gaspar, the indigenous peoples (IPs), including the Manobos, considered their ancestral lands sacred, communal and valuable possession; thus, it should not be sold, purchased, or leased [16]. Moreover, Eddie Qutoriano, also a scholar on Manobos, claims that land ownership is an important part of the Manobos’ customary laws since they consider their ancestral land as very sacred and very important to them. Qutoriano argues that the Maonobos’ ancestral lands have so much significance for them since they do not just provide them with the food they eat and the place where they can practice their traditions, but more so, they give them a sense of identity; thus, losing their land represents a loss of identity and means for survival [17].

The same concept is true with the DulanganManobos of Sultan Kudarat whom I have been with for ten days during my fieldwork. As a matter of fact, according to DatuEnggol, they consider land ownership as a community property. It is their life, source of survival and where their identity as Manobos depends on. Thus, for the Manobos, encroaching upon their ancestral lands is a violation of their customary law and stealing their lands is likewise stealing their identity as Manobos.

As we can see, theManobos have established their unique culture and practices that provided not only just peace, justice and equality in the Manoboland butalso allowed them to express their ingenuity as the Manobos. However, at present, the Manobos indigenous' way of living is under attack by powerful forces of globalization, such as the land grabbing, militarization and logging activities. They were marginalized and disenfranchised because of the different forms of injustice that these agents of economic globalization exacted on the Manobo people.

3. Research Methodology

In the first phase, this study made use of hermeneutic and descriptive method in presenting the Manobos' historical background and Honneth's theory of recognition. In the second phase, ethnographic study was conducted to gather primary data on the Manobos' present social condition and their actual experiences of injustice exacted by the agents of globalization. After permits from local authorities and tribal leaders were secured, I proceeded with the gathering of data in Salumping and Legodon. I stayed in the community for a total of 10 days, including preliminary visits and actual observation in the Manobo community. In my stay, I lived in a small house, owned by a former local government employee of Esperanza, located within the area where I conducted the study. I observed and recorded all the information I needed for the study, conducted actual interviews with the Manobos, local government officials, and some local elites. The gathered data were verified through focus group discussion with the Manobo leaders and some local officials. In the second phase of this study, critical-analytic method was employed in the application of Honneth's theory of the struggle for recognition in the Manobos' struggle for social justice.

4. Ethical Consideration

Since the study involved the indigenous peoples (IPs), particularly the Manobos in Mindanao, Philippines, permission was secured from the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) and the tribal mayor of the DulanganManobos in Esperanza, Sultan Kudarat. In the conduct of this study, the respondents' rights, particularly of the Manobos, were protected, and the full confidentiality of gathered information was assured. Hence, there was no piece of information that discloses research participants' identity, or published without their specific consent to the disclosure and only imperatively necessary. Likewise, the subjects' participation was voluntary and they were informed of their right to withdraw anytime if they feel not comfortable in the process of gathering of information. Moreover, the data were validated by the participants through focus group discussion

with the Manobos' tribal leaders and some local officials of Salumping and Legodon.

5. Results and Discussions

5.1 Honneth's Theory of Recognition

Axel Honneth is the leading critical theorist in the 20th century and the current director of the Institute for Social Research, otherwise known as the Frankfurt School. In his book entitled *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*, Honneth argued that the possibility of one's self-realization as a free and individuated person is dependent on the development of her self-confidence, self-respect, and self-esteem. For Honneth, the denial of the individual's demands for recognition causes social sufferings and experiences of injustice. These feelings of injustice for Honneth simply prove that the society is doing something unjust to its people [18]. Thus, giving the full recognition of the individuals' deep-seated claims and expectations is the best alternative to attain social justice.

In his theory of recognition, Honneth argues that indeed, we, as human persons, need a sense of approval and recognition from other people particularly in the spheres of love, rights and solidarity. Put these concepts in a political context, this means respecting everyone's rights as free, rational and co-equal citizens. However, as we can see in the present society, various individuals, most especially those who belong to the groups of cultural minority, ethnic groups and the indigenous peoples, see themselves as being wrongly treated by others, insulted and humiliated. For Honneth, these forms of disrespect, the denial of recognition for that matter, are forms of injustice that injure the subjects' positive understanding of themselves that they have acquired intersubjectively or bring interruption on one's practical relation-to-self. Thus, as Honneth argues, these experiences of disrespect deprive the subjectthe opportunity to exercise her freedom and control over her body since the degree of humiliation or insult created in the individual a feeling of defenselessness and dependent on the mercy of the other [19].

Honneth elaborates how these different forms of disrespect motivate the individuals to struggle for recognition. First, in the sphere of love, in which one gains self-confidence, it is through the experience of physical abuse, such as torture or rape that hinders the child to have access to her affective and physiological needs. As a result, one loses trust in oneself and the control over oneself is taken for granted. Second, in the sphere of rights, in which one gains self-respect, it is by way of denial of one's rights as a full-fledged member of the society that brought the individual's feelings of social shame. Furthermore, this form of disrespect creates in the individual a feeling of being neglected as a morally responsible agent of the society since her expectations and deep-seated claims were denied. Hence, it also resulted in one's feelings of being marginalized since the subject loses her ability to relate to oneself as co-equal partner of interaction with other human persons. Also, the individual feels being disenfranchised since she is being disregarded as a subject capable of forming moral judgments. And third, in the sphere of solidarity, where one gains self-esteem, it is

through the experience of social devaluation wherein the status or the “value” of the person is being degraded, depriving her of such recognition of her contribution in the society. As a result, the individual feels that she has no significant value in the community [19].

