Remembering the Mendiola March: Understanding the Role of Experience and Accounts in the Construction of History

Megan C. Mullins
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations

Part of the Sociology Commons

Recommended Citation
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1126

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.
UMI Number: 3154505

Copyright 2004 by
Mullins, Megan C.

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI

UMI Microform 3154505
Copyright 2005 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For my family and Matt.

Megan C. Mullins
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ................................................................. ii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION ................................................................. 1

   Description of Research Project ................................. 1

   Beginning with Experience ........................................... 3

   Research Purpose .................................................... 8

   Project Outline and Sociological Significance ............... 10

II. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON CULTURE, SYMBOLS,
    AND HEGEMONY .......................................................... 18

   Introduction ............................................................. 18

   Symbolic Interactionism: The Construction and
   Study of Culture ..................................................... 19

   Cultural Hegemony ................................................. 35

   Text, Ruling Relations, and News-Making .................... 41

   Historical Conditions ............................................. 51

III. HISTORICAL LITERATURE REVIEW .................................... 56

   Introduction ........................................................... 56

   Literature Review Part I: Globalization Theories,
   Neo-Colonial Practices, and a History of
   Colonialism and Resistance in the Philippines .......... 60

      Globalization Theories .......................................... 60

      Spanish Occupation ............................................. 68

      United States Occupation ..................................... 78

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table of Contents—continued

CHAPTER

Marcos, Power, and Neo-Colonial Control ...... 92
Martial Law ........................................... 101
People Power and the Church ..................... 110
After the Ousting of Marcos ....................... 117

Literature Review Part II: Institutional
Responses to Hunger and Poverty ................. 120

Introduction ........................................... 120

The Role of International Organizations in
Dependency and Underdevelopment in the
Philippines ............................................ 120

United States Power Expressed through
Lending Policies ..................................... 125

Religious Institutional Response to Social
Injustices and World Hunger: Traditional
and Alternative Approaches ....................... 146

IV. RESEARCH METHODS .............................. 164

Introduction ........................................... 164

Research Design and Data Collection ............. 165

The Newspaper Articles ............................. 168

The Interviews ....................................... 170

Critical Discourse Analysis and the Media ...... 172

The Production of Text: Media Articles and
Discourse ............................................ 174

The Production of Text: Interviews and
Remembered Accounts .............................. 177

iv

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table of Contents—continued

CHAPTER

The Comparison of Accounts Using Discourse Analysis ........................................ 181

Textual Framing Techniques .................................................. 184

Authorized Subjects/Voices Technique ........................................ 184

Foregrounding and Backgrounding Techniques .......................................... 190

Omission Techniques .......................................................... 192

Discussion .................................................................................. 193

Project Strengths and Weaknesses .................................................. 196

V. RESEARCH RESULTS: ARTICLE ANALYSIS ................................. 204

Introduction .............................................................................. 204

Analysis of January 23rd 1987 Article ........................................... 205

Article Summary ........................................................................ 205

Authorized Subjects/Voices ...................................................... 212

Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding,
and Omission Techniques ......................................................... 214

The Demonstrators .................................................................. 215

The Military .............................................................................. 219

The Government ....................................................................... 223

The Communists ...................................................................... 224

Aquino's Political Arrival ......................................................... 226

Analysis of January 24th 1987 Article(1st) ................................ 228
Table of Contents—continued

CHAPTER

Article Summary ............................................. 228
Authorized Subjects/Voices ......................... 236

Identified Groups, Actions, and
Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding,
and Omission Techniques .............................. 239

The Peace Talk Negotiators ......................... 241
The Military ............................................. 243
The Government ......................................... 245
Aquino's Opponents on the "Right" ............ 247
Aquino's Opponents on the "Left" ............. 249

Analysis of January 24th 1987 Article (2nd) .... 252

Article Summary ............................................. 252
Authorized Subjects/Voices ......................... 256

Identified Groups, Actions, and
Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding,
and Omission Techniques: The Paris
Club/Foreign Creditors ................................. 257

The Philippine Bank and Associates ............ 259
The Marchers and Aquino's Government ... 261

Analysis of January 25th 1987 Article .......... 262

Article Summary ............................................. 262
Authorized Subjects/Voices ......................... 263

Identified Groups, Actions, and
Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding,
and Omission Techniques: A Summary .......... 264
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Contents—continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of January 26th 1987 Article (1st) ..... 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Summary ................... 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Subjects/Voices .................. 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques ............ 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leftists ....................... 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Military ...................... 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchers and Their Families .......... 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of January 26th 1987 Article (2nd) ..... 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Summary .................... 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Subjects/Voices ............. 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques ............ 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Negotations and Presidential Power ............ 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leftist and Communist Groups .......... 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Representing the &quot;Center&quot; .......... 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Analysis Conclusions ............ 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. INTERVIEWEE ACCOUNTS ............... 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction ....................... 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section I: Organizational Ties and Trip Experiences ............ 315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vii

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table of Contents—continued

CHAPTER

Section I: Authorized Subjects/Voices ........ 315

Section I: Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques ............. 318

Interviewee Group/Organizational Affiliations in 1987 ........... 319

The Purpose of the Trip .......................... 356

The Purpose of the March ....................... 379

Description of the March and Massacre .... 390

Section I: Overall Analysis ..................... 400

Section II: The Cultural Context of Ecumenical Work on Social Justice Issues in the United States ................................. 408

Section II: Authorized Subjects/Voices ...... 409

Section II: Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques ............. 410

The Political and Religious Landscape of the 1980s ................. 411

On Being an American ........................... 445

Education Through Experience .................. 463

Section II: Overall Analysis ..................... 479

VII. OVERALL ANALYSIS AND REPORT CONCLUSION ............. 482

Overall Project Analysis .......................... 482

Report Conclusion ............................... 487

viii
Table of Contents—continued

APPENDICES

A. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ........................................... 490

B. H.S.I.R.B. PROJECT APPROVAL LETTER ................. 493

REFERENCES ................................................................. 495
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Research Project

This research project investigated the relationship between personal experiences of events and public descriptions of events. Using qualitative interview and content analysis research, I developed a case study around a 1987 march and demonstration for land reform in the Philippines. First, I analyzed articles from the New York Times describing the immediate event and its aftermath. Next, I interviewed participants who had been on a trip to the Philippines and were interested in the groups that participated in the march. Some of these interviewees also witnessed the march and demonstration. My first goal of the research was to compare these accounts using discourse analysis techniques in order to reveal any existing consistencies and contradictions in definitions and descriptions of the event and the issues surrounding its occurrence. My second goal was to gain a better understanding of the relationship between the tour members' personal experiences of the event and available public
descriptions of the event. My specific research questions were as follows:

1. What consistencies and contradictions exist between the newspaper accounting of the event and interviewee accounts?

2. What historical discourses did each type of account include when informing me of the significant events and issues surrounding the occurrence of the Mendiola March?

3. How, using examples from their lives and through the context of their church work, did interviewees describe the relationship between the United States and the Philippines?

4. What, if at all, did participants identify as either social structural barriers or aids existing for them within the United States that influenced their ability to do their work in the during the 1980s?

5. What can a sociological comparison of these accounts reveal about the role of power in shaping the placement of experience in the study of history?

Overall, the information collected through this research enabled me to provide an example of how news media can frame international news content in order to emphasize neo-colonial ideology and structural globalization practices. Interviewee accounts revealed how this ideology
can be adopted, negotiated, or rejected based upon the resources to which they had access.

Beginning with Experience

On January 22, 1987, my mother almost died in an event that came to be called the Mendiola Massacre. I was 16 years old. This investigation began with my attempt to understand how she had come to be present at that march. I never really had a detailed understanding of that day. I had never read any newspaper reporting of the event and did not even know what events had led my mother to be in the crowd. At sixteen, I had been self-absorbed enough in my adolescent milieu that I only remember her coming home battered and broken and her long process of recovery. Once while I was visiting her as an adult, she mentioned that she had saved some newspaper articles from the march and asked if I wanted to see them. I said yes. I wasn’t looking for anything specific. I just wanted to find out what had gone on that day. Up until that point, I hadn’t realized how little I knew of the events of that day. I just wanted to connect my memories to a better understanding of what happened. I was also in graduate school and here I was learning about “the big picture.” I was learning about the
processes of colonization and globalization, of their macrolevel magnitude and significance to sociology, learning about what it takes for social change to occur, and learning how power influences people's (including a sociologist's) everyday world.

From these articles and our conversations about them, I learned that on this day, near the city of Manila located in the Philippines, approximately 10 to 15,000 farmers and supporters participated in a march to the palace of the new president, Cory Aquino, to advocate for land reform. The march was stopped at the foot of the Mendiola Bridge where riot police and the Philippine Marines met participants. The police and marines would not let the crowd pass and then began firing into the crowd. In the ensuing chaos, 18 people were killed and over 100 injured. I learned that my mother had been one of the people injured. She had been trampled by the crowd.

Reading those articles, I realized how close my mother had come to being another death, big to me but small to others, with unreported and invisible ties to greater causes and dreams. Her experiences and the reasons for her being there that day were unreported and invisible in the articles, giving me the impression that she hadn't been there at all: nor the group of Americans she had been with.
were there either. I saw pictures of young, scared Filipino men, and read many quotes from various military leaders and from the new President, Cory Aquino, denouncing the incident. I studied these pictures and stories to try to understand what had happened and what my mother had been involved in, but was unable to conceptually connect the information provided by these stories with my mother's presence there. From these realizations, I came to understand that I needed my mother's story and the stories of others who had been on that trip to braid the information I had about her, about the Philippines, and about what had happened at the Mendiola bridge into a cohesive narrative.

I learned about the complex issues surrounding this event, thus informing my interpretation of it, from research based in academe, from newspaper accounts, and most important to me now, the testimonials of people from the United States that were in the same group as my mother. This paper, then, begins my account of the investigation into this incident and the lives of Americans that composed the group with whom my mother was traveling.

Therefore, this is not only an investigation of the event, but also an investigation of this part of my mother's life. I now know some specific reasons for her
being there at the march and the violence that ensued. She was part of a Christian-based educational tour that had come to the Philippines to investigate how communities were attempting to diagnose and change power dynamics viewed as creating the problem of absolute poverty and the experience of hunger in communities. Participants on the trip represented or worked directly with different United States Christian denominations that financially supported the organization sponsoring the trip. The sponsoring organization was a Christian-affiliated organization working for the self-development of people suffering from hunger and poverty as a result of land displacement, land ownership, and other agrarian issues. The purpose of the trip to the Philippines was to enable people from the United States to see and hear from people living in conditions of poverty define what obstacles they faced to developing their community and what types of assistance from outsiders would help their community development projects.

My own situation as witness also informs this account. In addition to witnessing my mother’s injuries, I witnessed her being forced to justify her position to multiple family members and critics in our local community in the United States. I wanted to defend her position even though I didn’t
know what it necessarily was. As an adult, my memories of her marginalization in the community and my defensive feelings developed into my first research questions. How had my mother come to be in the Philippines in order to witness this event? What had happened in her life to bring her there? Needless to say, other questions followed.

What resulted from this investigation is first of all, a story of ecumenical work on social justice issues in the 1980s, people’s lived experiences working within the United States and in other countries, and the impact of work on hunger and social justice issues upon their lives. What resulted as well is a deeper understanding of the relationship between personal experiences and public accounts of historic events. Overall, I began the study by believing that what we as people know begins with our experiences and then extends beyond them to include other social relations that are usually rendered invisible through specific cultural practices. I believe that research on the construction of knowledge and its intersections with social institutions and individual experience can be explored by drawing from the perspective of personal history to see how and where this personal biography connects into the social system and into history in significant ways.
Research Purpose

In order to investigate both the incident at the Mendiola Bridge and the lives of the Americans that had been on the tour with my mother, I interviewed participants on the trip using the process of oral history research. My larger purpose and intent was to gain a better understanding of the relationship between the tour members' personal experiences of the event and available public descriptions of the event. Therefore, in addition to interviews, I also performed a discourse analysis on the New York Time's articles describing the event during the week in which it happened. I developed a case study of this incident from these two sources and my own experiences.

The first purpose of the research project was to provide a detailed investigation of how these published accounts of the event compare to peoples' personal accounts of the event. Specifically, I investigated how the newspaper defined, theorized, and described issues as they relate to the Philippines and the Filipino march such as its purpose, the participants involved, and the resources (people, history, events) being used to construct meaning about the event. Then I compared this description to
personal accounts of involvement with the event in order to reveal what each type of account prioritized in its framing of the massacre. To understand the relationship between accounts, I focused my analysis on the consistency and contradiction in the framing of issues discussed in these testimonies. In doing so, I investigated how the newspaper articles and interviewee accounts constructed certain definitions, theories, and overall descriptions of the event and its surrounding issues by depending upon certain resources. By resources I mean those different symbolic frameworks for understanding power relationships between people and between countries from a perspective shaped by United States culture.

The second purpose of this project was to get at some of the deeper issues that concerned the participants. To do this, I asked participants to describe what is was like to do their work in the 1980’s, their feelings about the work they’d done, and its impact on their outlook on life. I chose to investigate their work lives based upon knowledge gained from my mother that the people who had attended the tour were affiliated with a variety of ecumenically and community based social justice agencies. I was looking to see how people’s experiences had been structurally organized based on what cultural resources
they turned to in order to define their work activities as well as those elements of culture that created obstacles to their work. Overall, not only was I able to obtain alternative viewpoints than the newspaper descriptions, I was also able to better understand the ways that individuals organized the meaning of this trip in relation to their other experiences.

Therefore, the purpose of this research project was to provide an exploratory example of a comparison of public to private, experiences when attempting to gain knowledge about an international issue. The purpose of this study is not to generalize to greater issues but rather to explain a process that may represent other discrepancies in public ad private accounts that exist due to the minimization or disappearance of alternative types of accounts in historical documentation.

Project Outline and Sociological Significance

In this beginning chapter, I have explained how a disjunction in meaning between what I publicly read and privately experienced inspired this research project. The chapters following emphasize the structuring and further significance of the research project.
In Chapter II, I discuss the theoretical influences on this research project. Specifically, I detail how culture, as composed by symbolic frameworks, helps people make meaningful sense of their lives. In order to do this, I first drew on the sociological and historical literature that define as problematic the negation of experience as influential in the construction of a social science research inquiry. Second, I used some of the theories of critical symbolic interaction to discuss the role of symbolic frames and their distribution through mass forms of communication to emphasize how publicly available, historical constructions of meaning are created and adopted. Third, I discuss how people can interpret the experiences of others through dominant frameworks for interpretation spread by mass communication and the consequence of presenting this information to people through textualized categories that abstract people's experiences in order to fit them into general categories for interpretation in popular culture.

Chapter III represents my historical literature review and it is separated into two sections. First, I constructed a historical account of events occurring in the Philippines that I felt were relevant to gaining necessary background knowledge for understanding this research. I knew that I needed to have a better understanding of Philippine history.
in order to have some historical context in which to place interviewee and newspaper article accounts. Yet I knew that in reading about this history from within U.S. culture, I needed to be cognizant of colonialism and colonial interpretations existing in what I read. With this awareness, I drew on what is publicly available to people interested in the historical contexts of particular issues such as sociologists, journalists, historians, and other academics, to see how these resources could inform my account. I felt that this information would provide me with the histories that are already available and could represent how people in the United States become informed about their political and economic relationship with other countries. I also used my literature review to develop and investigate the relationships with which I, as a sociologist, am concerned. World politics, the historical relationships between the United States and the Philippines, myths of world hunger, and the work of United States churches on social justice issues are all cultural components I regarded as relevant and necessary to developing a framework in which to place this study.

I want to emphasize here that this literature review is only a partial one and is not exhaustive in its approach. However, what historical accounts I have included in this
research provide a necessary although not comprehensive baseline to readers on political and economic events that reflect some of the historical context in which I frame the Mendiola March and its relationship to the people I interviewed. The literature review also places the occurrence of the Mendiola March within the context of the complicated, postcolonial relationship between the Philippines and the United States.

For this part of the literature review, I also drew upon the available literature in academe to understand the sociological discourse surrounding these issues. As I am aware of ideas regarding hegemonic domination, world systems theory, and those Western institutions that reinforce specific economic, and political networks that wield great power over the definition of relationships between countries, these hegemonic organizations and practices are framed through a discussion of globalization and development theory. This element of my research also includes a historical summary of the impact of World Bank and International Monetary Fund organizational projects in the Philippines.