Honneth argues further that the experience of being socially humiliated, disrespected or being denied recognition jeopardizes the identity of the human person because the negative experience brought to that person a feeling of social shame. Social shame characterizes the lowering or losing of one’s feeling of self-worth and social value since one’s action is rejected [20]. As a normal reaction to this negative experience, the person will get angry, ashamed, hurt or indignant [20].

In order to provide substance as to how the denial of rights and exclusion from the society affects the emotional reaction of the victim, Honneth cited John Dewey’s pragmatist psychology. According to Dewey, as Honneth sees it, negative feelings, such as anger, indignation and sorrow, come out when one’s expectations are not met. On the contrary, positive feelings, such as joy or pride, arise when one finds a suitable solution to her pressing problem [21].

With these concepts from Dewey, Honneth argues that the denial of recognition, the experience of disrespect or injustice, created an obstruction in the habitual human actions, or so to speak, the capacity of the human person to act freely and responsibly. According to Honneth, if human actions or human freedom is violated, then, it causes moral conflicts in the society. In this sense, if the person’s normative expectations are hampered or violated, it will create a feeling of social shame, inferiority and disappointment. With this, Honneth is convinced that these negative emotional experiences brought by denial of recognition serve as impetus for the individuals to struggle for recognition, and, thus, those individuals who have suffered denial of recognition could still potentially reclaim the place in which their expectations can be achieved [22]. In addition, Honneth argues that the negative emotional reactions that is rooted from the experience of denial for recognition holds out the possibility that the injustice done to individuals will become a motive for political resistance. However, for Honneth, it still depends on the subject’s cultural-political environment that the forms of injustice be disclosed, since it is through the articulation of the social movement that the experiences of disrespect and forms of injustice become the driving force for acts of political resistance [23].

In the present times, we have seen various kinds of political resistance, for instance, the struggle of LGBT communities, cultural minorities, ethnic groups and indigenous peoples all over the world. Their social struggles are stemmed on the feelings of being unfairly treated or discriminated by the society, which is moral in nature. This means that the social struggles in the present times are motivated by individuals’ experiences of being denied of recognition or their experiences of injustice. Thus, as for Honneth, by giving these inflicted individuals due recognition of their deep-seated claims and expectations will pave the way in attaining social justice.

In this context, I am convinced that Honneth’s theory of recognition provides a powerful critique of the modern society and serves as theoretical basis of moral struggle of the marginalized social groups today, in this case, the Manobos. For this reason, as I will show later, I will attempt to appropriate Honneth’s theory of recognition to the Manobos’ struggle for social justice in the Philippines. Recognition, particularly in the legal sphere, which characterizes Honneth’s notion of freedom and social justice, takes on new meanings when applied to the current social conditions of the Manobos in the Philippines. For instance, the proper implementation of the IPRA law and adherence to the UN Declaration on the Rights of the Indigenous Peoples could be a redemptive point for the Manobos.

5.2 Marginalization of the Manobos

Let me now present economic development initiatives of the country which are believed to have provided country’s economic sustainability, poverty alleviation, and improvement of people’s well-being. However, these economic development initiatives resulted in the structural transformation of the Manobos’ customs and traditions and even loss of Manobos’ identity. Moreover, the economic policies incorporated in the country’s economic development goals were made as shields for the transnational corporations to gain domination and social control over the Manobo communities.

In Gaspar’s book entitled *The Lumad’s Struggle in the Face of Globalization*, he noted that the roots of the present misfortunes that the IPs, including the Manobos, are facing could be traced back to the beginnings of the country’s colonial history. Gaspar argues that in the 16th century, the Spaniards, through the implementation of encomienda and the hacienda systems, gave birth to feudal system in the Philippine economy. During this period, the monetary, exchange and banking systems are introduced which gave rise to the capitalist mode of production. Likewise, for the first time, as Gaspar argues, the land was considered as a commodity in the market that caused the disintegration of the indigenous system of land ownership and control. It is for this reason that the indigenous people were pulled out of their ancestral homelands and pushed towards the interior and highland areas [24]. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) wrote that the encomienda system allows the collection of high tributes from the Fiipinos, including the indigenous people. Because of the resentment of most of the Manobos to the Spanish economic policies, they moved to the upland areas which wereremote from the Spaniards’ influence, and continued to practice their customary laws regarding utilization of land and other resources [25].

During the American occupation in the early part of the 1900s, the American government enacted various land laws. These include Land Registration Act No. 496 of 1902, which allows the state to provide land title to the claimants, Philippine Commission Act no. 178 of 1903, which provides the state the authority to classify and exploit all unregistered land which has been classified by the state as public domain, Mining Law of 1905, which gave the Americans the right to acquire public land for mining purposes, and Public Land

Acts of 1913, 1919, and 1925, which opened Mindanao and other fertile lands that were declared public domain for the utilization of homesteaders, local elites and corporations for settlement and plantation business [25]. Because of these laws, huge fertile areas which were mostly inhabited by the Manobos and other Lumad groups in Mindanao were acquired by the local elites and corporations, making these areas the grounds for industrial plantations, logging and mining activities.

The exploitation of the Manobos' ancestral lands continued in the post-colonial years when the Philippines recognized and incorporated in the 1935, 1973 and 1987 constitutions the concepts of Spanish Regalian doctrine and the America's policy of land ownership. In the 1987 Philippine Constitution for example, it states that all lands of public domain, waters, minerals, coal, petroleum, and other mineral oils, all forces of potential energy, fishes, forests or timber, wildlife, flora and fauna, and other natural resources are owned by the State [26]. These constitutional mandates then serve as the basis for the enactment of the National Integrated Protected Areas System Act of 1995, Mining Act of 1995 and Presidential Decree 705 or the 1975 Revised Forestry Reform Code of the Philippines. In particular, Section 15, Chapter II of the PD 705 states that:

Lands eighteen per cent (18%) in slope or over which have already been declared as alienable and disposable shall be reverted to the classification of forest lands by the Department Head, to form part of the forest reserves, unless they are already covered by existing titles or approved public land application, or actually occupied openly, continuously, adversely and publicly for a period of not less than thirty (30) years as of the effectivity of this Code, where the occupant is qualified for a free patent under the Public Land Act: Provided, That said lands, which are not yet part of a well-established communities, shall be kept in a vegetative condition sufficient to prevent erosion and adverse effects on the lowlands and streams: Provided, Further, That when public interest so requires, steps shall be taken to expropriate, cancel defective titles, reject public land application, or eject occupants thereof [27].

This provision opens most of the Manobos' ancestral lands to economic activities, such as mining, logging and tree planting activities, considering that most of the Manobos and other IPs ancestral lands are located within the mountainous area with a slope of 18%. Because of this, the Manobos and other IPs were greatly displaced.

Included in the PD 705 is the formation of the Industrial Tree Plantation Lease Agreements (ITPLA) of 1975, and was continued through DENR's Industrial Forest Management Agreements (IFMA) up to the present times. These programs give way for more industrial and commercial tree plantations, and logging projects which are mostly funded by transnational financial institutions, such as the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP). According to Gaspar, there is no question about the government's initiative for reforestation and economic development, but what is being assailed by the NGOs is the constitutionality of the implementation of IFMA policies that resulted in land grabbing, militarization,

and massive logging operations by the transnational corporations and local elites that have jeopardized the lives and the economies of the IPs [28].

In one of my conversations with DatuEnggol, a Manobo tribal mayor in Legodan, Esperanza in one of my visits in Esperanza in 2016, he discussed the importance of their customary laws and practices in their lives as Manobos and how it changes because of the intrusion of agents of economic globalization in Legodan. DatuEnggol argues that in their community, customary laws and practices are being observed and developed further so the young generation will not forget them. Since for him these customary laws and practices are marks of being a Manobo, losing them would result in losing their identity as indigenous people. However, because of the implementation of IFMA in Esperanza that allows the reforestation projects of M & S Company, as well as the intrusion of capitalists in their community, the Manobos' concept of land ownership and system of labor have been suddenly changed from being communal to individual. In the past, DatuEnggol added, the Manobos are helping each other in doing their works, especially in their farmlands. This Manobos' system of labor, which DatuEnggol refers as *pintakasi* system, allows the Manobos to work as a community, wherein no amount or payment is given to the workers in exchange for their services because it is their contribution to their community. But now, as he says, because of the influences of capitalism, the Manobos, especially the farmers, work only for their own welfare because every labor rendered is being paid. Thus, if a Manobo farmer works more for the capitalists, he receives more amount of money for himself and for his family.

DatuEnggol argues that the adoption of the barangay system in their community changes the Manobos' legal system particularly their conflict resolution. Before, according to DatuEnggol, it will only take 30 minutes to one hour to settle the problem, no matter how big or small their disputes are. In the Manobo's customary law, the datu will call the offender and the offended parties. They will be asked for the amicable settlement which both parties will agree on the amount of money or properties that the offender's family will raise to satisfy the offended party. After both parties agree, all the datu in their community will sign the agreement form proving that the disputes are settled. However, at present, if there are disputes, the Manobos don't report to their datu anymore but to the barangay officials or police authorities and undergo the long judicial process.

For DatuEnggol, the DulanganManobos treasure their ancestral domain because it is part and parcel of their identity. For them, their land and waters are sacred and no one could talk or pass through these areas without giving respect to their gods and to the people inhabiting that area. Likewise, they consider their forests as their health center, wherein they can get variety of medicinal plants to cure their illnesses. Even just the climate in the forests already serves as medicine for them. At present, however, DatuEnggol contends that the guards and CAFGUs working for M & S Company are not allowing them to enter in their forests, sacred places and even control them in using their potable water.

DatuEnggol noted that in the later part of 1980s, there were tribal leaders who were killed by the company's militia because these tribal leaders opposed the logging and reforestation activities of the M & S Company. The Alyansangmga Lumadsa Habagatang Mindanao alangsa Demokrasya (ALUHAMAD) reports that the Consunji's Magasaysay and Sons Company private guards have been linked to numerous abuses against the indigenous peoples. ALUHAMAD claims that during the late 1980s, 3,000 private armies guarded the tree planting activities of the M & S Company in Esperanza, Sultan Kudarat and were responsible for a the widespread extra-judicial killings. Likewise, these private armies are also liable for the destruction of the Manobos' property as well as the displacements of the Teduray, Lambangian and Dulangan Manobo residents who refused to plant trees for the company [29].