In the second part of Chapter III, I include a historical review of the United States Christian response to social justice issues and the contested definitions of the
role of the church in such matters as part of the historical conditions that brought the interviewees together for the trip. Due to the nature of the people who participated on this trip, I chose to study religiously affiliated activists. I was aware that I needed some context for understanding their experiences as both representatives of alternative viewpoints on globalization as well as understand the placement of religious groups in historical roles that perpetuated colonizing practices. Therefore, this history enabled me to better understand the historical context of the involvement of Christian churches in these matters.

I felt that getting an understanding of this history would help me place the work of interviewees within the general climate of the United States. I thought this literature review would give me some necessary background into how this debate influenced people's work on social justice issues as the people I interviewed were people who had the opportunity to do so using personal understandings of religious purpose and activist knowledge. In this way, the controversy between institutionalized religious purpose supported by institutional structures and the individual faith that inspired social justice work also informed my
analysis of interviewee accounts of their lived experiences working on hunger and social justice issues.

In Chapters IV, V, and VI, I compared and contrasted accounts using discourse analysis techniques. I limited my sample of articles to six for my analysis of an example of the way the incident was portrayed in the popular media. I chose to analyze only those articles mentioning the march and its aftermath within seven days of its occurrence in order to use the descriptions as an exploratory example, rather than generalization, of how mainstream media approached the issue. Additionally, I interviewed a small sample (N=6) of people. These small samples enabled me to perform a thorough, microanalysis of the components of each article and in each interview while framing this comparison around the facts of the event as reported by the paper and by interviewees.

Additional material gathered in the interviews enabled me to explore theoretically how people representing the oppressor of a group or system interpret and confront the issues raised by groups of people oppressed from post-colonial and globalized trade relationships in order to make the changes suggested by these groups. In this way, interviewees offer important insights into the lives of religious representatives during this time period that may
eventually represent trends in thinking of the whole group or may be refuted once more interviews have been completed. Therefore, further research is necessary in order to reveal the themes in beliefs about the work of people participating on that trip.

Overall, the information collected through this research enabled me to investigate the relationship of neo-colonial ideology and structural globalization practices to people’s lives within the United States. As such, this research represents an exploratory example of how this ideology can be adopted, negotiated, or rejected based upon the resources to which one has access, including the resources of the researcher, both experientially and academically. Therefore, this project is the exploratory beginning of a larger project meant to compliment other sociological and historical studies of relationships between the United States and other countries and findings should be interpreted with caution.

Therefore, in this chapter I have discussed the research questions that developed for this project and the experiences that caused me to develop the research design of this project. Additionally, I have provided an outline of the arrangement of this research project and paper. In the next chapter I will discuss how critical symbolic
interactionist theories, cultural theory, and theories of power have influenced the theoretical framework guiding this research project.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON CULTURE, SYMBOLS, AND HEGEMONY

Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss some of the theories that have been relevant to my understanding of the relationship between experiential and public accounts. First, I discuss how culture can be viewed as a constructed process and its role in defining social order. To do so, I discuss how symbolic interaction theory informs cultural studies by studying the construction of meaning for people in cultural contexts as representing a dialectic between individual consciousness and structural determinants. Second, I show how symbolic interaction shapes how a social scientist can study and interpret the social construction of meaningful events and accounts in history and the role experience can have in this shaping. Third, I discuss how hegemony shapes what is publicly available for people to draw upon and use as resources to make meaning. Fourth, I show how this process is impacted by the structuring of publicly available textual accounts (such as newspapers) with a distribution that classifies them as a mass form of communication, who
create a selective version of the past that influences people's activities and ideas for the future. Overall, I discuss the theoretical viewpoints that support my analysis of how hegemony can structure interpretations of the past based on the reproduction of selective histories taking different social forms in culture. In this way, I show how public mainstream media can be viewed by researchers as one example of a hegemonic social form in a public community such as the United States and the relationship of this form to experiential accounts and historically accumulated, public knowledge.

Symbolic Interactionism: The Construction and Study of Culture

Clark & Gerson (1990) discuss how symbolic interaction theory can assist researchers in investigating the symbolic frameworks of culture. This perspective emphasizes the study of the interpretive in culture (Denzin 1992). They discuss how critical symbolic interaction is a tool used to examine and study the construction of scientific accounts — that scientific facts, data findings, and theories are socially constructed. They also emphasize that knowledge is a process, a form of work, informed by experiences and
socially organized (Clark & Gerson 1990). Therefore, one should make no distinction between the cognitive and social aspects of knowledge as the construction of knowledge embodies a type of work using both experiences and social ordering as resources in constructing an interpretation. Specifically, they state that, "For interactionists, ideas are commitments, ways of allocating resources and responding to constraints" (Clarke & Gerson 1990:182).

Denzin (1992) expands upon their perspective by demonstrating how one can analyze the interactions of biography and experience within social structures and historical contexts that produce meaning and actions basic to group life. He writes that symbolic interactionists,

...study the intersections of interaction, biography, and social structure in particular historical moments. Interactional experience is assumed to be organized in terms of the motives and accounts that people give themselves for acting. These accounts are learned from others, as well as from the popular culture. These motives, gendered and nongendered, explain past behavior and are used to predict future behavior. They are ideological constructions which create specific forms of interactional subjectivity in concrete situations. Power, emotionality, and force are basic features of everyday life. Intersubjectivity - the shared knowledge that exists between two persons regarding one another's conscious mental states - is basic to shared human group life. Intersubjectivity is established through shared emotional experiences which are temporally constituted. (Denzin 1992:22)

Framed within contemporary studies of culture, this perspective on symbolic interaction shapes how one can study
and interpret the social construction of meaningful events and accounts in history (McCall & Becker 1990). Symbolic interaction can and has informed cultural studies by contributing to the study of the construction of meaning for people in cultural contexts as representing a dialectic between individual consciousness and structural determinants (McCall & Becker 1990). From this perspective, meaning is defined as inter-subjective as well as social.

Additionally, the role of the individual subject is prioritized in these accounts as she/he has subjective as well as objective experiences in the process of constructing social reality and expresses this perception of reality through language. As Denzin writes,

Interactionists have persisted in believing in the presence of a concrete, real subject. This subject’s presence in the world is given through subjective and objective reports about personal experience and the interaction process. Language (and the verbal reports it permits) has been taken as the window into the life of the person (1992:2).

In this way, symbolic interaction theorists suggest that people can be studied both as rule followers or actors and tool users. They also express how language is used as a medium for both conscious and unconscious ways of constructing knowledge about the relationships existing between social events and ones’ self. Here, action is guided by meaning and knowledge takes form in the
interaction between people through language because language is both conceptually and materially produced. This approach to culture, "...sees causal significance not in defining ends of action, but in providing cultural components that are used to construct strategies of action" (Swidler 1986:273).

Personal experience can therefore inform more traditional and public representations of events by enabling active subjects to frame the interpretation by reportedly "telling what happened" using available cultural and historical discourses to analyze hegemonic trends in the depictions of events in history (Hall 1981). Public representations, such as those constructed by mainstream news media sources, are dominated by a process of communication and of gathering information that shapes the perspectives people can be grounded in on particular issues (such as international relations) that are not directly experienced. It is this bureaucratic characteristic of the public news media that enables me to use the newspaper articles as an example, and essentially a theoretical baseline. I used this baseline to represent an example of how typifications regarding international news are arranged by the public news media. I then compared this account to some of the existing sociological and historical literature and to the interviewee accounts in order to show how the
Mendiola March and Massacre, as well as the issues surrounding its occurrence can take on different representations and forms in history.

Human understanding is also grounded in biographical experiences. People learn what to expect in the social construction of reality from their biographical experiences. This is how people learn to define a situation in terms of its limits and possibilities (Schutz 1962). As such, my research also reflects elements of my biographical history. Comparing interviewee accounts to newspaper articles, informed through the information gathered in the literature review, enables me to explore myself as an individual and as a researcher and connect this event in my life, my mother's life, and the other interviewee lives to larger structural occurrences.

Based upon this understanding, meaning is culture and it can be studied by analyzing people's attempts to coordinate their activities with one another through the use of significant symbols. Symbolic interaction theorists present culture as meaningful social interaction between individuals and highlight that it is an individual's awareness and reflexivity that allows them the unique ability to create meaningful action in their lives within cultural contexts. As Hewitt writes, "Society and culture -
the human environment - are themselves constantly the products of human symbolic activity as well as factors that constrain what people do” (1976:29). People reflecting on their experiences from the past within the context of these interviews have the potential to identify the ways in which they were aware of and able to articulate how their lives were intertwined with the social order and the actions that resulted from this awareness.

Theorist Raymond Williams complements these symbolic interaction writers by placing great value on developing a theory of the sociology of culture that investigates the interaction of culture with a stratified social order based upon historical conditions that constrains what people can know and do. He discusses how culture can be defined as organized relationships and practices expressing meanings and values framed within historical conditions. He notes that culture represents,

...both the meanings and values which arise amongst distinctive social groups and classes, on the basis of their given historical conditions and relationships, through which they ‘handle’ and respond to the conditions of existence; and as the lived traditions and practices through which those ‘understandings’ are expressed and in which they are embodied (Williams in Hall 1981:26).

To his understanding,

...‘cultural practice’ and ‘cultural production’ (in its most recognizable terms) are not simply derived from an
otherwise constituted social order but are themselves major elements in its constitution (Williams 1981:13).

In this way, culture constructs social order as it is simultaneously defined by social order and vice versa. Therefore, he defines culture as partly constitutive of social practices and he also sees it as the,

...signifying system through which necessarily (though among other means) a social order is communicated, reproduced, experienced and explored (Williams 1981:13).

Williams compliments symbolic interaction by pointing out that the production of objects in culture involves varying degrees of sensuous, organic, embodied activities that do not just represent a production in some general way (Williams 1981). Specifically, he writes that,

To say that all cultural practice is 'ideological' need mean no more than that (as in some other current uses) all practice is signifying. ... what is then omitted ... is the set of complex real processes by which a 'culture' or an 'ideology' is itself produced (Williams 1981:29).

In terms of its study, he notes that,

We have then to look in detail at the ways in which relatively constant biological processes and relatively variable means of production have combined both in specifically comparable ways, always within special social (historico-social) situation (Williams 1981:23).

Anthropologist Clifford Geertz compliments this definition of culture in noting that,

...it denotes an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of
which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life (Geertz 1973:89).

For Geertz, culture is public and created by human behavior defined as symbolic action. He emphasized that "Culture is public because meaning is" (Geertz 1973:12). He expands on the role of meaning by discussing how individual action is informed by a culture's significant symbols, and that the community provides these significant symbols to individuals (Geertz 1973). Here, meaning is both individual and social and it is mediated by the application, the interpretation, and action of significant normative symbols provided by a community. He suggests that the study of this type of culture emphasize the searching out of the patterns of symbolic codes underneath routine activities by describing these activities from a variety of perspectives (Geertz 1973). From a social change perspective, this type of scholarly work on culture as it relates to political action views culture as a mediating factor which promotes participation in culture as civic engagement fostered by democratic values that generally support social order (Almond & Verba 1963).

From this perspective, people are not consciously aware of most values as normative social constructions. People may be knowledgeable, reliable actors in the world but as
such, they still take meaning from the information presented to them in their culture in taken-for-granted ways. For instance, U.S. news is taken-for granted in its legitimacy to speak about the world. For example, as Tuchman notes, these ideas can contribute to the study of news work by explaining how,

Rather than adopt an attitude of doubt toward the social world, actors of the social world accept phenomena as given. For instance, although a newspaper reader might challenge the veracity of a specific news story, he or she does not challenge the very existence of news as a social phenomenon. The reader may attack the slant of a specific story or of a specific newspaper or newscast, but newspapers, newscasts, and news itself appear as objective givens (Tuchman 1978:186).

This is what Schutz (1962) called “the natural attitude” - the idea that patterns in the world are unquestionable. This point is particularly important to emphasize as Schutz discussed how once actions are typified, people follow rules - norms occurring through dominant social messages, in part, blindly. If action is guided by meaning and language, the construction of a news account typifies individual experiences into an institutional language (shaped by the discipline of journalism) in order to create certain taken for granted typifications in people’s daily lives.
Therefore, I argue that what information I received when I read the newspaper articles represent typifications. These typifications are composed of both conventional social forms to support dominant social trends and the conventional norms for its reading through the methods of the social sciences that supports some interpretations over others due to the process by which it is constructed. Yet the Black political experience in the United States reveals that opposition and democratic values go hand in hand, creating an oppositional civic culture" (Harris 2001:61). Therefore, when investigating the role of symbols and interaction in social change, formation of alternative discourses on a subject and the creation of group action around these alternative discourses demonstrates the interaction of these concepts in everyday life. In this way, the interviewee accounts can be seen as examples of oppositional perspectives to the newspaper accounts as they rely on a variety of alternative historical, social, and experiential resources to frame their interpretation of events and the alternative process by which they can report on these issues. As Harris notes,

An oppositional culture is the attribute of a group. It is usually broad and has many sometimes incompatible strands. An oppositional consciousness is the attribute of both individuals and groups. It focuses on injustice and domination (2001:61).
In these approaches to social interaction, individuals are seen as using symbols in interactions and organizing their experiences by them, sometimes in very taken for granted ways but also in deliberate, purposive ways to conduct strategies of action (Swidler 1986). In both types of analysis, "The purpose ... is to grasp how the interactions between all these practices and patterns are lived and experienced as a whole, in any particular period" (Hall 1981:22).

In my research, I combined the different tools and discursive practices available to me in order to create meaning and knowledge about this event and to see what social practices and patterns exist around the reporting of the relationship between the United States and the Philippines. I also combined these resources in order to understand the sociological history of the purposes and activities surrounding the motives of interviewees being in the Philippines at that time to see how these practices were lived and experienced. In this way, cultural studies and symbolic interaction effectively explore the shaping of meaning through cultural contexts and frame

...the tension between experiential accounts and a larger account of structural and historical determinations has been a pivotal site of [critical symbolic interaction] theorizing and debate... (McCall & Becker 1990:7).
Here, lived experience is constructed as relevant or irrelevant within the different normative perspectives of the social sciences. What is at issue here is the social construction of meaning, the definition of truth. Some traditional approaches to social science reject the subjective interpretations of people as not relevant to the study of trends in society. Yet, as Reinharz notes, to account for the way that people interpret social realities and how this impacts behavior social scientists must consider that,

...different situations produce different perceptions and definitions of reality rather than there being a real response that contrasts with a biased response. The human experience is varied, not a dichotomy between real and biased. Behavior can best be accounted for in terms of all the possible impacting conditions in which it is embedded (1992:87).

Raymond Williams adds to this perspective. In his work, he emphasized that while social scientists generally research and study the appearance and existence of conventional social forms, that these rational modes of conduct should not be considered as more meaningful than other forms of activity in one’s analysis. Although writing that these conventional forms and their processes could detail underlying patterns of processes and relationships in any specific society at any particular time in history, he
also suggests that one must pay very close attention to divergences from these conventional descriptions of social forms as,

It is then easy to miss one of the key elements in cultural production: innovation as it is happening; innovation in progress. ... Thus significant innovations may not only be compatible with a received social and cultural order; they may, in the very process of modifying it, be the necessary conditions of its reproduction (Williams 1981:201).

As such, in the study of culture, emphasis solely on conventional forms in understanding social reality, including those forms chosen for study by social scientists, prioritizes some definitions over others. This limits the frame of individual memory and popular history in any given culture and impacts the reproduction of a social form as conventional in social history and in present times by shaping collective social memory to this popularized, conventional definition or trend.

For memory is, by definition, a term which directs our attention not to the past but to the past-present relation. It is because 'the past' has this active, living existence in the present that it matters so much politically (Popular Memory Group 2002:78).

Importantly, Williams notes that, "...it is characteristics of any social order, as of any active cultural form, that it has continually to be produced as well as reproduced" (Williams 1981:199). In this way, these authors consider the impact of both symbolic and social boundaries as equally
important to determining the root elements of people’s understandings of their own actions.

Through this case study, I show how contesting frameworks are struggles involving significant symbols that frame both dominant and alternative understandings and actions regarding the relationship of U.S. lifestyles, culture, and policy to those in the Philippines. These frameworks are represented by the sociological and historical discourses present in the literature review, the newspaper articles, and the interviewee accounts. Using these resources, I investigated the locations for a Westernized meaning in popular histories, specifically in histories of global social justice work in the 1980s and about certain events and issues regarding the relationship of the United States to social problems in the Philippines.