Moreover, in my dialogue with Ruben Sumangga, one of the Manobo leaders, he shared his thoughts about the unending militarization in their community. According to Sumangga, there are more or less 100 hired company guards from Davao and other places under the M & S Company but they are registered as CAFGU, under the AFP ruling. The primary roles of this CAFGU are to serve as forest guards and secure the properties of the company inside their IFMA covered areas. However, most of these company guards and CAFGUs are being used to intimidate and displaced the Manobo farmers and their family. As a result, it has created culture of fear to resist against the M & S Company. In many instances, according to Daingan, the company workers will just plant durian seedlings on a Manobo ancestral land, on the following day, the M & S employee guarded by company's militia will show a letter from the company demanding the Manobo family living in that area to leave the place because it is now part of the company's IFMA.

Since most of the Manobos are incapable of reading the content of the letter that the employee had shown them, the Manobos will voluntarily leave the place and move to an unoccupied area. In some cases, the company uses force to displace the Manobos. For instance, the company workers, with the company guards, will uproot and even bulldoze the planted seedlings of the Manobo farmers. Thus, out of fear, the Manobo family leaves the place and move to Legodon, an IP barangay in Esperanza, for a safer ground.

The same observations are also found the in the report written by Jonathan Cranston, a member of Peace Builders Community Incorporated (PBCI) in the Philippines. According to Cranston, various human rights violations have been recorded against the DulanganManobos in Sultan Kudarat by the company guards. For Cranston, the company guards have killed, hurt, intimidated, burned houses and uprooted the crops of the DulanganManobos [30]. Edgar Kandi, a Dulangan Manobo leader from Sultan Kudarat argues that the Magsaysay & Company Incorporated (M & S Company, Inc.). According to Kandi, they have witnessed how the M & S Company guards bulldozed and destroyed their crops. Kandi noted that because of these incidents, many Manobos suffered from extreme poverty, malnourishment among Manobo children, and some died in starvation [31].

5.3 DulanganManobos' Current Social Conditions and their Struggle for Recognition

Having discussed the Manobos experiences of injustice brought by the intrusion of the forces of economic globalization in their community, the next task is to explore how the Manobos responded to such experiences of injustice. As previously mentioned, the Manobos have been subjected to exploitation, oppression, killings, land grabbing and other forms of economic activity; thus, the feelings of being marginalized and deprived of their right to self-determination motivate them to struggle for recognition. However, before doing this, allow me to share the result of my ten days immersion in the Dulangan Manobo community in Espeanza, Sultan Kudarat. The presentation of the Manobos' present conditions is necessary because it provides a clear picture of how the Manobos have been denied recognition by the society.

Together with my wife and my cousin, we took the habal-habal [32] ride passing through rough and slippery roads in order to reach the Dulangan Manobo communities in Salumping and Legodon. As we enter the area covered by M & S Company's IFMA in Barangay Pamantingan, we have to pass by a CAFGU checkpoint and register our name, purpose, address, and place of our destination. Once approved, the guard on duty will issue us a gate pass. After few kilometers from the first checkpoint is another checkpoint. There we have to give our gate pass and our roll number in the logbook, and once verified, we can now proceed. Few kilometers after the second checkpoint, we have to pass again to the third one. There, only the driver will register, provide the number of his passengers, and the car pass number of his motorcycle issued by the M & S Company. The same procedures happened in the succeeding checkpoints. As we pass through the M & S Company, I took notice of the huge area with variety of fruit trees such as durian, mangosteen, palm trees, and different kinds of forest trees.

After reaching the final checkpoint, I have observed that the roads were narrow, that only 2 motorcycles could pass unlike those in the area covered by M & S Company that even a 10 wheeler truck could pass. Likewise, I have also noticed that the bridges were made of bamboo, unlike those 5 steel, wide and beautiful bridges we have passed inside the IFMA covered areas. After nearly 4 hours of travel, we have reached Salumping and Legodon, where I have met groups of Manobo youth, women, farmers and their tribal and barangay leaders. We gathered in a small area and I started discussing with them the purpose of my visit. After making my intentions clear to them, they started sharing the stories of their social conditions, experiences of injustice by the different stakeholders, their struggles against domination and their demands. After our conversation, Salumping's punong barangay LitoDaingan together with other tribal leaders, we do the tour of their village. They showed me their main source of livelihood, their farms, their school, and the areas which they are claiming part of their ancestral land.

LitoDaingan described the DulanganManobos' social conditions in Salumping and Legodon as very poor because they only rely on farming as their main source of livelihood,

and in most times, they have low harvest. Usually, the Manobo farmers will also have to borrow capital from the local capitalists, which is payable during the harvest season. If the Manobos could not pay their dues on time, some capitalists ask the Manobo farmers to sign on a sheet of paper, telling them that it is a lending contract, but unknowingly in some cases, it is already a deed of sale of their agricultural lands. Because of this, some Manobos lose their lands in favor of the local capitalists. Daingan also revealed that there were a number of Manobos who are working for the M & S Company as company guards or farm workers; but, they only stay for a short period because they are being harassed by the Consunji's private guards.

As for the infrastructure projects, according to Daingan, only those steel bridges located inside the M & S Company's IFMA covered area were provided by the national government through the "Tulayng Pangulo Program" by then president Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, while those bridges made of bamboo are barangay initiated projects. In terms of health and sanitation, the two barangays don't have health center and potable water facilities, except for Salumping where they have on-going potable water facilities project funded by the barangay's internal revenue allotment (IRA). Likewise, no doctors or midwives visited them regularly to check the health conditions, especially of the pregnant women and children.