I located these dominant and alternative constructions by documenting interviewee experiences at this time and by examining the dominant discourses of newspaper narratives. Tuchman notes the consequences of news construction on the development of knowledge in discussing how news can create for people, “...the relevance of our collective past to our present and future actions by invoking elements of the past to justify present actions” (Tuchman 1978:195). Thus, as we learn about the United States involvement in business,
military and government practices, we have a limited frame of reference to draw upon to understand and attach meaning to the situation if we only have access to one type of resource - the media.

Using these different discursive resources provide examples of what boundaries of social position (geographic, ethnic, gender, class) are reaffirmed in people's understanding of their activities and which ones intersect in the stories told by interviewees and the newspaper articles. We can also see what is symbolically remembered about the event and the issues surrounding its occurrence in relation to events that were occurring in the United States during that time period. Essentially following this notion, this research asked what boundaries are established as well as crossed over or permeated in interviewee understandings of the intersections of their lives with the occurrence of the Mendiola march as they relate and respond to Eurocentric understandings of colonialism and debate it within culture? Their accounts can also inform readers as to how this process has surfaced in their lives historically as they are asked to look back and reflect on their memories of themselves during this time period and its relevance for them today.
Specifically, these theoretical perspectives allowed me to look at how the tools people draw on to interpret experience, popular history, and personal and news production history, are all objects of culture operated by members of society through the use of symbols. Therefore, through this perspective, I looked at how tools (methods for interpretation - experience, popular history, personal history) are in a sense, objects of culture. These are objects of culture that people internalize, that motivate an individual to believe or act, some of which is consciously done, and to investigate, through interviewee accounts, how it is done. As people draw on and use cultural objects, they produce culture. As such, this perspective guided me in investigating what alternative articulations existed at this time about this relationship and the process by which it entered into public discourse as told through the experiences of people. I do this by allowing in my research for the possibility that people have insight and awareness of the normative background guiding their behavior. In other words, they are conscious of the norms and how they are changing and they use them to make everyday decisions and to create meaning from lived experiences.
To this extent, I investigated the relevance of the issues brought forth by the literature review and analysis of newspaper articles to interviewee accounts - their awareness of how the colonial relationship of the United States to the Philippines impacted their lived experiences. In other words, their awareness of how the norms and discourses they drew on motivated them to act based on their experiences in U.S. society regarding social injustice as well as within other cultures and societies. The complexities of this discussion are noted by Bhabha (1990), who discusses how colonial discourse is the most theoretically underdeveloped but also the most crucial in the study of how differences and discriminations in societies are bound together into cultural hierarchies. Following then, how does the notion of a colonial history reflect a negotiated process in the lives of individuals?

Cultural Hegemony

Traditionally, cultural practices in the social sciences have been studied as separate entities rather than as power structures. When writers link culture to power they tend to write about how culture can be a specific set of dominant meanings, discourses, and values in what we can
determine is "dominant culture." Yet these theories do not fully expose who is creating the dominant definitions or the processes by which they are created. For the purposes of this research, I pose the question of "Who writes history?" as central to my reasoning for constructing an account of this event and my mother's involvement. I do this by comparing mainstream, culturally legitimized accounts to accounts that do not carry this cultural legitimization and whose type tends to be made invisible within popular culture communication forms (such as a newspaper). This emphasis focuses on values, a traditional focus for social scientists studying culture, but it understands values as being selectively introduced and reproduced through everyday activities that may appear as normal to people, but work to reinforce power relations.

Michel Foucault (1977) expands upon the relationship of power to cultural understandings and practices. Foucault describes how language is intimately connected to power in a society and how power is reinforced but can also change through the role of discourse in representing the politics of a culture and how this context is a social construction to which all people are subjected. By connecting language to power and knowledge, he moves theory from discussion on the dynamics of interaction and
engagement between people to talk about how some forms of discourse is a political construction that is negotiated. In other words, he moves understandings from structured meaning at the individual level to its existence as a politicized relationship. Power and knowledge emerge together and create a discourse that politically structures meaning (Foucault 1977). To him, social institutions are powerful and create "regimes of truth," thus restricting the interpretation of knowledge to maintain political power. His work investigates how dominant discourses emerge as such and how people are subjugated to these processes. Through systems of education and law, and here I include mass communication, values and ideology are imposed upon people with varying degrees of powerlessness.

He notes that,

The State is superstructural in relation to a whole series of power networks that invest the body, sexuality, the family, kinship, knowledge, technology and so forth (Foucault 1977:122).

The gradual imposition of these values through the teaching of literacy and instruction from the judicial apparatus creates acceptance by the mainstream, middle class public of bourgeoisie culture. These ideas compliment Durkheim's structural focus as well as parallel Marx's notion of a false bourgeoisie consciousness - as imposed on people
through the practices of particular modes of production and as limiting the choices for people. Foucault writes about how powers or ruling relations are at work in the discursive formation of truth - the development of some conceptual definitions over others. As a result of this process, some forms of knowledge are subjugated. The knowledge not subjugated by these processes becomes centered alongside power and it becomes the reporter of fact and bearer of truth.

By connecting language to power and knowledge, Foucault uses theory to explicate how power, domination, and oppression practices are reinforced as a social norm and motive for action through the discursive practice of language. Institutions support the values shaping these norms, and therefore strengthen the support for values that exist to reinforce structured inequalities. To change power,

...one of the first things that has to be understood is that power isn’t localised in the State apparatus and that nothing in society will be changed if the mechanisms of power that function outside, below and alongside the State apparatuses, on a much more minute and everyday level, are not also changed (Foucault 1977:60).

For Foucault (1977), what becomes available for public discourse reflects how power is exercised over language, and consequently our possibilities to create meaning. Therefore,
there are certain words, meanings, ideas, and definitions in public culture that are selected and amplified while others are neglected and suppressed. Here, then, culture and tradition are not separated from ideology. Ideology can be viewed as when a specific group articulates a certain set of beliefs as conceptions of lived experiences. This process shapes the way that people are able to name a problem or grievance and bring it into the public arena for discussion. If we can say here that values are selectively introduced and supported through culture, then inequalities can exist that people may not be able to define sufficiently to lead to action upon them. As these accounts are replicated over time, they become a selective tradition—a version of the past that shapes what we see as the past and influences how we see today and how we see the future. Therefore, this process shapes the way that people are able to name a problem or grievance and bring it into the public arena for discussion. This is how hegemony functions—as a reality confirmed by perceptions of a lifestyle informing the interpretations of everyday experiences. Individuals draw on and use available discourses in specific ways that support the unequal distribution of rights, goods, ideas, and power. As we are drawing on them, we are reproducing them. Essentially, this is how a hegemonic structure
influences how people create the boundaries within which to talk about public issues.

As the newspaper articles draw upon dominant discourses to reinforce this power, to a certain degree, my literature review and interviewee accounts deconstruct this discourse to reveal the dynamics and expression of power involved in the negotiation of accounts and the absence of accounts not conforming to mainstream agendas. The review of the national newspaper and interviews with trip participants can reveal how descriptive boundaries are created regarding colonization, imperialism, the relationships between individual lifestyles and institutional oppression of people, and how the role of individuals in being responsible for change is disputed within culture. Comparisons of both institutional and experiential accounts reveal the way that this discourse is debated and what groups are involved in this debate.
The impact of power in constructions of meaning results from the cumulative effect of accounts in constructing an interpretive frame (Smith 1990). Smith notes how this process is mediated by texts. In her work (Smith 1990; 1999) she discusses how people construct their reality through the creation, use, and sharing of symbols with one another. Specific to her discussion is that symbols in texts, specifically those used by social institutions to organize the work of the institution across different locations, construct certain frames for meaning and knowledge. Her explanation of the "active text" is specific to my discussion here, as she notes that texts are actively part of the social relations creating public opinion. She discusses how,

Texts constitute a discrete ordering of social relations characterized by the detachment of discourse from the locally situated speaker and her particular biography, the substitution of categorical forms for actual members and accounts of actual events, the anonymity of readers (or watchers) and the one-way movement of messages. It is a medium in which the world exists for the participant as a textual construct, and in which belief is a commitment to one construct rather than the other, and arises quite differently from the immediacies of our experienced reality (Smith 1990:123).
She writes that it is in this manner that people organize knowledge around textually-mediated discourses and thus create the circumstances by which relations of ruling are produced and perpetuated. Ruling relations are, ...that internally coordinated complex of administrative, managerial, professional, and discursive organization that regulates, organizes, governs, and otherwise controls our societies. ... It is a mode of organizing society that is truly new for it is organized in abstraction from local settings, extra-locally, and its textually-mediated character is essential (it couldn't operate without texts whether written, printed, televised, or computerized) and characteristic (its distinctive forms of organizing and its capacity to create relations both independent and regulative of local setting depends on texts)(Smith 1999:49).

Ruling relationships are activated when an individual's experience prompts them to interact with an institution. The paperwork required, or text, becomes the key tool by which institutional action is taken, and as a tool of the institution reflects institutional concerns (Pence 1997). This ordering of a belief system emphasizes people as objects rather than as subjects in culture.

As part of my investigation, I studied how power shapes the discourse of news. Gitlin (1980), Tuchman (1973) and others analyze and discuss how tremendous financial pressures shape the news by influencing and therefore distorting coverage of issues and events. They reveal how ownership by a few individuals creates control...
over the dominant flow of information through media to mass
audiences as well as discussions on the role of news making
in creating consciousness of an issue and therefore in the
construction of ideology. Specifically, Tuchman notes
that,

Working distinctions among legitimate newsmakers,
quasi-legitimate newsmakers, and the amorphous public
imply gradations in whose truth-claims may be reported
and framed as fact. Again, the power of legitimate
sources comes into play (1973:92).

In these ways, power shapes the discourse of news work
because business requires that authors distance themselves
from their end product. This is partially accomplished
just by nature of going through the bureaucracy of editors
and the resources available to journalists, and the time
constraints organizing the process by which a story is
constructed. This literature suggests that the everyday
work of journalists, following the rules of their
discipline within a corporate and capitalist economic
system, create a picture of events that support the status
quo conditions of U.S. society. In these ways, news media
texts and their mass availability to the public are
actively part of the social relations that make up public
opinion and do so in a way that denies people's experiences
the cultural legitimacy to report on political situations
in a significantly knowledgeable way. The news media
structures the reporting of the actual lived experiences of people to fit into the status quo ordering of social relations that carry with them the cultural legitimacy of mainstream discourses that reflect bourgeoisie values. These values are expressed in culture through the norms and processes of everyday life and through institutions that organize information to be distributed through mediums of mass communication. Yet, this process is often made invisible.

Therefore, news media plays a powerful role in the construction of hegemonic ideology as expressions of local experiences are framed by organizational language to prioritize the expression of accounts by those in charge of organizational, institutional sequences of action (Smith 1990). As Pence notes,

Professionals are trained to translate what they see and hear and gather from the everyday world into professional discourses about that world. The professional discourse in reports and documents appears to be the objective work of an individual responding to a specific set of circumstances, yet this is far from what actually happens (1997:5).

Therefore, Smith's work begins with the theory that when people's real life experiences become someone else's knowledge through a process in the social structure that reflects ruling relationships, these processes perpetuate practices of power. These practices occur as the
organization of texts across multiple administrative work sites creates a process by which perspectives that represent local experience become fragmented and submerged in concepts and categories organized by institutional concerns. As a result, the elements that make an experience local get standardized and therefore erased from the institutional account. The institutional processes that stand in for experience create ideological ways of interpreting reality that reflect ruling relations (Smith 1999).

This structuring then becomes a publicly available resource, a source for knowledge that is taken as a norm in popular culture. Therefore, for this study, we can critically know that media, as represented by mainstream newspaper articles, prioritized a normative ideology that reproduces knowledge supporting status quo conditions concerning U.S. involvement in the Philippines. I certainly know that there are also non-mainstream, alternative, anti-corporate news media forms available through which to attain alternative news media on events and issues. However, I am emphasizing the use of a mainstream newspaper example because of past research that has already demonstrated the role of authorized voices and bureaucratic editorial processes in making news conform to
mainstream, hegemonic interpretations. Ultimately, by translating meaningful experiences to people and seeing their association to structural issues, one can describe elements of historical consciousness that informs globalization definitions and debates within dominant and alternative discourses. In fact, consideration of this issue clearly points to the argument that publicly constructed meanings about these issues encourages public passivity rather than activity as a response, as mainstream interpretations do not contain news that people can define as something that can be acted upon.

In this project, I show some of the consequences in media depictions of people’s understanding of an event into a distanced position for understanding events that is dependent upon conceptual definitions, organized by institutional language, and information reported by official sources. In this way, the articles construct an account of the event and the issues it represents that carries a cultural legitimacy and authority that the interviewee accounts are not granted. Yet, interviewee accounts reveal how these dominant meanings are both opposed to and involved in negotiated processes.

Additionally, while I am specifically pointing to news work in order to frame a discussion of the impact of power
on publicly available discourse, the same ideas about control of information are relevant to religious institutions as well. As news organizations have historically produced texts that are influenced by power, so have religious institutions and organizations. As religious activities emphasize the importance of evangelism, historically, this focus has been used extensively in the colonization of different peoples and in protection of the rich and powerful. This process has historically required that religious workers distance themselves from the social justice lessons in biblical texts that condemn the unequal distribution of power and resources. As the literature review on religious action will reveal, this occurs through the public and private negotiating of the meaning of Christianity with mainstream accounts supporting one’s relationship to God to be represented through individual reflection on a personal relationship to God. In this way, the process by which dominant definitions for the roles and activities of religious workers in the United States becomes one that aligns itself with the powerful. Yet alternative definitions of religious purpose emphasized the necessity of collaborating with the poor to help improve their social conditions. This alternative ideology impacted how people
approached the role of the church in addressing these issues, and this is what my project discusses. Therefore, the interviewees have also had ties with organizations or institutions that rule the production of discourse. Additionally, performing my interviews with them almost twenty years later has allowed for time to pass, organizational relationships to change, and reflections to occur.

These interviewee accounts, while reproducing power in social relations, also represent activities that violated social norms on the definition of religious purpose institutionalized and supported by a hegemonic social order that supports the unequal distribution of power and resources. Accounts represent and demonstrate how individuals were able to contest these dominant definitions. In my analysis, I am prioritizing how these perspectives become publicly available and the process by which they are relegated as private experience through the exercise of dominant values and symbols represented through mainstream discourses in culture. It is my research interest to show how these values were placed into cultural action by people in a variety of social institutions that sanctioned interviewee participant beliefs and behaviors, both negatively and positively, and to capture their
memories of that time. Therefore, I chose to only
investigate how power has been negotiated and contested
within traditional religious structures and the
relationship of public accounts to personal experiences in
the social construction of history. Through this history
and through interviewee experiential accounts, they reveal
how these definitions of the role of religious institutions
is contested - just as the role of journalists also
struggle against the constraints of media work in
challenging status quo conditions. For this same reason, I
am not interested in investigating the content of
alternative media sources as my primary resource focus is
on the impact of the dominant messages put forth through
mainstream media and distributed through processes of mass
communication.

Additionally, I am interested in other accounts that
are produced in different ruling relations, such as
academic accounts. The histories of these practices also
have a lot in common with the discourse of sociology.
Traditional perspectives align themselves to support status
quo conditions while these definitions are at the same time
contested by individuals located both within and external
to the discipline. The research in sociology that I
respect challenges these dominant definitions by
emphasizing the meaning-work involved in people's lives and the resources people use to make this meaning for themselves.

These dynamics are important processes to consider and I am interested in understanding how they are sites for this production of dominant discourses by creating a project that incorporates the role of experience in the framing of any social science research. Therefore, I focus the discussion of this dissertation on how any one perspective only represents one dimension of an issue and study the process by which alternative accounts are rendered invisible, leaving a very one-dimensional perspective on events in history. This therefore limits the publicly available discourse regarding perceived options, actions, and consequences in a culture as a response to this unequal distribution of power and resources.

Following then, information within a hegemonic social system directs people to interpret experiences in certain abstracted ways. Overall, I hope to uncover how the structuring of public discourse concerning social injustices, particularly that of hunger, due to trade relations emphasizes conformity to ruling relations. I also hope to provide to the reader a collective response to
this process as created from the different locations of experience with these issues presented in this project. Ultimately, I aim to present how people make experiences meaningful using or rejecting norms shaped by structural issues. Doing so, I aim to illuminate their use of globalization, civil rights, and religious discourses, meanings, and debates available in both dominant and alternative cultural resources.

Historical Conditions

These news making and knowledge production processes based upon everyday activities impact historical constructions and shape social forms in popular culture. As the Popular Memory Group notes,

"...public discourses live off the primary recording of events in the course of everyday transactions and take over the practical knowledge of historical agents (2002: 78)."

History and its meanings to individuals and groups can be seen to represent a collection of networked actions, events, and reflections that have collectively shaped and continue to shape one's view of the world. History is what is symbolically remembered and documented. This collection has public and private dimensions and leads people in all
societies to develop particular notions of history. Having a sense of history,

...is one means by which an organic social group acquires a knowledge of the larger context of its collective struggles, and becomes capable of a wider transformative role in society. Most important of all, perhaps, it is the means by which we may become self-conscious about the formation of our own common-sense beliefs, those that we appropriate from our immediate social and cultural milieu. These beliefs have a history and are also produced in determinate processes. The point is to recover their 'inventory', not in the manner of the folklorist who wants to preserve quaint ways for modernity, but in order that, their origin and tendency known, they may be consciously adopted, rejected, or modified. In this way a popular historiography, especially a history of the commonest forms of consciousness, is a necessary aspect of the struggle for a better world (Popular Memory Group 2002:79).

Consideration of this argument reveals that dominant media accounts encourage public passivity rather than activity insofar as their interpretations define what exists to be acted upon. Therefore, if a group does not have an understanding of the historical development of commonly held beliefs, they may not have the awareness or ability to articulate other alternatives and therefore are limited in the ways that they can approach and decide about an issue.

In this paper, the lifetime experiences of individuals enabled them to struggle with alternative conceptions and articulate their concerns using their experiences in their work to make meaningful sense of their work within a U.S.
political and religious culture that rejected large components of their belief system. As Evans and Boyte note in their discussion of “free spaces” in society,

This mix of community and public, particular history and larger connection, is the key to a political education that allows people simultaneously to draw upon and transform in democratic fashion their inherited identities and the ties of daily life” (1992:ix).

I investigated how participants made an effort to tie their experiences working on hunger and social justice issues to knowledge about structure and the process involved in people’s meaning-work to make this connection - what discourses they relied upon as resources to explain their experiences to me. At the same time, I mapped how hegemonic accounts shift attention away from structural awareness and issue awareness by analyzing the discourse in the newspaper articles.

It is my hope that this project provides readers with an exploratory example of how one can use social science research methods to gain more complex, more reliable knowledge of issues through analyzing the impact of biography, history, and experience - as mediated by texts - on public knowledge. I also hope to show how the Mendiola Massacre symbolizes an intersection in time, social occurrence and personal biography that allows me to look at
how my family has been tied to public issues. I also use this case study to consider sociological concerns about the consequences of this type of structure on the development of public knowledge. As Scott notes,

The study of experience, therefore, must call into question its originary status in historical explanation. This will happen when historians take as their project not the reproduction and transmission of knowledge said to be arrived at through experience, but the analysis of the production of that knowledge itself (1992:37).

By investigating how knowledge is produced through experience by guiding people to draw on specific dominant or alternative cultural resources available or hidden to create meaning, this project is also my humble attempt to contribute to the growing discussion on integrating experience into discussions of social history.

Therefore, in this chapter I discussed how critical symbolic interactionist theories, cultural theory, theories of power, and historical conditions have influenced the theoretical framework guiding this research project. In the next chapter, I will provide the literature review for this research project. As such, I discuss a history of colonialism and resistance in the Philippines and how globalization theories and neo-colonial practices are helpful in interpreting this history. Additionally, I discuss how these practices and overall history are related
to the institutional responses to hunger and poverty and the overall ecumenical debate over the appropriate response to these issues during the 1980s.
CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

As previously mentioned, this literature review was my effort to understand the "bigger picture" of the issues I expected to encounter while doing my research. I wanted to come to the interviews and articles prepared with knowledge about the events and issues I expected each account to include and so that I could understand my own interests in relation to their experiences. Thus, the literature review was my effort to learn about the history of the Philippines and the reasons for my mother being there by using historical and sociological resources.

I want to start by talking about my experiences developing this literature review by discussing what was available to me in my search. I had a difficult time discovering texts that were not written from the perspective of United States culture. This made me very cautious about the histories that I consulted for this project knowing that they very well could be offering up colonial interpretations of the Philippines. Yet, since these were the resources
available, and I based my research design on what could be available to the general public, I depended on them, while still being critical of them. I made special efforts to search nationalist Filipino authors to include their perspectives on globalization practices in the Philippines, resistance to these issues by peasant movements, and resistance to the church as a colonizing force in the country. Thankfully, due to some extra searching on the Web and numerous trips to the library, I was able to piece together what I consider to at least be an adequate account of Philippine history for the purposes of this project. This history therefore, was able to include some Filipino perspectives in academe, nationalist writers, and those voices organized around exposing human rights violations in the Philippines.

While expecting trouble in finding these types of Filipino resources to use for this literature review, I also ran into unexpected trouble researching the history of ecumenical movements in the United States on social justice issues related to hunger and globalization. While I found resources on this history, I soon discovered that what exists in academic text form is extremely critical of this type of church work and is developed from perspectives supporting extreme religious conservatism regarding these
issues. Essentially, there is literature on this angle towards social justice work, recognized as developing from Latin American-based liberation theology movements. Yet U.S. articulations of this movement are not considered legitimate framed within the resources I found for this aspect of my literature review, which emanate traditionally from perspectives representing the religious right. Therefore, I did find a lot of literature on the philosophy connecting hunger and social injustice to religious purpose. However, when I searched for historical contexts - dates, times, events, involved people - I found only texts documenting the content of conferences from the World Council of Churches rather than documents explaining the activities that people were working on to resolve these issues. The texts that I did find focused on the process of development of the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches. These texts advocated highly conservative religious perspectives that described the ecumenical movement as wrong and as a failed social movement that misrepresented the role of the church within individual lives. Nonetheless, I was able to use this conservative literature to construct my account of the ecumenical movement and the role it played in networking religious groups together to illuminate world injustices.
With this being said, this literature review is divided into two parts. Part One provides some general information on globalization and development theories and the history of the Philippines to demonstrate the traditional colonial relationship the Philippines has had with Spain and the United States and its history of resistance to these practices. Second, the literature review presents how the Philippines suffered under neo-colonial international business policies enacted under the rubric of development theory, a theory used to justify the dependency of nations with high economic debt on Western countries with international economic and political power. Specifically, I discuss how this neo-colonial relationship is directly associated with a high poverty and hunger rate in the Philippines while simultaneously supporting some of the popular discourse surrounding public perception of the causes of world hunger circulating in the United States.

Part Two of the literature review discusses the historical role of United States churches in responding to issues of hunger and social injustice, and the debate between traditional and non-traditional approaches to these issues.

Overall, this history frames the relationship of the Philippines to the United States as historically colonial
and contemporarily as neo-colonial relations. These historical issues all have a role in the eventual march to the Mendiola Bridge, and to the interpretations of the different accounts organized through this sociological investigation.

Literature Review Part I:
Globalization Theories, Neo-Colonial Practices, and a History of Colonialism and Resistance in the Philippines

Globalization Theories

One of the issues I wanted to understand in regards to articulations of my own experiences and the experiences of the people I interviewed is how people in colonizing countries try to make sense of and respond to the existence of social injustices within an ideological framework called globalization. I also wanted to understand the resources I have available to me as an academic in order to articulate it as such. By globalization here I mean,

...a confluence of two related historical processes: most fundamentally, it is the product of capitalism's expansive dynamic and its drive for limitless accumulation; in a more proximate sense, globalization is the ongoing project of a particular constellation of dominant social forces seeking to institutionalize their power in historical structures which will facilitate the transnational expansion of capitalism (Ruport 2000:16).
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As Rupert notes, globalization can be understood as,

...shorthand for a process of re-articulating relations between local sites and the world economy. I presume this global-local dialectic cannot be mapped whole, but must be examined as it unfolds through the social struggles and contested representations of concretely situated social agents (2000:1).

For the purposes of this project, I focus on the relationship of the practices and agenda of globalization practices to world poverty and hunger. Additionally, I examine how concretely situated tour members and the New York Times journalists represent and use the assumptions and agendas within discourses of globalization and the practices it represents conceptually. To investigate these discourses further, I stress in my perspective of globalization that colonial power and strength preceded the development and implementation of transcorporation globalization practices. Colonial power entrenched those same Eurocentric ideologies and social influences that legitimated and justified a liberal free market global economic system and the loss of local production for local consumption. This entrenchment covertly and also overtly influences a Westernized public understanding of globalization and development for countries with high economic debt and little economic power. Eurocentric ideologies influence historical accounts, personal accounts, and popular accounts of issues of social
injustice and world hunger. Therefore, these ideologies also influence how the United States public connects the issues of world hunger and poverty to the structural processes involved in globalization and defines it and disseminates it into popular culture through mainstream forms of mass communication.

In the field of sociology, theories of the relationship between rich and poor countries have gone through three stages, modernization theory, underdevelopment theory, and new development theory. Each theoretical stage has directly impacted the public policy decisions and debates about development practices and histories written on the subject of development in countries such as the Philippines. Traditionally, development efforts have been framed by theories emphasizing that poorer countries must increase their efforts at industrial and economic modernization in order to achieve that nation status carried by countries such as the United States.

Essentially, modernization theory advances the idea that poorer, "Third World" countries must have assistance in order to "catch up" and "copy" the political and economic systems of industrialized, wealthy countries like Europe and the United States. Modernization theory, therefore, assumed that underdeveloped countries needed the capital for
resources that would enable poorer countries to invest and then produce enough products to enter into the global economy and succeed. Yet as Litonjua notes,

...many development efforts resulted in substantial upward redistribution: the rich grew richer, the middle class got nothing, and the poor were worse off. The promise of economic growth did not trickle down to the masses (1998:12).

As a result of modernization theory’s weaknesses in reversing the continued state of underdevelopment in poorer countries, development theory arose to explain the problems of Third World countries. Wallerstein (2000) contributed to this theoretical development by mapping out the relationships of the world’s nations with one another by placing them into categories of core, semi-periphery, and periphery countries. Additionally, Andre Gunder Frank, in 1969, proposed a theory of underdevelopment to explain why traditional modernization theories of development were ineffective in relieving the problems of poverty and hunger. Frank notes that,

...the basic context of poverty and underdevelopment is the dominance-dependence relationship between rich and poor, powerful and weak countries. The development of the rich countries brought about and continues to maintain the underdevelopment of poor countries. Instead of modernization theory’s continuum from traditional to modern, therefore, underdevelopment is the counterpart of development. Countries of the Third World are not merely undeveloped, they are underdeveloped (Litonjua 1998:13).
Both models have been criticized for their static approach to the analysis of the relationship between the core/periphery, North/South, First/Third World countries. They have also been criticized for ignoring the role of international organizations and national network involvement in the implementation of development policies in a particular country (Litonjua 1998, Broad 1988). As Broad notes,

Since the bulk of the developing world won political independence, several sets of international institutions have played major roles in molding and shifting these countries' domestic economic policies (1988:6).

These international organizations need support internally from people located in the government of the developing country in order to activate their plans and policies. New dependency theory asks that analysts investigate different states of dependence and underdevelopment, as countries can be reflecting a type of "dependent development" that emphasizes alliances. As explained by Broad in discussing the theoretical perspectives of Cardoso and Faletto,

Some local classes or groups sustain dependency ties, enforcing foreign economic and political interests. Others are opposed to the maintenance of a given pattern of dependency. Dependence thus finds not only internal 'expression,' but also its true character as implying a situation that structurally entails a link with the outside in such a way that what happens
'internally' in a dependent country cannot be fully explained without taking into consideration the links that internal social groups have with external ones (Broad 1988:17).

Specifically, this theoretical development introduces "the structuring of a 'system of alliances,' or links, among 'a new kind of oligarchy' of elite representatives from three sectors: local capital, the LDC [Least Developed Country] state, and foreign capital" (Broad 1988:17). Overall, this perspective emphasizes that research must concentrate on investigating how alliances between local capital, or the wealthy elite of a country, the LDC state, or the government of a "Least Developed Country." Foreign capital, meaning foreign investors such as United States corporations, creates a network structuring the relationship between nations in which a minority holds power in the country and opens it up to the global market thereby destroying local patterns of consumption.

This system of alliances is greatly influenced by the policies of the two dominant international lending organizations, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Their work within the Philippines has been well documented, in part due to a massive leak within the organization in the late 1970's that exposed over 6,000 secret World Bank documents to the public (Bello, Kinley, &
Elinson 1982). Another example is the relationship that foreign investors have with those government and other wealthy officials within a country who enable foreign investment to be located in that country.

These arrangements are expressions and practices of neo-colonialism. By neo-colonialism, I mean the most general definition of an analysis of the political and economic relations between two countries, one of which was a former colony of the other, and who is still being controlled by the colonizing country through the state of dependency and underdevelopment described above. These practices legitimate the discourse in popular culture on development and abstract its impacts as a form of neo-colonialism in two ways.

First, these practices emphasize the continuation of a colonial mentality by assuming that because a country is wealthy; that they have the right to tell a less wealthy country how they must change in order to become more wealthy. Sartre analyzes the colonial mentality as placing importance on the role of economics, the lack of appropriate social services, or as the problem being psychological: the inferiority complex of those that are colonized (Sartre 1964). He describes this colonial perspective in critiquing France's control of Algeria.
It is by acting upon these factors that he will be reassured: if he eats enough to satisfy his hunger, if he has work and can read, he will no longer suffer the shame of being a sub-human and we will rediscover that old Franco-Muslim fraternity (Sartre 1964:31).

In this way, dominant groups legitimize their own culture as superior to the colonized culture. Second, these practices reinforce certain myths about the causes of hunger and poverty in other countries that create solutions that only increase a country’s dependency on the neo-colonial relationship.

These two points are examined in the literature review on the Philippine’s history and of the historic role of international lending agencies and United States foreign investment in neo-colonial trade relations with the Philippines. They will be significant dimensions of my analysis of newspaper articles and individual interviewee accounts. Additionally, these accounts will identify the process by which these political and economic practices create world hunger as well as justify dominant definitions of solutions to world hunger, solutions that fail to address existing inequities and oppressive circumstances. As a result, such solutions reinforce the neo-colonial state of underdevelopment and suffering often experienced by rural people living in countries with little economic power and high international debt within the global economy.
Therefore, the literature review that follows provides some of the historical context within which the economic and political situation of the Philippines has been considered by First World/Northern countries. Specifically, this review describes how Philippine development was and continues to be managed by organizations such as the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and various corporate financiers from the United States such as Citibank. Further, it will show how these theories inform available public discourse about world hunger, fragmenting explanations, producing myths that place blame on individual poor people, and offering abstracted and mythical causes of world hunger that do not reveal its structural roots. Theoretical models of development contribute to a cultural hegemony that makes these structural causes invisible and unavailable as a resource in public discourse. Instead, available discourses draw upon and emphasize solutions that reinforce neo-colonial and dependent states of some nations to others.

Spanish Occupation

The Philippines was colonized when Magellan stepped ashore and “claimed” it for Spain in 1521 (Goodno 1991). Its geographical position was its most valuable asset to the
colonizing country, so it was developed as a trading post between the Far East and Latin America for Spain. Pre-colonial descriptions of Filipino communities describe it as organized through a collection of small fishing groups commanded by local chiefs and rarely in contact with other regional groups. This led to a society whose class structure was diverse and complex with no established state or governmental bureaucracy based upon a hierarchy of rulers, commoners, and slaves whose communities were based upon chiefdoms and whose communities were dispersed along the coastal shores of the islands (Nadeau 2002).

After Magellan’s discovery, Spanish bureaucrats, pioneers, and Catholic friars soon moved to the islands. The friars have the most historical presence in the historical literature of the Philippines as the colonizing population with the most influence in structuring and implementing colonist policies and procedures. Although the bureaucrats and pioneers set up legal, political, and economic structures and systems, the friars established control over rural areas and laid ownership claims to land by nature of their religious duties (Goodno 1991). Essentially, they were the only Spaniards in the small rural villages in which they began to cultivate their religious base. Constantino (1978), a Filipino nationalist writer and
historian notes that colonization was largely due to acceptance of the Catholic religion by indigenous Filipinos. He also notes that in many of the villages the only colonial authority present was the friar, giving the friar extraordinary power over the villagers. Other authors discuss how colonization through religion was not difficult for friars. As Ileto in Nadeau notes,

...the early Filipinos (from here forward read: Indios) interpreted Christianity in terms of traditional Southeast Asian cultural practices and beliefs, rather than from the Spanish perspective. It is for this reason that Filipinos were early able to articulate in the language of Christianity a means for expressing their own values, ideals, and hopes for liberation from their colonial oppressors (2002:76).