In Salumping and Legodon, the DulanganManobos are living harmoniously with the Tedurays, but unlike the Tedurays, the DulanganManobos are greatly marginalized because most of their ancestral lands are covered by M & S Company's IFMA. Since the DulanganManobos are in the mountains, they are so much dependent on their agricultural products, such as camote and cassava root crops, fruits, vegetables, rice, corn and coffee productions for daily subsistence. However, unlike in the lowland farms, the Dulangan Manobo farmers could not maximize their yield because of the absence of the factors, such as access to government's irrigation system, agricultural machineries like tractors, water pumps, farm to market roads, and steel or concrete bridges.

In my reflection based on my observation, interviews and the stories I've heard from the Manobos, I can say that their community is so depressed. This is because they were deprived of government support system, such as infrastructure, basic services and agricultural projects which are very important in improving their social status. In some of my conversations with the Manobos in the community, I have learned that their only source of family income is their agricultural products such as rice, corn and coffee. But because of the difficulty of bringing their products to the town proper due to the absence of farm to market roads and very high transport costs, they sell their products to the local capitalists, who have the capacity and machineries in transporting the products to the market. However, in most cases, these local businessmen, whom the Manobos fondly called *christianos*, took the advantage of buying the Manobos' products at a very low price. Since the Manobos need the money for their family, they just agreed to the price set by the capitalists.

Although Salumping and Legodon have public elementary and secondary schools, which most of the classrooms are donated by the KapitBisig Laban saKahirapan-Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services (KALAHI-CIDSS), yet only few Manobo children are enrolling. However, most of these children could not finish their basic education because in the middle of the year, they will drop-out from school since they are needed by their parents to help them earn a living. Because of this, only few Manobo children could finish elementary and high school. In fact, no one has finished college up to this time because of poverty.

The barangays of Salumping and Legodon are just two barangays of Esperanza inhabited by the DulanganManobos. These barangays cover 21,228 hectares of ancestral lands, which belong to the Manobos. Out of these 21,228 hectares, more or less 8,000 are occupied by the Magsaysay & Sons Company (M & S Company) for logging business, which secured license through the Timber and License Agreement (TLA) sometime in 1970. However, when DENR implemented IFMA in 1990s, M & S Company has converted their TLA's to IFMA. When the approval was made, according to Daingan, there was an absence of public consultation by the DENR with the M & S Company and the IPs. Likewise, there was no proper delineation of the area covered by IFMA.

After years of exploitation of their people and of their ancestral lands by the agents of economic globalization, the DulanganManobos together with other IPs in Esperanza took action against the abuses of the M & S Company in 1995. But unlike in other places, the DulanganManobos are known for being peace-loving people and, thus, they had never engaged in war against these agents of globalization. In fact, the DulanganManobos staged their struggle in a peaceful manner by patiently observing lawful and long processes in claiming their ancestral claims and demands. First, the Manobo and other IP leaders in Esperanza gathered together for the first time to discuss their claims on ancestral domain. Through the help of then vice mayor Ricardo Piad, the letter of the IPs in Esperanza requesting for the Certificate of Ancestral Domain Claims (CADC) of the DulanganManobos covering the 21,228 hectares of Salumping and Legodon was formally forwarded to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). However, it took 6 years of follow-ups before it was finally approved by DENR in 2001. In my interview with Piad, he argued that although the request has been approved by the DENR, the surveyors could not pursue with the perimeter survey of the ancestral domain claims because of the intimidation made by the company guards to the surveying team. Because of this, in 2005, the Manobo with the other IP leaders seek help from National Commission for Indigenous People (NCIP) for the continuation of perimeter inspection and delineation of the ancestral domain claims citing the IPRA law of 1997. On that same year, the NCIP issued a memorandum stating the continuation of perimeter survey of the ancestral domain claims of the DulanganManobos in Salumping and Legodon.

Quoting from some important documents gathered by Peace Builders Community Incorporated (PBCI) in the Philippines,

Cranston argues that after the NCIP memorandum in 2005, the government hired surveyors began to inspect and delineate the ancestral domain claims of the IPs of Esperanza in May of the same year. However, Cranston noted that few days later, the survey activities were stopped because the surveyors were harassed by the company guards [33]. Since 2005 up to the end of the term of the former Pres. Benigno Aquino, the IP leaders of Esperanza are still waiting for the answers from the government regarding their claims.

After a decade of fruitless waiting for government action, the peace-loving DulanganManobos became frustrated. In 2015, the Manobo leaders together with the other IPs have created a tribal council to formulate course of action regarding their ancestral domains claims and their demands concerning the M & S Company and the renewal of their IFMA. For DatuEnggol, since the M & S Company seeks for renewal for another 25 years agreement, he said this is the right time for them to be more united and vocal in staging their demands and rights in their ancestral domain because the company needs their free and prior consent as part of the requirements for IFMA renewal. In all of the government's delaying tactics on the processing of Certificate of Ancestral Domain Claim (CADC), the Manobo leaders are convinced that the company has always the unseen powerful machineries manipulating the local government and even the national authorities to do such delays. But still they are hopeful that their rights will be respected and their demands will be recognized by the company and the government authorities.

Because of this, the Manobo and other IP leaders stated clearly the following demands in their position paper. First is the immediate continuation of the delineation perimeter survey of the area contested by the IPs as part of their ancestral domain as well as the awarding of Certificate of Ancestral Domain Titles (CADTs) to the IPs in accordance with the IPRA law. Second, that the IP communities shall be granted the right to benefit from the proceeds of utilization, extraction and development project activities of the logging company. Third, that their rights on ancestral domain shall be respected. And lastly, free and prior informed consent should be secured prior to the renewal of M & S Company's IFMA.