In other words, this author explains how Filipinos adopted Christianity into their traditional values and identified the stories of the Bible and the character of Jesus to express their hopes to end their own oppression by the friars and colonial structure. This element of early Philippine culture could be interpreted as colonial. The imposition of a Christian religion upon traditional Filipino practices develops as something that was not adopted through force, yet clearly the friars had the power to force their will upon these communities and had the Spanish Army and colonial government to back up their requests. However, this element of Philippine culture is more importantly to this
discussion, highlighting one of the historical influences on the development of a Christian consciousness organized around the fight for liberation of the oppressed from their oppressors in a colonial or post-colonial structural arrangement.

Socially, the friars ruled through their religious teachings. Education of the Filipino people was limited to scriptures that valued obedience, devalued independent thinking, and omitted ideas that the friars felt would not contribute to the stability of the colony (Constantino 1978). Economically, this colonizing social structure based upon friar power and Christian spirituality forced Filipinos to move from a system based on a subsistence economy to one that produced surpluses to feed the newcomers.

Friars also required that the Filipino tribes form structured villages and housing, changing their previous way of living. Because no precious gold or gems had as of yet been discovered to mine and bring back to Spain, agriculture was the main industry developed in the newly claimed country. Additional surplus products were traded with Chinese traders, who also began to settle in parts of the Philippines in order to do business with the Spanish (providing that they convert to Christianity or marry a Filipino woman (Karnow 1989). The friars, who owned the
majority of land, profited from this developing trade and
developed an economic stake in the colonizing of the
Filipino people (Constantino 1978).

An increase in Philippine agriculture and rise in
export crops fueled a rush by elites to claim land for
themselves. In fact,

...by the mere expedient of having untitled lands worked
by others titled to their names, by outright land
grabbing, many farmers were dispossessed or found
themselves as tenants in the land they had previously
tilled as their own. Thus was born the hacienda system
and what is called feudalism in Philippine agriculture
( Constantino 1978:252)

Filipinos disadvantaged from this system struggled within
it, sometimes protesting violently in response to their
oppression. As Constantino notes, “Although the masses had
been trained in a hierarchical society to ‘follow their
betters,’ their experience in struggle gained through
innumerable uprisings gave them a definitely separatist
rather than assimilationist perspective” (1978:216).

Geography helped foster that struggle in that the islands
were very discontinuously developed. In addition, “Periodic
peasant revolts were a response to the social transformation
and abuse imposed by Spanish civilian and church
authorities, by their own native elite, and by economic
conditions” (Kessler 1989:6). Kessler (1989) points out
that rural Filipinos dependent on agriculture for their
livelihood instigated rebellion over taxes, over forced labor, and over arbitrary use of authority by both the government and the churches. Here, religion played a role in bonding peasant resistance movements. As Kessler notes,

Religion was a powerful bond in all these chiliastic peasant movements, suggesting a deeper cause for rebellion than just oppression or economic deprivation. The Philippine nation can be understood as an Eden lost when the nation was first colonized - an Eden that could be regained only through participation in the country's religious tradition. As the ideals of nationalism grew, especially in the late nineteenth century, they found expression in religious forms that peasants easily understood and accepted. These native movements promised their followers something more than land reform and higher wages: they offered salvation and independence (kalayaan) of the inner self (loob) in a greater brotherhood (1989:9).

Here, this is a good example of colonist historical interpretations of Filipino use of the Christian religion that emphasizes how Filipinos utilized a structure imposed upon them to inform their nationalist beliefs and activities. This description implies that Filipinos used the Catholic religion because it was easy for them to accept and understand - a classic colonial description of the ignorant savage, used to minimize and eliminate traditional customs and activities from a colonized people's culture that an imposed religion will sophisticate and resolve.

Additionally, a wealthy elite family system developed from generations of offspring from Spanish and Chinese-
blooded Filipinos and Malay Filipinos. This familial system of the elite class in the Philippines became the group that instigated change towards Filipino citizen rights. Yet this group also represented a rural hierarchy in which they had the most power due to their ownership of land and the rising industry of agriculture in the Philippines. As Kessler (1989) notes,

Although different regions experienced different patterns of growth, the general trend was toward the commercialization of agriculture and the alienation of peasants from their land. By the 19th century a rural hierarchy had developed of the hacenderos (landowners), noncultivating tenants, and sharecroppers. So long as new land was available, the peasants could migrate. But in the mid- to late nineteenth century, increasing population growth and limits to land availability intensified social pressures. Peasant revolts in the eighteenth century had been caused mainly by oppressive measures, such as corvee labor, imposed by local and Spanish authorities. By the late nineteenth century, land tenure (with concentration of ownership in haciendas) had become the major sense of tension, and changes in the economic and political system worsened rather than alleviated the conflicts. A period of economic prosperity was ending, the hacienda system was spreading (thus disenfranchising farmers), and Filipino nationalism was on the rise (1989:7-8).

In 1863, a series of educational reforms enabled Filipinos to develop knowledge of the systems that controlled them and enabled them to advocate for reform in the Filipino government (Keesing Report 1988). Mainly, these were the developing middle class citizens, of Spanish-Filipino and Chinese-Filipino descent from wealthier
families demanding access to the governmental and religious institutions that had denied them full and equal participation. As Karnow notes, during the 19th Century, The newly enriched also started to travel abroad, or sent their sons to study in Europe, where they inhaled freedom and absorbed contemporary ideas. The fresher climate produced an important species known as the *illustrados* - an intelligentsia of lawyers, doctors, scholars, artists, journalists and other professionals with no stake in the preservation of an antiquated Spanish imperial structure (1989:63).

Again, here we see a colonial interpretation that describes Europe as beautiful, free, and good, and as these *illustrados* as having no stake in changing an economy that they benefited from within the classist structure. Yet, this intelligencia also represented a group that, while being a member of the wealthy class, also strived to change the power structure chaining them to colonialism. Some members of this group strove for assimilation with the Spanish system while others developed national sentiment framed around a desire for total independence from Spain. Importantly, while middleclass and wealthy Filipinos began to become more educated about the processes and culture of their oppression, the friars and Spanish colonists refused to make any changes that compromised their absolute power in the colonial system. Wholesale repression occurred in response to any attempts at even moderate reform. Leader
after leader championing nationalistic reform was murdered and consequently martyred for the nationalist cause. This process created the foundation for a middle and upper class Filipino national identity through immersion of consciousness and action in struggles against colonialism (Constantino 1978).

Here we can see two strains of rebellion historically developing from these oppression and resistance experiences. The poor, landless farmers had consistently protested deprivations and abuses by the friars and the colonial government. The young, middle to upper class aristocracy had different motivations as many came from families who owned haciendas that were involved in the rural hierarchy over the peasants (Kessler 1989).

The revolution of the Philippines against Spain took place at two periods of time. The first breakout was in 1896. Two Filipino leaders, Andres Bonifacio and Emilio Aguinaldo, led a revolt of the masses. Although Bonifacio was later court martialed and executed on Aguinaldo’s order, this first phase of the revolution resulted in the Spanish developing and signing a Filipino constitution with the condition that Aguinaldo, now the sole leader in the movement, agree to a life of exile in Hong Kong (Litonjua 2001).
The second phase began when the United States became involved in supporting this movement as a move to distract Spain from its ongoing defense of Cuba in order to defeat Spain in the Spanish-American war. The U.S. government, through verbal and economic support, supported Aguinaldo’s movement to drive Spain out of the Philippines, but was, at a policy level expressed within the United States, not interested in advocating for immediate Philippine independence after the ouster of Spain. During the war, it is historically documented that Aguinaldo believed that the U.S. was also fighting for Philippine independence while on the U.S. home front, U.S. policy was already being formulated to implement a new form of government once Spain surrendered the islands. With the defeat of Spain in the Spanish-American War in 1898, the United States purchased the Philippines as a colony from Spain (Karnow 1989). Following U.S. occupation of the islands, the revolution of the Philippines turned into the Philippine-American War (Litonjua 2001). It took the U.S. six years and 120,000 soldiers to suppress the resistance movements led by Aguinaldo and others for Philippine independence (Constantino 1978). Sixteen thousand Filipino troops died and 200,000 Filipino civilians as compared to 4,000 American troops (Kessler 1989). As Kessler notes,
the failure of the United States to recognize the country’s independence at the conclusion of the Spanish-American War precipitated a second struggle to liberate the Philippines that was not finally suppressed until 1903. The Katipunan movement, however, was a historic watershed in the linking of nationalism with peasant unrest, bringing together peasant aspirations for religious salvation and bourgeois yearnings for national independence (1989:10).

United States Occupation

Stanley Karnow writes that, “The episode marked a pivotal point in the American experience. For the first time, U.S. soldiers fought overseas. And, for the first time, America was to acquire territory beyond its shores—the former colony itself becoming colonialist” (1989:79). The debate in the United States over American imperialism was bitter as it contradicted the American experience with colonization, nationalism, revolution, and independence. Many Americans had died fighting in the rebellion against the British as a colony and considered the U.S. as anti-colonial although history demonstrates their role as colonizers already at this time. Mainstream discourse at that time demonstrates how their ignoring the internal colonization of First Nations Peoples during the settlement of the United States as well as the dependency on Black slaves for labor clearly indicates that colonization was
already being practiced at this time. Nevertheless, the decision to acquire and hold onto the Philippines was made by President William McKinley. Supposedly, amidst the debate over what to do with the islands, McKinley, upon praying over the issue, heard "the divine voice of 'Manifest Destiny' ... while he was on his knees in prayer" (Litonjua 2001:377). Other interested parties in its acquisition were industrialists and financiers interested in expanding their wealth through acquisition of land on the islands (Litonjua 2001).

As the Americans took over the land, the Roman Catholic church continued in the colonial agenda by agreeing to limit the activities of priests to ecclesiastical and charitable work, and to sell the United States the land owned formerly by the friars (Steinberg 1994). Importantly, these former holdings of the friars were sold off to the wealthy elite families of the Philippines. As Bello notes,

The sale of excess church lands ordered by the colonial government in the first years of the new century should have provided the wedge for the transformation of Philippine agriculture into a system based on small owner-cultivators. Instead, the friar lands were sold to the gentry - a move that was not merely an adjunct to military pacification, but part of an evolving strategy to forge the regional elites into a national ruling class that would serve as the base of American colonial rule (2001:197).

Alongside this change in church governance, the co-
Optation of Filipino elites was an important factor in forming the foundation for a successful takeover of the Philippines by the United States. This group of Filipino elites was elected to legislative positions; they formed political parties that developed policies highly accommodating to American business and government interests. Additionally, 

The Taft Commission, appointed in 1900, viewed economic development, along with education and the establishment of representative institutions, as one of the three pillars of the United States program of tutelage (Dolan 2003:56).

Education, a traditional colonial method of imperialism, was implemented to teach Filipino students the English language, culture, and social structural system. Due to the liberalizing of the Catholic Church that these changes and others encouraged within the Philippines, this system of "open" education encouraged educated Filipinos to enter into the Catholic Church as priests, therefore Filipinizing the Catholic church (Steinberg 1994). Constantino passionately notes that, American colonialism superimposed its own brand of Westernization initially through the imposition of English and the American school system which opened the way for other Westernizing agencies. The result was the utilization of education as a weapon of pacification and for the transmission of colonial ideals that transformed the people into naively willing victims of American control (1978:218).
Throughout these transitions, little was changed regarding landholding by elite families and a dislocated, landless poor whose living conditions were in further decline. The Americans never imposed a policy for land reform, as winning the support of the Filipino elite and maintaining their political and economic power in the Philippines was essential to the United States' success as a colonial power. Therefore, land ownership continued as it had before, with the discrepancy between the wealthy and the poor widening as more industry developed (through the implementation of agribusiness farming technology and systems) for the purpose of profit within the quickly growing agricultural industry. As Dolan notes,

It was estimated in 1924 that the average tenant family would have to labor uninterruptedly for 163 years to pay off debts and acquire title to the land they worked. The kasama system created a large class of peons or serfs; children inherited the debts of their fathers, and over the generations families were tied in bondage to their estates. Contracts were usually unwritten, and landowners could change conditions to their advantage (2003:57).

This landlord/tenant relationship also became increasingly more impersonal, as landlords used their profits to support their wealthy lifestyles and business investments (Dolan 2003). In fact, “By 1939 the wealthiest 10% of the population received 40% of the islands’ income” (Dolan 2003:57). New urban centers rose, tenant farming increased,
and tenant resistance movements became more active and organized (Dolan 2003). While many smaller peasant movements fell apart, a Socialist party was formed by many poor farmers and some members of the intelligencia who were appalled by the colonial impact on the lives of farmers (Goodno 1991).

These events ignited a class struggle that engaged the poor with the wealthy elite to advocate for more shares of the harvest, fair treatment by landlords, and an end to harassment by landlord private armies and the Philippine police (Goodno 1991). Here his descriptions inform us that they were not yet demanding land redistribution (Goodno 1991). However, denial of these issues as legitimate by government and landowners as well as continued abuses by the military and landlord-hired private armies encouraged more sophisticated development of organized groups of resistance as had occurred in the past. As Dolan describes,

In 1938 the Socialist Party joined in a united front with the Communist Party of the Philippines (Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas - PKP), which was prominent in supporting the demands of tenants for better contracts and working conditions. As the depression wore on and prices for cash crops collapsed, tenant strikes and violent confrontations with landlords, their overseers, and the Philippine Constabulary escalated (2003:59).

In order to protect their power, wealthy families increased their collaboration with the United States government and
foreign investors. For example, Citibank has been involved in financing operations in the Philippines since the late 1800's (Morgan 1987). Additionally, as Goodno notes,


In 1934, the Tydings-McDuffie Act was passed, stating that the Philippines would be independent after a ten-year transition period in which a government was established that the U.S. perceived to be stable (Dolan 2003). Many of this act's provisions involved trade and tariff regulations which,

...allowed for five years' free entry of Philippine goods during the transition period and five years of gradually steepening tariff duties thereafter, reaching 100 percent in 1946, whereas United States goods could enter the islands unrestricted and duty free during the full ten years (Dolan 2003:59).

Filipinos Sergio Osmenas and Manual Quezon, two members of the ruling elite, ran as vice president and president of the newly constituted independent government (Steinberg 1990). Thus, U.S. trade advantages became firmly entrenched in the politics and economy of the Philippines. Independence therefore meant a full transfer of the government from the United States to the ruling elite with whom United States
officials and investors were networked. In essence, this was a transferring of colonialism to neo-colonialism.

Then, a surprise shocked both the Philippines and the United States. Japan invaded the Philippines ten hours after its attack on Pearl Harbor and laid claim to the islands on January 2, 1942 (Dolan 2003). The U.S. army general in charge of the Philippines, Douglas McArthur, and Filipino leaders took refuge in other countries (namely the United States and Australia) in order to plan a successful return (hence McArthur’s famous statement of “I will return!” to the Filipino people). Most Filipinos strongly resisted the Japanese occupation due in large part to the brutal mistreatment of Filipino citizens during Japanese occupation of the islands. As Steinberg notes,

Despite the Japanese claims that they were there to emancipate the Filipinos, drive out the wicked white rulers, and establish a true bond with the Filipinos, their brutal beating and abduction of ordinary people, their seizing of property and livestock, and their cruelty toward Filipinos and Americans alike during the Bataan death march doomed their chance (1990:102).

Yet, the Japanese were also supported by the traditional Filipino elite and by,

...others of the same class found new economic opportunities to amass wealth by supplying strategic materials and other items badly needed by the Japanese war effort. Meanwhile the bulk of the Filipino population resisted and suffered severe deprivation” (Litonjua 2001:380).
A large and significant element of this resistance was the Huk resistance, who are identified in many historical descriptions as "The most important unofficial anti-Japanese guerilla group [which] sprang up in Central Luzon as a result of the united efforts of the peasant organizations and the KMP" (Dolan 2003:39). As a result of suffering harsh treatment at the hands of the Japanese-enforced government, postwar investigations showed that about 260,000 people were in guerilla organizations and that members of the anti-Japanese underground were even more numerous. Their effectiveness was such that by the end of the war, Japan controlled only twelve of the forty-eight provinces (Dolan 2003:61).

In 1944, the United States returned to the Philippines in order to reclaim its control over the islands and Manila was "liberated" in 1945 (Keesing Report 1988). Quezon, the Philippine president before Japanese occupation, had died, and Osmena, the next successor, was successfully challenged by McArthur's personal friend Manual Roxas, who had been pardoned by McArthur for collaborating with the Japanese "puppet government" during their occupation of the islands. Roxas was a strong U.S. supporter and the U.S. Reconstruction after the war depended on U.S. aid,

...but it became quickly apparent that the availability of that aid was to be inextricably tied to the concession of preferential trading rights to the USA. Specifically, the Philippine Trade Act instituted advantageous tariff rates for US goods and the granting of parity rights to US citizens in the exploitation of
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resources and the operation of public utilities within the Philippines (Keesing 1988:6).

Thus, the neo-colonial structural placement was established through the establishment of pro-U.S. Filipino leadership representing a minority of Filipinos.

After WWII, not only were U.S. companies interested in further expanding their investment in the sugar, coconut oil, and other industries, the islands were also valued for their central geographic position between China and the United States. In this way, they represented a strategic post in facing any threat of communism for the United States. Thus, a Military Bases Agreement was also created and,

In light of the escalating cold war, the Philippines became tied to the foreign policy priorities of the USA. On March 14, 1947, Roxas signed an agreement which gave the USA a 99 year lease upon 23 US military facilities, including the airforce base at Clark Field and the naval installation at Subic Bay, both of which were seen by the US armed forces as vital in the containment of international Communism (Keesing 1988:7).

Additionally, in the 1950’s, peasant alienation and tension between the farmers and the government-backed landholders fueled a large insurgency by the Huks, which had continued to exist and fight as a guerrilla army against injustices to poor rural Filipinos. As previously mentioned, this group developed as an anti-Japanese guerilla group during the
Japanese occupation of the islands. However, as the Huk movement grew larger and began having a stronger impact as a result of,

The gradual out-migration of the landlords and their replacement by overseers weakened the social relationships between the landlords and tenants. The breakdown of the traditional system aggravated the economic situation. Absentee landlordism, together with landless tenants set the stage for revolution. In the face of the explosive situation created by the social unrest, many families have migrated to other areas (Poethig 1973:63-64).

In such a role, this group also fought against U.S.-backed private armies supporting elite landholders, who wanted to extinguish all arms-bearing peasants (Goodno 1991). Their resistance, built upon the histories of resistance to colonialism already discussed demonstrates the building of a historical consciousness of resistance within Filipino culture in the face of oppression.

U.S. interest in maintaining power and the support of the Filipino elite families sought to diffuse the issue of land reform by promoting land relocation instead (Bello 2001). This relocation program involved Christian takeover of traditionally Moslem territory in the southern islands of the Philippines, causing much conflict and increased suffering and oppression of the Moslem population by relocated Christian Filipinos (Steinberg 1994). This caused great controversy on the predominantly Moslem-controlled
islands. Therefore,

A further challenge to the authority of the central government arose in the form of the activities of the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) which was established in 1968 as the vehicle for achieving independence or autonomy for the Moslem population of the Philippines ... a culturally homogenous and distinctive group which suffered levels of social and economic deprivation greater than any of their Christian neighbors (Keesing Report 1988:9).

As previously mentioned, the dominant Philippine political parties and economic structure were and are run through family ties and patronage to one another. As Litonjua notes,

Filipino politics has often been described as enmeshed in patron-client networks lacking therefore the structural differentiation and functional specialization of American politics (2001:379).

This system arose in part from Spanish rulers formalizing the power of specific tribal chieftains that created a class of native capitalist rulers (Kessler 1989). This system developed into one that effectively works to leave the political and economic system at status quo conditions, with most power and wealth belonging to a small group of wealthy elite, regardless of what party member became an elected official of any kind, including president.

Additionally, the wealthy elite families also had relationships with U.S. investors or other types of senior American officials so that the political landscape of the
Philippine was manipulated based upon the patronage of U.S. company interests, rather than for the people of the Philippines themselves. This resulted in the Filipino politician mediating between the needs of American investors and the masses of underprivileged people in order to serve their own personal gain (Litonjua 2001). Crony politics based upon client loyalty created an elite democracy, as

...the aftermath of national elections saw the spectacle of elected officials rushing to affiliate themselves with the party of the victorious presidential candidate because the president had a stranglehold on patronage. ... Most Filipino politicians were members of both the Nacionalista and the Liberal Parties at one time or another. Political parties did not aggregate ideological or principled or even partisan interests, but were alliances forged by political families and their networks of clients which at any moment could shift and assume another configuration (Litonjua 2001:383).

Additionally, in the early 1960's, more exchange controls were dropped in order to obtain more US loans, "which were conditional on the devaluation of the peso and other concessions to bilateral trade" (Keesing 1988:7). The role of U.S. lending and of international lending organizations will not be discussed in depth here, as it merits a more in-depth discussion in the Section II following this one in the literature review.

Landlessness as a social problem was creating groups resisting these practices which were consolidating into
bigger groups. In 1968, the Communist Party of the Philippines was formed and in 1969, the New People's Army, its military branch, founded in the historic HUK movement, was formed as well. Additionally, the National Democratic Front, founded in 1972, was used to support and network with labor unions and farm worker organizations. These groups could practice their political opposition and advocate for the rights of the poor and for improved social conditions in public compared to Communist organizations whom the government targeted for persecution (Kessler 1989). These groups were prominent in anti-Marcos regime demonstrations, as was the Movement for a Democratic Philippines, which worked primarily with worker, student, and trade unions (Goodno 1991; Kessler 1989). Farmer's organizations, such as the Federation of Free Farmers which was a group started by Jesuits, were also organized and networked within this larger umbrella of organizations. As Steinberg noted, "Liberation theology, as developed and practiced in Mexico and Central America, gave moral and religious justification for sociopolitical action" (1994:94). Campbell points out that,

Accordingly, from the perspective of Gutierrez and other liberationists it is more accurate to describe the Latin American continent not as 'underdeveloped', but as located on the periphery of the industrialized world in a situation of enforced dependence and
oppression. It is this situation which qualifies Latin Americans as what I have called 'new voices.' They speak from within a situation which has generally been defined by others. Now they struggle not only to speak about that situation for themselves, but also to transform it (1999:56).

This perspective emphasizing religious purpose through social action will be discussed further in Part II of the literature review.

Foreign missionaries were also part of this process of developing an oppositional frame that challenged the power structures in the Philippines, through the implementation of a development concept called Basic Christian Communities. These Communities worked to organize and educate the poor around the ideology that people were poor and suffering due to the “sinful” structure of the economy and government (Kessler 1989:47). Alongside of these communities, the Catholic churches had established social action centers. Here then, we see how religious people, in working with rural people in local regions, became frustrated about avenues to help the poor without becoming involved in the politics of the region while they believed that real help for the poor required a change in the social structure. Some priests, frustrated by the failure of social action centers to emphasize political struggle while still attempting to assist the poor, became radicalized and joined
organizations such as the New People’s Army or National Democratic Front, while others formed the Christians for National Liberation organization (Kessler 1989). Here, religion is seen as being expressed in ways that served the ruling relations as well as used as a resource to oppose ruling relations, through the combining of faith and politics. All of these groups mentioned above participated in the struggle for human rights overall while advocating for the institution of civil rights for the poor and landless. Some of the organizations formed were more communist-influenced in mission than others, some were more militant than others, and some of them practiced their activism as a group more overtly as established organizations than others in society.

Marcos, Power, and Neo-Colonial Control

Ferdinand Marcos stands out as a prominent ruler in the Philippines to American audiences due to the widespread reports of his close friendship with Reagan, his implementation of martial law, and his wife’s excessive and lavish shopping tendencies. He entered the political scene in the 1960’s. First elected to the Congress and then to the Senate, he was elected president in 1965. Marcos promised change in the power distribution, long held in the
hands of the familial oligarchy, yet these changes were never represented in anything more than his words. Rather, Marcos began a pattern of corruption, buying lavish gifts for both domestic and foreign friends, hiring scores of public relations firms and agents, and bribing outright sycophants and supporters. The use of such money was a long-honored tradition of Philippines politics, but Marcos escalated both his own corruption and that of others to levels unimaginable in the previous administrations. The increasingly bureaucratic outreach of the state was used as a vehicle to put the president, his family, and the government on the take. The schemes and techniques first used during the era of Constitutional government were later expanded exponentially during the martial law period (Steinberg 1990:119).

Unlike the previous presidents, Marcos was re-elected for a second presidential term amidst well-documented scandal, protest, and widespread voting fraud (Bell et. al. 1988; Karnow 1989; Steinberg 1990; Goodno 1991). One could say he essentially elected himself. His activities as president and his unprecedented reelection led organized groups to move toward advocating for a rewriting of the 1935 constitution and to ensure that Marcos would not try to serve a third presidential term (Bell et al: 1988). In 1971, the year to begin campaigning for the next legislative elections, political violence and lawlessness were rising, and the NPA was increasingly seen as a threat to the government. Government leadership and military officials feared a communist takeover of the government (Bell et. al.
1988). During Marcos' regime, many activist groups (both religious and non-religious) worked within a larger movement, in coalition with one another, under the title of the KMP (Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas or Peasant Movement of the Philippines). These organizations, under this umbrella name, instigated most of the mass protests during this time, involving labor and land reform issues.

As Goodno notes,

The 'open mass movement,' to which the KMP belongs, is but one part of a potent movement for radical change. Its background is the underground left consisting of the NDF (National Democratic Front) and its 14 constituent groups, including the CPP (Communist Party of the Philippines), the NPA (New People's Army) and CNL (Christians for National Liberation). The CPP plays the central role in the movement as the leader of the NPA, as an organizer and prime mover in the NDF, and as an actor - sometimes with a lead role, sometimes a supporting part - in a array of legal organizations (1991:8).

Goodno (1991) also notes that it is this group and its affiliates that have borne the brunt of state and private repression. The New People’s Army worked with villages in rural areas in the attempt to network them as,

...advanced, political, military, economic and cultural bastions of the people’s revolution. It believes in an alliance of the working class and the peasantry as being the true foundation of a broad democratic unity. It's main strategic principle is the waging of a protracted people's war from rural bases (Permanent People's Tribunal Session on the Philippines 1980:50).
A rising challenge was the popularity of Ninoy Aquino, the leader of the Liberal Party. Ninoy Aquino, like Marcos, came from an elite family background and was a powerful landholder due to large plantations he had acquired from his marriage to Cory Cojuangco, daughter of another prominent and elite landowner family in the Philippines. Aquino had also belonged to the same fraternity in college as Marcos, and both he and Marcos had been previous representatives of their rivaling parties - Ninoy had originally been a representative of the Nationalist Party, while Marcos had previously been a representative elect of the Liberal Party.

As Goodno notes,

Filipinos elect their senators on a nationwide basis, with voters casting ballots for individual candidates rather than for party lists. The eight with the most votes would make it to the 24-member senate. Many considered the 1971 Senate election a dry run for the 1973 presidential election. Though not running, Ninoy Aquino took an active role in the campaign. Pundits considered him a prime candidate to succeed Marcos [in the presidential election to be held in 1973] (1991:65).

Yet Ninoy Aquino had not formally stated his intent to run as a presidential candidate. Politically, though, as a member of the Liberal Party, the largest party running in the elections against the Marcos-represented Nationalist Party, his vocal opposition to Marcos' presidency and policies was resented by Marcos and represented the dominant
theme of his political platform.

Then, at the end of the Liberal Party’s nomination campaign, a bombing occurred at the campaign party, injuring all eight candidates, killing nine people, and injuring over one hundred participants (Goodno 1991). Aquino was uninjured, as he had planned to arrive late to the event. Political violence was rising to an unprecedented level, and rising corruption in politics and poverty increased the number of demonstrations and strikes. These events were increasingly controlled by the use of military and police forces (Keesing 1988). Marcos’ legitimacy as president was further eroded by the rise in economic and social chaos.

Overall, this increase in popular dissatisfaction with the conditions of the country, and the human rights abuses of citizens by the military was causing a dramatic increase in both popularity and membership in the predominant communist Party of the Philippines, the New People’s Army.

By 1972 the NPA was acknowledged to be the de facto administration in numerous remote areas of the country including parts of Luzon and on several outlying islands, where it undertook land redistribution and raised revenue through the collection of rents and taxes (Bell et. al. 1988:9).

The Marcos’ lavish personal spending, along with stagnation in the agriculture and export economies, created a balance of trade deficit that plunged the nation into
bankruptcy. Economic trends led to greater government sponsored terrorism of suspected dissidents by either the military or paramilitary groups. Student demonstrations and farm worker protests were increasingly becoming more visible and involving more violence, and people were regularly witnessing abuse committed against Filipino civilians by members of the Filipino military. Most of those abused were people who were poor and lived in rural areas. Many were landless farm worker tenants who had been forced off of their lands by the government in its plans to open up the market to global consumption and foreign investment trends in industrial development. The military officials accounted for its widely indiscriminant, violent, and callous abuses as exercises of power justified in their search for Communist Party supporters or Muslim insurgents.

Foreign investment in the Philippines, channeled through the hands of the wealthy elite, continued to flourish. In 1970, roughly 80% of foreign investment in the Philippines was American. American businesses controlled roughly 40% of the economy while Philippines businessmen controlled roughly 60% (Valdepenaz Jr. 1973). Due to the relative absence of income taxes, 75% of government revenue came from sales taxes while 25% came from income taxes, half of which were paid by business corporations (Valdepenaz Jr.
1973). This essentially exempted those people with the most money invested in the country from responsibilities to address any of the social problems of the country.

In these conditions, Philippine Catholic Church leaders began to evaluate the role of the church in the occurring politics. By this time,

...approximately 85 percent of the population is Catholic, 5 percent is Aglipayan, 5 percent is Muslim, and the rest is scattered among the Protestant sects, a number of which have grown rapidly in the past decades. ... The Roman Catholic Church continues to reach into every nook in the country, and the clergy, now almost exclusively Filipino, is one of the most potent forces for change (Steinberg 1994:94).

Bishops and priests, depending upon the area in which they worked, differed in their attitude towards the responsibilities of the church for the social and political conditions of the people that they were servicing. As Youngblood notes,

The attitudinal center of the Catholic Church and the CBCP [Catholic Bishop’s Conference of the Philippines] rests with involvement primarily in Church administration, maintenance of the religious, social, and political status quo, and emphasis on spiritual matters, whereas the attitudinal periphery presages involvement with the masses in their struggle for greater socioeconomic and political justice (1982:33).

The churches located in rural areas tended to advocate for the rights of the villagers who were their religious constituencies. Their geographic location placed them as witness to the injustices villagers suffered through
foreigner control of land and the physical abuses and terror inflicted on them by the military, para-military groups hired by landlords, and anti-Communist vigilante firing squads that was not as visible in urban areas. As Youngblood notes,

Precisely because the religious jurisdictions of many progressives are on the periphery, these bishops more frequently encounter injustices by the government and abuses by the military that go uncorrected, and by residing in more heterogeneous regions, that is, in areas populated by Muslims, pagans, and ethnic minorities, the progressive bishops are forced to reconcile their call to proselytize with a countervailing need to preserve the right of others to remain different (1982:53).

Wealthy Filipinos and U.S. investors viewed these activities within the country with increasing alarm. Along with the threat of the rise in popularity of the Communist Party, U.S. government and investors began to fear that the Philippine economic system was becoming severely unstable. Economic and political conditions in the country were not progressing well. As Kessler notes,

Although agricultural productivity increased between 1970 and 1980, it did not benefit the peasants. In the 1980s productivity then began to decline, becoming negative in 1983. By 1985, of the estimated 62 percent of all Filipinos in rural areas, 63 percent lived below the poverty line. In urban areas 52 percent were poor. The land-reform program had proven to be more rhetoric than reality: 61 percent of farms were smaller than three hectares, accounting for only 24 percent of arable land. High population growth continued to reduce farm size and constrict incomes. Economic
policies, such as capital-intensive industrialization, provided few opportunities for surplus labor (1989:17).

Wealthy Filipinos began to relocate their financial savings into more stable accounts located in other countries. Foreign investors began to doubt current and future investments in what had been historically lucrative and successful industries (Reid & Guerrero 1995). As Reid & Guerrero note,

The U.S. Embassy became alarmed that Marcos was losing control at a time when the Communist rebellion was spreading, not only in the hinterlands but on the campuses of the nation’s most prestigious universities. That posed a threat to the six military bases in the country as well as the substantial American investment in the Philippine economy (1995:21).