As we can see, the demands of the Manobos contain not just for the improvement of their socio-economic interests but more so, it is a moral claim hinges on respect and self-determination. We have learned in the preceding discussion that the Manobos' struggle for recognition hinges on their being one of the most oppressed and exploited social groups in the Philippines. The impact to the Manobos caused by logging and militarization activities of the agents of economic globalization in their community, have deeply marginalized and disenfranchised them. This simply means that the feelings of frustration resulted from the experience of being marginalized and disenfranchised drives the Manobos to struggle for recognition. Thus, following Honneth, giving the Manobos due recognition of their rights and demands shall pave the way for their emancipation from all forms domination and social control.

5.4 Instances of Disrespect

In the preceding section, I have showed how the infiltration of the powerful agents of economic globalization in cooperation with the government in the Dulangan Manobo communities in Sultan Kudarat deeply marginalized and disenfranchised the Manobos. For example, the land grabbing and militarization activities that resulted in displacement, destruction of customary traditions, destruction of crops, and even death of some Manobos. Because of these forms of disrespect committed among the Manobos, they struggle for the recognition of their rights as IPs and claims for their ancestral domain. Again, for Honneth, these forms of disrespect create a feeling of disappointments which drives the oppressed subjects to struggle for recognition. For this reason, I will discuss the various instances of disrespect on the Dulangan Manobo communities in Sultan Kudarat using Honneth's perspective.

Loss of land

Ancestral land for the Manobos is considered sacred, communal, and their source of identity. It is for this reason that they have developed their deep sense of belongingness and solidarity as tribes. Yet, because of the unending encroachment and land grabbing activities of the mining and logging companies to the Manobos' ancestral land, it has destroyed the Manobos communal relationship and even loss their identity. For Honneth, this is a form of disrespect that denies their identity leading to self-uncertainty. Being uncertain, it is impossible for the Manobos to achieve self-respect because their rights to live as one community of the DulanganManobos are being denied.

Barangay System

The Manobos have established system of government and customary laws even before the colonizers came to the Philippines. The Manobos' system of governance is founded on the idea of equality among its members. As a matter of fact, for every right violated by the Manobos, there is a corresponding punishment based on their concept of justice and equality in which the elders are given the authority to be the decision maker in settling disputes. However because of the intrusion of the barangay system, the Manobos were stripped off of their power and authority on making rational decisions for their community because the government enacts laws for them without considering the welfare of the IPs. In Honneth's point of view, this is a concrete act of disrespect that disregarded the Manobos' rights to act as full-fledged members of the community who are free and capable of making rational decisions in handling issues that affects the community relationship. Since the government laws are imposed on the Manobos, the elders losing their important role as recognized peace maker of the community, and the law is alienating the integrity of their customary legal system, there is a clear manifestation, in Honneth's perspective, of another form of disrespect to the rights to equality of the Manobos with the local community. In effect, these instances of injustice could lead to the loss of self-respect in the sense that the feeling of inferiority could lead to what Honneth calls self-misrecognition. Thus, having denied such recognition, the DulanganManobos lost their distinct identity since they were absorbed by society's judicial system.

Militarization

Like any other Filipinos, the identity of Manobos is anchored on their customary traditions and practices, as expressed in the way they value life and their environment. In fact, the Manobos are considered peace-loving people and environment-friendly individuals. But because of the constant experience of threat, destruction of their crops, force evacuation of the Manobos from their land, and extra-judicial killings of some Manobos committed by the private company guards, it developed a culture of fear in the Manobo community. This culture of fear in Honneth, curtailed their freedom to act and move as autonomous individuals denying them of maintaining their positive relation to self. Disrespecting their capacity to act freely and responsibly denies them the right to achieve self-esteem since they could no longer contribute to the welfare of the society. In effect, it could lead to the loss of their self-worth as persons having value in the society.

Government Indifferences

The IPRA law and the UN Declaration on the Rights of the IPs are considered in such a way a form of recognition by the government and the international community of the IPs in the Philippines. These laws are supposed to provide the IPs the security and protection of their human rights including the preservation of their ancestral domain. However, these laws lack concrete implementation by the local and national government. Since the time the IPRA law has been promulgated in 1997, no action has been accomplished to enact the law. In fact, the government seems allowed the continuous disrespect of the M & S Company on the Manobos as proven by the unceasing extra-judicial killings, delaying of the processing of CADCs, displacement of the Manobos, and destruction of their livelihood. This attitude of indifference for Honneth shows the government's direct misrecognition of the Manobos as Filipino citizens having the rights to benefit from the state's social services like any other members of the society. This in Honneth is a clear manifestation of the society's denial of the Manobos' rights and expectations. The Manobos are not regarded as co-equal members of the society having inherent rights to life and property. Honneth also claimed the possibility of misrecognition infiltrating the minds of the individual resulting to the feelings of social shame expressed through anger, indignation, insulted and humiliated like the experience of the Manobos. Being humiliated and insulted, the Manobos feel that their value is degraded and their existence is insignificant to the community.

Because of these experiences of injustice, the Manobos feel indignant and frustrated since their normative expectations are being denied by the society and, thus, these feelings motivate the Manobos to struggle for recognition. The Manobos' struggle for social justice is not just characterized by the equal distribution of the society's resources but also by their demands for the recognition of their rights, culture, identity and dignity, which is clearly moral in nature. As Honneth argued, recognition is very important factor in life of every human person. Through recognition, the individual attains self-realization, which made her as person in full sense of the term. However, if recognition is denied, the individual feels frustrated and, thus, struggle for recognition.