First and foremost, Marcos broke with traditional politics by campaigning and attaining reelection. This represented a,

...deterioration of the liberal democratic political system which mediate competition between different factions of the ruling class on the one hand, and the increasing assertiveness of peasants, workers and segments of the petit-bourgeoisie such as the students, on the other (Rocamora 1981:69).

Previous to Marcos' reelection to president, politics in the Philippines revolved around specific elite groups whose patronage of one another, regardless of which one was the current president, kept status quo political and economic conditions in the country. Marcos' reelection created a political rupture between the ruling families where there
had been none before, thereby revealing the instability of family control over politics and weakened what had previously been a more unified reaction to the demands of workers and peasants. As Rocamora notes,

The economic demands of workers and peasants also took shape as political demands. Working together with students and other segments of the petit-bourgeoisie, plus a number of national bourgeois elements faced with increased competition from foreign investors, workers and peasants served as the social basis of a fast-growing radical nationalist movement. This movement exposed the dominance of foreigners, especially Americans in the economy and called for greater national economic self-reliance (1981:69-70).

Additionally, he notes that in 1969, "more workers went on strike than in any other year between 1965 and 1975" (Rocamora 1981:69). As these issues rose to an unpredictable peak, Marcos declared martial law in 1972.

**Martial Law**

Marcos declared martial law in 1972 arguing that it was necessary in order to prevent the overthrow of the government by communist rebels. He argued that urban areas (Manila and its surrounding areas) were being hit by militant protests on a variety of issues and he called attention to labor organizations, farmer's groups, and socialist and communist groups joining together in class struggle. Appealing to Communist fears, he was able to
maintain that the country was in danger from takeover by communist groups. This enabled him to attack any groups opposing his rule and receive U.S. military aid to do so. The United States supplied large funds and military aid to stop the influence of these groups in the Philippines. As Keesing notes,

In an address to the nation the President explained his action on the grounds that 'our democracy ... is endangered by the peril of violent overthrow.' The imposition of martial law, he explained, would enable the government to undertake a major drive against the rebels and their supporters, whilst also facilitating measures to reduce the degree of popular dissatisfaction within the country. Such measures he suggested would include 'a clean-up of corrupt and sterile government officials,' the initiation of land reform, the punishment of those members of the military who had committed offenses against the civilian population and a radical reduction of the level of violence which had become endemic to Filipino society (1988:10).

During this time period, Marcos closed down schools and universities in order to remove students and professors that were suspected as communist agitators. He demanded that all government employees resign so the government could decide who of the staff would be re-appointed and who would be charged with corruption. The government also, under martial law decree, closed most newspapers and radio stations, leaving open only those that were required to adhere to strict government guidelines for what they could report, therefore creating an atmosphere of strict censorship in the
country (Keesing Report 1988).

Additionally, he appointed staff who had proven their loyalty to him previously and took possession of the family fortunes and land titles of those families not supporting his rule as part of his martial law powers. Essentially, he revised the entire apparatus of the state to be entirely under his control, dismantled most social institutions, disarmed his opposition, and used his complete control over the military, merged military and presidential powers to form is basis for rule (Litonjua 2001). Additionally, as Steinberg notes,

The declaration of martial law won the strong support of the international business community and of President Richard Nixon and his government. The defeat in Vietnam made both Marcos and continued U.S. access to the two giant bases seem critical. ... In the aftermath of Vietnam it was important to maintain allies (Korea and the Philippines, for example) whatever their political repression or internal policies, provided they were anticommunist and pro-U.S. Marcos was one of the beneficiaries of this new policy (1994:123).

Marcos also arrested and imprisoned those opposing his rule and government, including Ninoy Aquino and prominent Communist leaders. As Reid and Guerrero note, “Ninoy’s arrest transformed him from political gadfly to an international figure and symbol of resistance to oppression” (1995:18). Aquino was charged with murder, subversion, and possession of illegal weapons. Marcos allegedly rigged the
four-year trial from the beginning (Reid & Guerrero 1995). However, Ninoy rallied his supporters while in prison by staging such acts as hunger strikes to protest the Marcos regime. In 1977 he was sentenced to death (Reid & Guerrero 1995). These events and their media coverage turned Ninoy into an international figurehead. As a result, this sentence was never carried out (Reid & Guerrero 1995). In 1978, half way through the total length of martial law, Marcos held another election that he won, despite the popularity and support for opposition candidates (Goodno 1991).

Marcos also tolerated widespread corruption by those loyal to his regime, especially from his senior military members who had pledged their loyalty to the Marcos regime. As a result of Marcos turning a blind eye to military abuses in order to ensure their support of his dictatorship, a certain portion of military leaders and members of the military began to gain great power and abuse the human rights of Filipino citizens. As Reid and Guerrero note,

A provincial commander could earn thousands of dollars a year, far more than his government salary, through rake-offs from gambling, smuggling, and illegal logging. ... Favored generals were allowed to keep their positions long after the mandatory retirement age. That guaranteed a loyal chain of command but encouraged deep resentment among middle-grade officers, whose promotions were delayed because of the logjam at the top (1995:17).
Despite these excesses and widespread corruption, the United States continued to channel money into the Philippines in order to protect its military bases and economic investments. As Goodno notes,


Therefore, through military base funding and military aid, the United States played an important role in keeping Marcos strongly in control of the nation, and trained and organized Philippine soldiers (The Permanent People's Tribunal Session on the Philippines 1980). Martial law continued to take its toll on people through continued economic and cultural repression. At the Permanent People's Tribunal Session on the Philippines held in 1980, one testifier noted that from 1972 to 1980,

> ...more than 60,000 Filipino citizens have been arrested and imprisoned without trial and charges; many languish in jail for years. Most have been subjected to brutal physical and mental torture. A considerable number have been murdered and some have never been heard of after arrest. Military safehouses have been extensively used for the torture of prisoners. Recently, instead of taking prisoners, the military has resorted to the so-called salvaging policy, i.e. the outright killing of arrested persons or the massacre of citizens in their homes. In imposing martial law, not only did Marcos confirm the 1971 suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, but he opened the way for indiscriminant arrest and prolonged detention. Public
demonstrations are prohibited under heavy penalty (The Permanent People's Tribunal Session on the Philippines 1980:9).

Historians have discussed (see Rocamora 1981; Constantino 1978; The Permanent People's Tribunal Session on the Philippines 1980) how when Marcos declared martial law, then, it was in order to shut down protesting nationalist organizations and groups that threatened the economic system he wanted to implement. This economic system would ensure his position of power and relationship with U.S. investors, and comply with international lending organizations, specifically the World Bank, readjustment policies that would provide security to foreign investors.

As such, Marcos and his supporters aimed to create an unrestricted flow of foreign investments, requiring the dismantling of the existing structure of export and import tariffs, centralization of export industries, and cheap, unorganized labor (Rocamora 1981). Once these conditions began to take place, foreign investment, and primarily United States investors, increased dramatically. In fact, According to the Central Bank, direct foreign investment between 1970 and 1972 totaled only $16.3 million while profit remittances and other payments totaled $87.8 million. In the three year period subsequent to the declaration of martial law (1973-75), direct investment, predominantly American, totaled $362.1 million (Rocamora 1981:71).
These political, economic, and social injustices led to the development of a politicized and publicly critical Catholic Church. As Steinberg notes,

During the years of repression under martial law, [Cardinal] Sin and thousands of priests, nuns, and seminarians were morally outraged by the Marcos regime’s abuse of the rights of Filipinos both famous and insignificant. These human rights violations politicized the church. Cardinal Sin wrote in the early 1980’s that 'when people lose faith in their leaders, fear the military, and do not trust the courts, the only person left for them to go to with their grievances is the parish priest, ... and he cannot just file away their complaints like everyone else and pretend they do not exist. He has to act to do something or he too will lose hope (1994:94).

In the meantime, the number of Basic Christian Communities began to grow in the countryside in a continued attempt by local priests and lay leaders to reorganize society along more equitable means (Steinberg 1994). The distribution of power and resources was being increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few families. In 1983, 58.8 percent of the nation’s total income was controlled by the top 20 percent of Filipino families and in 1985, 37 percent of the nation’s total income was controlled by the top 10 percent of Filipino families (Kessler 1989).

In 1980, Ninoy Aquino suffered a heart attack while in prison. Refusing surgery at a Filipino hospital, he was flown to the United States where he had a successful surgery. Then, he moved to a suburb of Boston and accepted
a fellowship at Harvard. The crisis in the Philippines was getting worse. As Kessler notes,

In the 1980's productivity then began to decline, becoming negative in 1983. By 1985, of the estimated 62 percent of all Filipinos in rural areas, 63 percent lived below the poverty line. In urban areas 52 percent were poor. The land reform program [promised by Marcos] had proven to be more rhetoric than reality: 61 percent of farms were smaller than three hectares, accounting for only 24 percent of the arable land. High population growth continued to reduce farm size and constrict incomes. Economic policies, such as capital-intensive industrialization, provided few opportunities for surplus labor (1989:17).

Yet, Marcos continued to have his supporters in powerful government positions in both the Philippines and the United States. As Goodno notes,

The military still appeared to be solidly behind the regime and the U.S. fell in line. In 1979 the Marcos and Carter governments concluded their review of the Military Bases Agreement, with various amendments accepted and a US government promise to do its best to deliver $500 million in military and economic aid by 1983. Carter had stopped criticizing Marcos once Aquino was released (1991:76).

During Aquino's exile in the United States he spent time traveling around the United States, meeting other scholars (particularly in California), and pondered the question of how to help the Philippines out of martial law and Marcos' rule. His wife, Cory Aquino, though a figurehead due to the popularity of her husband, remained, for the most part, in the background of these activities and is described in the historical literature as quiet or shy, a
conservative mother of five children, and a pious Catholic. The events that were about to occur were to change her entire life and place her at the forefront of Filipino and U.S. politics.

In 1983, Ninoy decided to return to the Philippines, as it was rumored that Marcos was ill and many groups were uncertain of who would be his successor. Two years earlier, Marcos had declared that martial law had been lifted but continued to rule by decree, essentially leaving the practices of his regime unchanged. Many, including Ninoy, feared it might be Marcos’ wife Imelda who would succeed him (Reid & Guerrero: 1995). As Goodno notes,

Believing there was no other option, he decided to return home to campaign for the national Assembly, lead a non-violent struggle, and once again urge Marcos to restore political competition (1991:78).

As his plane landed in the Philippines and he had exited the plane towards the stairs, witnesses on the plane heard voices say, “I’ll do it, I’ll do it, shoot, shoot!” Shots were heard, and Ninoy lay dead, shot in the head on the plane runway next to his supposed murderer, a petty criminal with connections to the police. The same police escorts who had accompanied Ninoy down the plane’s steps shot this man. Aquino’s murder shocked the international community. Marcos
ordered an investigation and claimed that the assassin was a Communist (Reid & Guerrero 1995).

At this point, the appeal of Communism was spreading and gaining more legitimacy within public discourse as people searched for different solutions to the repeated abuses of the Marcos presidency and U.S. imperialism as well as the continued suffering of the poor within their country. Many citizens were not even old enough to remember a time in their lives when martial law had not been in place yet advocated for change with those who remembered. Marcos was attacking opposition groups by enabling military and anti-Communist vigilante groups to murder indiscriminately (Kessler 1989). He was also using anti-communism as a chant to U.S. leaders to continue to receive more military aid.

As Kessler notes,

Aided by Marcos’ declining popularity, the growth of opposition groups among the moderate Manila upper classes, and the deteriorating economic situation that weakened the government’s effectiveness even further in the rural areas, the NPA [New People’s Army] assumed a Robin Hood–like image as “Nice People Around” (1989:55).

People Power and the Church

Marcos’ chief of staff and twenty-five other people were tried for Ninoy’s (Benigno’s) murder and then acquitted in 1985 (Reid & Guerrero 1995). However, there was a
general consensus in the air that Marcos was to blame. Riots and demonstrations increased in the cities. Additionally,

Benigno Aquino's murder radicalized Cardinal Sin and, with him, nearly the entire Roman Catholic Church of the Philippines. It became clear to the tens of thousands of priests, nuns, seminarians, and lay leaders that Marcos had lost all moral force and that the political struggle could be seen in terms of good and evil sides. ... In the waning years of the Marcos era, the church became the center of anti-Marcos activity (Steinberg 1990:97).

Dissatisfaction with the corruption and unequal distribution of power also caused a section of the military to branch off and plan a coup attempt on Marcos before elections were to take place. Additionally, coalitions were being formed by church and university leaders to unify under a potential presidential candidate that could beat Marcos in the next election. As Reid & Guerrero note,

In 1984, a group of Catholic businessmen and intellectuals began to meet to formulate a political strategy and choose a candidate to oppose Marcos in national elections set for 1987. Members included Jaime Ongpin, a Harvard-educated businessman and the first Filipino president of the giant Benguet Consolidated Mines; the Reverand Joaquin Bernas, president of the Jesuit-run Ateneo University; Emmanuel Soriano, president of the University of the Philippines; and Dr. Alfredo Bengzon, a prominent physician. They were associated with Jaime Cardinal Sin, the archbishop of Manila and a Marcos critic (1995:21).

Here, we can still see traditional colonial structures in place as Catholic intellectuals and other powerful members
of the community owning local industries, laid the plans for changing the presidency without including the perspective of the people who suffered the most under the declaration of martial law. In this way, we see how definitions of colonialism and resistance to it are also tied to class structures.

Cory Aquino, widow of Ninoy, was seen as a potential candidate. She was seen by this business and intellectual group as having immense moral authority and popular appeal among the poor and landless Filipino population, as well as the middle and upper classes. In this way, she was seen as a candidate who could unite the opposition groups, including the military, elite families, Moslems, and Communist insurgent groups (Reid & Guerrero 1995). Reid & Guerrero (1995) note that her candidacy was made possible due to the emotional component of Philippine politics in that she had stirred people’s emotions through her husband’s public death. One million signatures collected in support of her as a candidate convinced her to run for the presidency (Reid & Guerrero 1995). As Steinberg notes,

Cardinal Sin became one of the key actors in the drama. It was he who imposed a compromise on Corazon Aquino and Salvador Laurel [the front running candidate against Aquino] by which the opposition agreed to field a single slate against Marcos (1990:97).
Here we see how even the mainstream Catholic Church in the Philippines was becoming entrenched in the political outcome of the presidential election.

Due to special interest groups in America concerned about the human rights violations occurring in the Philippines, Ninoy Aquino’s murder and cover-up, and Marcos’ increasingly negative image in world opinion, the United States faced increasing pressure to monitor its activities with Marcos and began to distance U.S. officials from Marcos’ activities. Additionally, on the day of election in February, the United States successfully requested that a private agency be in place to monitor the election and perform an unofficial count of votes to ensure a fair election (Reid & Guerrero 1995). After the election, both Aquino and Marcos declared victory. World opinion that Aquino was the victor was reinforced when the computer operators in charge of tallying the votes walked off the job claiming they were being forced to falsify figures by the Marcos administration (Reid & Guerrero 1995). As Reid & Guerrero note, though,

There was more to the walkout, however, than the simple outrage of the computer operators. Their leader was Linda Kapunan, wife of an air force lieutenant colonel, Eduardo ‘Red’ Kapunan. Her husband was a member of a clique of young military officers who were secretly conspiring to overthrow Marcos. The vote manipulation was real, but the military conspirators wanted the
world to know about it as justification for the action they were planning to undertake (1995:26).

This group of officers called the Reform the Armed Forces Movement (RAM), had the support of the defense minister, Juan Ponce Enrile, whose standing with the president had declined. Originally, Enrile had been a key advisor to Marcos in establishing and administering martial law (Goodno 1991). Enrile enlisted the support of another high ranking army official, General Ramos, and Ramos agreed to join Enrile in a military mutiny. The leaders and their forces overtook an abandoned military camp, Camp Aguinaldo, and,

They announced that they had mutinied against Ferdinand Marcos because he had stolen the election. Enrile declared that he could no longer acknowledge Marcos as chief executive but was evasive when asked if he considered Cory Aquino the legitimate president (Reid & Guerrero 1995:30).

But the next day, fearing failure, Enrile denied that a coup had been attempted and declared Cory Aquino as the true president of the Philippines (Goodno 1991). Another team of opposition forces, in coalition with Enrile’s group, had occupied a camp directly across from Camp Aguinaldo, Camp Crane, in support of the mutinying troops (Goodno 1991). Together, with a few thousand citizens supporting them at their stronghold, they were no match for the army forces commandeered by Marcos and his top general.
Marcos, in televised interviews, was planning his attack on the two camps that were now occupied. Cardinal Sin requested citizen and clergy support of the troops over the Catholic radio station to uphold Aquino as the rightful president. The next day, more organized groups of civilians and religious clergy had arrived and had blocked the roads Marcos' military would have to use to reach and attack the camps. The tanks came to a stop as thousands of citizens and religious representatives stopped in front of the tanks and prevented them from reaching the camps (Goodno 1991).