Given the degree of domination and social control in the Manobo communities, resistance therefore is absolutely necessary in order for them to escape from this system of domination. As mentioned, the Manobos together with other IPs in Sultan Kudarat, have formed their council of elders. These elders "come together" to discuss and find solutions to their claims on ancestral domain as well as to resolve the illicit activities of the agents of globalization affecting their communities. The "coming together" is exactly what Honneth means of his concept of solidarity. Honneth is correct in claiming that social movements anchored on moral claims are interpreted as something affecting not just an individual but also the whole tribe [34]. The mere fact that the DulanganManobos is pushing for the recognition of the law through giving of CADCs and the concrete implementation of the IPRA law, a collective struggle for recognition is realized as envisioned by Honneth.

5.5 DulanganManobos' Unique Political Resistance

Surprisingly, the DulanganManobos have unique form of resistance as compared with other IPs who expressed their social struggle publicly and sometimes even violently. The DulanganManobos staged their struggle in a peaceful manner by patiently observing lawful and long processes in claiming their rights to equality, gaining back their identity, self-determination, autonomy and be recognized as valuable members of the society. Though it seems that this attitude shows the nobility of the Manobos' character yet, seen in the perspective of Honneth, this is an instance when the disenfranchised individuals internalized the false, contemptible, and distorted image created by the society due to the long established culture of exploitation which begun in the past and continued until the present.

Being inferior, the Manobo people submit to the whims of the M & S Company, the government incompetence as well as the abuses of the local elites. Just for instance, looking at the position paper crafted by the Manobo leaders, they are not actually demanding for the expulsion of the M & S Company from their ancestral domain but only to benefit a portion of the company's profit for their survival, which is in consonance with the provision of IPRA law. However, the deep internalization did not totally dissolve the internal resistance of the Manobos to claim their rights as expressed by the demands to have a government recognized CADCs and free and prior consultation in the renewal of M & S Company's IFMA. This manifests the desire of the Manobos to be equally recognized in Honneth's view as full-fledged members of the society.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

Clearly, the instances of disrespect on the Manobos seen in the perspective of Honneth showed that the agents of economic globalization have continuously denied recognition of the Manobos' claims on ancestral domain, their privileges, and rights as Filipinos. These experiences of injustice have deeply marginalized and disenfranchised the Manobos and created the negative feelings of being treated as 'second class' citizens.

Because of the severe impacts of economic activities in their communities, the Manobos are losing their land in favor of the capitalists. But for the Manobos, it is not only their land that is in danger, but also their identity as Manobos. Because of these, they struggle for the society's recognition of their rights as IPs and as Filipinos. Thus, as Honneth suggested, it is by giving the oppressed group's deep-seated claims and expectations that they were able to attain freedom and social justice.

In this sense, I am convinced following Honneth, that social justice for the Manobos is achieved by way recognizing their value as co-equal members of the society. Also, it is by providing the Manobos equal opportunity like any other Filipinos, to develop themselves in consonance with their customary laws and unique cultural practices; giving them their rights on the utilization of their ancestral lands; and, recognition and preservation of their rich cultural heritage.

In view thereof, I am recommending the following measures to the different concerned agencies as concrete plan of action on how the Manobos are able to attain social justice.

- 1) The strict implementation of IPRA in the Philippines as well as the United Nations' Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. These laws have been crafted to ensure protection of our IP brothers and sisters from all forms of injustice. In this manner, the national and local authorities, in cooperation with the international organizations, should go hand in hand in promoting the welfare of the Manobos and all other IPs in the Philippines by providing them necessary support in terms of the issuance of CADTs, efficiency in the delivery of social services, establishment of health centers, educational institutions, as well as in providing educational and livelihood assistance.
- 2) The DENR should revisit the process of granting of IFMA to all concessionaires. There should be proper delineation of the met and bounds of the identified areas prior to the renewal of IFMA. Also, the DENR together with NCIP should verify the veracity of the free and prior consent of the concerned Manobo communities before proceeding on an economic activity that will involve the IPs.
- 3) After granting the IFMA renewal, the DENR together with the NCIP should also regularly check the company's compliance to the agreement and validate if all the provisions stipulated in the contract have been properly implemented. This would ensure that the Manobos will be given a fair share in the productivity and net proceeds from the company's utilization of the ancestral lands.
- 4) The establishment of Legodon as IP barangay. As the center of the Dulangan Manobos in Esperanza, Sultan Kudarat, this will be a great help for the Manobos since they will be given the autonomy to further develop their rich Manobos' culture and traditions. Likewise, this will allow them to enrich their customary laws and practice their system of government.

References

- [1] Datu Doloman Dausay, "Statement: Salupongan Ta' Tanu Igkanogon Talaingod, Davao del Norte," *Mindanao Times*, 28 November 2014, Opinion section.
- [2] "The fugitive of Talaingod," <http://davaotoday.com/main/human-rights/fugitive-of-talaingod> (accessed 20 August 2016).
- [3] Lakbayan refers to People's March and Caravan staging various issues concerning human rights abuses ancestral domains, militarization, among others. Various lakbayan have been staged in the country, as a form of protests calling the government and other organizations to stop Lumads' killings and other IPs.
- [4] Karlos Manlupig, "Timeline: Attacks on the Lumad in Mindanao," <http://www.rappler.com/nation/105847-timeline-attacks-lumad-mindanao> (accessed 20 August 2016).
- [5] John M. Garvan, *The Manobos of Mindanao*. Memoirs of the National Academy of Science, Vol. 23, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1931), 2. See also Ma. Oliva Z. Domingo, "Indigenous Leadership and Governance", *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XLVIII, Nos. 1 & 2 (January-April: 2004), 18.
- [6] "Manobo", <http://ncca.gov.ph/about-culture-and-arts/culture-profile/manobo/> (accessed 17 February 2017).
- [7] Lydia Mary De Leon, "Manobo" <https://ghostcarrots34.wordpress.com/people/manobo/> (accessed 09 April 2017).
- [8] Ma. Leny Felix, "Exploring the Indigenous Local Governance of Manobo Tribes in Mindanao", *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XLVIII, Nos. 1 & 2 (January-April: 2004), 124. See also "Position Paper of the Tedurays, Lambangian and Dulangan Manobo for the Mindanao Tri-People Peace Summit", <http://www.europe-solidaire.org/spip.php?article5257> (accessed 15 March 2017).
- [9] Institute for Autonomy and Governance, "The Origin of the Tedurays", <http://www.iag.org.ph/index.php/news/11-ipdevcontent/479-the-origin-of-the-Manobos> (accessed 07 April 2017).
- [10] "Portal to the Plateau", <http://portaltotheplateau.blogspot.com/p/the-dulangan-manobos.html> (accessed 22 February 2017).
- [11] Manggob Revo Masinaring, *Understanding the Lumad: A Closer Look at a Misunderstood Culture*, (Baguio City: Tebtebba Foundation, 2011), 4.
- [12] Garvan, *The Manobos of Mindanao*, 140.
- [13] Harland Kerr, "Cotabato Manobo Ethnography", *Studies in Philippine Linguistics*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (1988), 125-151.
- [14] Kaliwat Theater Collective, Inc., *Arakan: Where Rivers Speak of the Manobo's Living Dream*, (Davao City: KTC, Inc., 1996), 71.
- [15] Garvan, *The Manobos of Mindanao*, 25-26.
- [16] Karl M. Gaspar, *The Lumad's Struggle in the Face of Globalization*, (Davao City: AFRIM, 2000), 118.

- [17] Eddie L. Quitariano, "Land, Foreign Aid and the Rural Poor in Mindanao", *Overseas Aid and Agrarian Reform, Working Paper Series* (September 2009), 15.
- [18] See Jeffry Oday, "Critical Theory at the Margins: Applying Marcuse's Model of Critical Social Theory in the Philippines," A Dissertation Paper presented to the Department of Philosophy, Macquarie University, Sydney (October 2011), 17. See also, John Paul Petrola, "Paralympics: Spheres of Recognition for PWDs in the Philippines", *International Journal of Science and Research*, Vol. 6, Issue No. 11 (November 2017), 2025-2032. DOI: 10.21275/ART20178472.
- [19] Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*, 132-134.
- [20] Danielle Petherbridge, *Axel Honneth: Critical Essays With a Reply by Axel Honneth* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 271. See also, John Paul Petrola, "Paralympics: Spheres of Recognition for PWDs in the Philippines", *International Journal of Science and Research*, Vol. 6, Issue No. 11 (November 2017), 2025-2032. DOI: 10.21275/ART20178472.
- [21] John Dewey, "The theory of Emotion, I emotional Attitudes", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 1 (1984): 553-569, http://brocku.ca/MeadProject/Dewey_1895.html (accessed 04 April 2017).
- [22] Jean-Philippe Deranty, *Beyond Communication. A Critical Study of Axel Honneth's Social Philosophy* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 315-318.
- [23] Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*, 138-139. See also Christopher F. Zurn, "Recognition, Redistribution, and Democracy: Dilemmas of Honneth's Critical Social Theory", *European Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 13, Issue 1 (April 2005), 89-126.
- [24] Gaspar, *The Lumad's Struggle in the Face of Globalization*, 5-12.
- [25] Asian Development Bank, *"Indigenous Peoples/ Ethnic Minorities and Poverty Reduction Philippines"*, (Manila: Asian Development Bank, 2002), 9-10.
- [26] Sec. 2, Article XII of the 1987 Philippine Constitution.
- [27] "Revised Forestry Code of the Philippines", <http://www.gov.ph/1975/05/19/presidential-decree-no-705-s-1975/> (accessed 21 February 2017).
- [28] Gaspar, *The Lumad's Struggle in the Face of Globalization*, 35.
- [29] "The Philippines: Human Rights and Forest Management in the 1990s", <https://www.hrw.org/reports/1996/Philippi.html> (accessed 27 February 2017).
- [30] Jonathan Cranston, "Voices from the Dulangan Manobo File", <http://peacebuilderscommunity.org/2015/01/voices-from-the-dulangan-manobo-file/> (accessed 10 March 2017).
- [31] "Lumad group fight back vs land grabbing and abuses", <https://twaha.be/blog/lumad-group-fights-back-vs-land-grabbing-and-abuses>, (accessed 12 March 2017).
- [32] A bisaya term refers to motorcycle with extended seats at the sides or at back. These seats are made to accommodate more passengers and carry more baggage. In Esperanza, Sultan Kudarat, it called "skylab".
- [33] Jonathan Cranston, "Voices from the Dulangan Manobo File", <http://peacebuilderscommunity.org/2015/01/voices-from-the-dulangan-manobo-file/> (accessed 10 March 2017).

*N.B. Special thanks to my wife **Lorraine Grace**, my kids **Johanne** and **Pauline** for the inspiration. Also to **Mr. & Mrs. Nismal** and **family** for the unending support.*