Marcos threatened to use firearms against the crowds and ordered his generals to use artillery on the rebels (Goodno 1991). Yet the commander in charge procrastinated because he did not want to attack his friends or the civilians. In the meantime, rebel helicopters attacked Marcos' palace and took over the dominant television station (Goodno 1991). Aquino appeared at the camp to declare her victory and President Reagan stepped in and asked Marcos to step down (Goodno 1991). As Goodno notes,

Support for Marcos had crumbled in the US Congress, with both Democrats and pragmatic Republicans threatening to introduce legislation to cut off military aid to the Philippines. Secretary of State George Shultz, the most astute of Reagan's foreign policy advisors, impressed upon Reagan the truth of the situation in Manila. Marcos, in Shultz's mind, was a goner and an obstacle to stability (1991:101).
Reagan sent a diplomat to the Philippines to investigate the situation, who returned to convince Reagan to make a break from Marcos (Goodno 1991). Although pro-Marcos crowds were present throughout these incidents in the Philippines, the pro-Aquino demonstrations vastly outnumbered the pro-Marcos contingencies. U.S. Helicopters flew Marcos, his family and loyal followers, to safety in Hawaii. The palace grounds were stormed and ravaged and Aquino was sworn in as President.

One of the unique aspects of this governmental overthrow was the combined effort of the military, religious groups, the middle class, and the poor in support of the overthrow of Marcos. Each constituency group advocated for a change in leadership even though perspectives varied broadly on what they considered to be the next best steps for the country's future. The formation of this broad-based coalition created some shared meanings as well as some coalitions, such as the military who had been given unlimited power throughout the previous government, siding with Filipino citizens, or the middle-class empathizing with the plight of the poor. As Parsa notes, "Thus, it is important to analyze the process of insurgency and the dynamics that encourage or discourage coalition formation. In the absence of prior state breakdown or military victory
by insurgents, broad coalitions are crucial to the removal of powerholders” (2000:10).

After the Ousting of Marcos

Within the next year, from his haven in Hawaii, Marcos continued to exert a powerful influence in the Philippines. He still asserted that he was the rightful President, and that his people wanted him to come back home. He staged demonstrations in which protesters were bought off with food or money and instigated violence against pro-Aquino demonstrators in order to keep her presidency in question and assert his legitimacy (Karnow 1989). Aquino set about trying to begin the process of implementing the changes she had promised in her campaign platform, part of which was based upon her advocating for land reform. As Goodno (1991) notes, Aquino spoke publicly about her beliefs in land redistribution. He directly quotes her during her campaign for election as stating that,

The two essential goals of land reform are greater productivity and equitable sharing of the benefits and ownership of the land. These two goals can conflict with each other. But together we will seek viable systems of land reform suited to the particular exigencies dictated not only by the quality of the soil, the nature of the produce, and the agricultural inputs demanded, but above all by the needs of the small farmers, landless workers, and communities of tribal Filipinos whose lives and personal dignity depend on their just share in the abundance
of the land. (Aquino quoted in Goodno 1991:7)

Moreover, she offered to transform her family’s sugar plantation as a model for the rest of the Philippines (Goodno 1991). However, Aquino was facing a landowner/landlord-dominated Congress. She spoke of land reform and land redistribution to a Congress that was not interested in full-scale and permanent land redistribution.

As Steinberg notes,

Land ownership remains the most desired means for economic investment for rich or poor. The U.S. colonial practice of permitting the elite to gain power through land acquisition created a situation prior to martial law in which land reform was impossible because the privileged elite controlled the government and was the government. … Subsequent land reform efforts, including the Economic Development Corps (EDCOR), the 1955 Land Reform Act, the 1963 Agricultural Land Reform Code, the Marcos efforts of the 1970s, and the 1988 Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP) have failed to address these inequities adequately (1990:25).

This passage brings up an interesting point. Efforts at land reform have been a continuous part of Filipino history and had been part of campaign efforts. Historically, the reforms that had been promised were not implemented through policy in any way that benefited poor and small farm farmers.

Three years after Aquino rose to power, very little had actually changed. Additionally, human rights violations
against the poor of the Filipino people increased. Again, Goodno describes how,

Human rights organizations, which had originally applauded Aquino when she released all but a handful of political prisoners after coming to power, called 1987 the worst year for human rights in the Philippines since 1978 (1991:14).

Much of the violence had begun with Marcos' support of para-military right-wing, anti-Communist vigilante firing squads. They, along with the abusive military personnel continued to be a terrorizing force in the rural countryside where most people had no protection from their abuses. As Goodno notes,

A bloody battle is being fought in the Philippines. In 1988 the AFP (Armed Forces of the Philippines) and NPA were losing an average of three to four fighters a day. Government and CPP officials are being killed. Civilians caught in the cross-fire or targeted by one side or the other are dying. This is one reason why so many Filipinos want peace and why so many people placed so much hope in the 1986/7 peace talks staged by the government and the NDF (1991:9).

Therefore, in this section I have highlighted some of the events in the overall history of the Philippines that takes us up to the point at which the Mendiola march occurs. I also described some of the main characteristics of the historical resources used by the powerful and the powerless to continue their struggle against one another aided and abetted by the unequal distribution of power and resources existing from colonial and neo-colonial economic and
political structures. In the next section of this historical literature review I will discuss how United States churches were involved with globalization issues as framed within the ecumenical movement in the United States.

**Literature Review Part II:**
Institutional Responses to Hunger and Poverty

**Introduction**

To complete this historical overview, I want to discuss two parallel movements occurring that are relevant to my research. First, I offer a brief historical review of the development of transnational lending organizations such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank and trace their impact in the Philippines. Second, I review the movement by the ecumenical community, specifically within the United States, to work on social justice issues advocated by the poor. Specifically, I examine the impact of the political policies of these international lending organizations on creating hunger.

**The Role of International Organizations in Dependency and Underdevelopment in the Philippines**

I take the position that the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund influence the decision-making of
countries in such a way that they disempower national
governments from developing long-term, sustainable industry
in their respective countries. Indeed, I will argue that
these two organizations, under the rubric of development,
promoted the underdevelopment of the Philippines,
particularly in the 1970s and 1980s.

The impetus for international lending organizations
sprang from post World War II conditions. While Europe and
Asia were devastated by war, wartime production had
strengthened America’s military, financial, and industrial
resources (Broad 1988). Thus, it was the United States who
had the most power and input on restructuring the world
economy after World War II.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) was established
to promote a balanced growth of international trade,
exchange stability, eliminate any exchange restrictions that
hindered world trade growth, make financial resources
available, and reduce payment imbalances in countries (Broad
1988). However, the agency was “dominated by the United
States, which has over 20 percent of voting power” (Bello,
Kinley, & Elinson 1982:6). The World Bank was developed to
facilitate how private capital would be used internationally
by guaranteeing loans to encourage investors to place money
abroad (Broad 1988). Like the IMF, the United States dominates the World Bank.

The two international organizations increasingly began to work together, although each focusing on separate tasks in funneling economic aid to developing countries and countries heavily saddled by international debts. The IMF was designed to provide credits to developing countries to bridge temporary shortfalls. The World Bank was designed to make long-term loans for development projects (Bello, Kinley, & Elison 1982).

Many of the World Bank’s development and project loans went to agricultural and industrial development projects. Ironically, these development projects did very little to address the economic conditions of the people suffering the most from the industrialized development of the country. These types of export-oriented development projects emphasized a reduction in local community self-sustainability and instead, “set out to reduce self-provisioning agriculture to one or two cash crops” (Institute for Food and Development Policy 1979:14). In many of these situations, foreign investors took over the agricultural production process, which took the best land away from farmers who had historically tilled areas of land,
and turned them into wage laborers (Institute for Food and Development Policy 1979).

The impact of these activities on local communities were further compounded by a negative view of traditional and diversified farming methods by investors and lending organization decision-makers. The developers viewed these methods as "backward" and "primitive" because they did not produce a marketable surplus from which one could accumulate wealth (Lappe, Collins, & Kinley 1979). As a solution, developers sought to implement the concept of agricultural production based on large amounts of surplus sold for a profit. These practices changed processes of food production for the local community and signaled the beginning of modern food dependency systems. As cash crops began to multiply as a method of agricultural development, the need to import food became critical.

In the 1950s and 1960s, a structuralist critique of global trade policies considered the position of poorer debt-ridden countries in the South compared to the wealthy and economically stable countries in the North. This critique developed as nations in Africa, India, and in Asia (including the Philippines) that had previously been colonies gained political independence and joined the independent but poor countries of Latin America (Litonjua
1998). This shift from colonies to post-colonial status began to destabilize the ideology of power and control that First World, wealthy, developed and industrialized countries had held over Third World, non-industrialized and least industrialized countries. While force and violence had been used to implement economic and political policy in colonized countries, once countries gained political independence they began to advocate for economic freedom.

The economic theory behind this critique posited that trade relations between industrialized and non-industrialized countries were worsening as it took more raw products in order to purchase manufactured products from the North. This trade relationship would worsen as the North began producing substitute for the raw materials and products they had previously depended on buying from the South (Bello 2001). Essentially, this position called for a restructuring of the world economy in order to enable nonindustrialized and newly industrialized countries to “catch up” to their Northern counterparts. To do this, a United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) was established. Here, Third World countries advocated for commodity price stabilization, preferential tariffs for Third World exports, expansion and acceleration of foreign assistance, not as loans but as representing compensation,
technological expansion, and protectionist trade policies to poor countries (Bello 2001). Overall, this was a movement to economically de-colonize these countries from their wealthier counterpart through the support of international agencies like the United Nations. UNCTAD's global reform plans were resisted and even small concessions made by the United Nations to the developing countries represented in UNCTAD were delayed. Rather than support their implementation, compromises typically favored the wealthier nations (Bello 2001).

In sum, these types of credit programs commonly did not reach and benefit small farmers. Sustainability in local communities was destroyed as cash crops replaced food crops. As George notes, "Expensive technology produces expensive food. Someone will have to pay for purchased seeds, chemical fertilizers and pesticides, irrigation equipment, mechanization and the like ... companies see this as a potentially profitable activity; as a way of gaining more control over food systems as a whole" (1984:82).

United States Power Expressed through Lending Policies

The 1980s were an unprecedented period of the United States influence on the decision-making and power of the World Bank and IMF organizations. As Bello notes,
When the Reagan administration came to power in 1981, it was riding on what it considered a mandate not only to roll back communism, but also to discipline the Third World. ... The instruments chosen for rolling back the South were the World Bank and the IMF (2001:10).

The United States attacked the World Bank as promoting socialism through its lending to underdeveloped governments that were not subscribing to transnational trading policies (Bello 2001). Reagan withdrew much U.S. support for multilateral lending and then pushed for more bilateral lending with aid from the United States being “tied more closely to the economic and security objectives of the United States” (Bello, Kinley, & Elinson 1982:3). The United States also embraced the practice of exporting surplus grain produced with U.S. government farming subsidies. In 1986, the U.S. Agricultural Secretary John Block was quoted at the Uruguay Round negotiations as stating that,

The idea that developing countries should feed themselves is an anachronism from a bygone era. They could better ensure their food security by relying on U.S. agricultural products, which are available in most cases at much lower cost (Block in Bello 2001:37).

Project lending shifted towards emphasizing projects addressing larger, nation-wide changes based upon conditionality requirements. As Bello notes,

In the mid-1980s, IMF and World Bank - imposed structural adjustment became the vehicle for a program of free-market liberalization that was applied across
the board to Third World economies suffering major debt problems (2001:11).

Conditions included raised standards of economic performance, economic growth, and competitiveness on the global market. This model clearly reflects the components and strategies inherent to modernization and expansion-based, neo-liberal economic development theory. Conditionalities on organizational lending led to an organizational agenda shift towards structural adjustment programs that opened a country’s trade policies to the global market. These method of reorganizing a country’s trade policies primarily worked to benefit the wealthy minority of a country and increase the amount of foreign investment, and therefore increase the power of foreign investors over a country’s national economic policies and priorities. Structural adjustment occurred through three measures of change to the national government of the country in consideration: reform in trade through liberalization, deregulation, privatization of industry and capital, and granting foreign investors virtually unlimited access to national resources (Bello, Kinley, & Elinson 1982). In these ways, both the IMF and World Bank concentrated on eliminating national controls (like minimum wage and
production for domestic consumption) in order to encourage
the increase and ease of mobility for the flow of capital.

The politics and economics of the Philippines, like
most developing countries, has been greatly influenced by
the policies and practices of these international lending
and restructuring organizations. The Philippines was a
unique candidate for structural adjustment implementation
for three reasons. First, the Philippines was a former
colony that had attained political freedom but not economic
freedom. Second, because of its indebtedness to other
countries, it was in desperate need of some form of
financial assistance. Third, although it had a democratic
government, it was still in a state of semi-colonialism to
the United States as,

...the United States secured the right to maintain over
20 bases and military installations in the country and
U.S. citizens acquired - through the Parity Amendment
to the Philippine Constitution and the Bell Trade Act -
equal rights as Filipinos to exploit the country's
natural resources (Bello, Kinley, & Elinson 1982:53).

Therefore, the Philippines was a model example and one
of the first nations to undergo structural reconstruction
according to the policies of both the IMF and World Bank.
Together, with the unequal trading policies that had been
historically in place to benefit the United States, these
new unequal trading policies set the Philippine government up for a new type of neo-colonial control.

Additionally, as stated earlier, the Philippine economy has historically been subject to corrupt practices and patronage politics, leaving the majority of the poor in the Philippines in a state of extreme poverty. In fact, from 1954 until 1972,

Under the guise of promoting economic independence [from the United States] and import-substitution industrialization, exchange rates were manipulated, monopolistic licenses parceled out, huge, cheap, often unrepaid bank loans passed around, and the national budget frittered away in pork barrel legislation. ... By the end of the golden era, five percent of the country's income earners received probably, about fifty percent of total income (Anderson 1995:16-17).

This led to massive poverty of the poor and underprivileged population. Aid to the Philippines started in the 1960's when President Mascapagal, a nationalist politician and president, received bilateral aid from the United States under the condition that the IMF become involved. As Broad notes,

In the end, the Philippines received a joint U.S./IMF stabilization fund, totaling almost $300 million, and a fairly typical packet of IMF conditions: (1) devaluation of the peso against the dollar; (2) Abolition of import controls and exchange licensing; (3) extension of incentives to foreign capital; and (4) tightening of domestic credit (1988:33).

Another IMF stabilization loan was provided in 1970, under the presidency of Ferdinand Marcos, with the IMF requiring
that Marcos devalue the peso based upon the value of the U.S. dollar (Broad 1988). At this time, the World Bank was also involved in providing aid to the Philippines by working in conjunction with IMF development attempts through elaboration of economic development plans (Broad 1988). The Bank's programs primarily focused on rural development, as a response to the Filipino agricultural crisis. As Bello, Kinley, & Elinson note, "The centerpiece of the strategy was increasing the productivity of small farmers through the delivery of 'technological packages' and upgrading agricultural support services like credit systems" (1982:24). This strategy was supposed to assist the problems faced by Filipino farmers, perceived to be primarily production-oriented - the World Bank wanted them to produce more quantity with more efficiency. Yet the adoption of these agricultural reform practices led to the bankruptcy of many small farmers who could not afford to adopt the new technology, while it primarily benefited machinery manufacturers, large-scale farmers, and U.S. pesticide companies (Bello, Kinley, & Elinson 1982).

Additionally, Marcos had promised land reform in both his presidential election platforms. But he never followed through on this promise. The landlessness problem could not be resolved without restructuring the relationship between
the most powerful and the most powerless in the Philippines. The World Bank could also not afford to lose support of the land-owning elite. Therefore, the World Bank’s land reform involved large technological productions (as a result of Green Revolution ideology) that worsened the situation of the poor and landless.

The involvement of the World Bank, United States, and International Monetary Fund in Philippine national strategy was preceded by a severe crisis in the Philippine economy that, consequently, strengthened U.S. control over Philippine economic and political decision-making, while worsening the living conditions of the country’s poor majority. The hunger and poverty crisis facing the Philippines in the 1960’s stemmed from slowing export and agricultural systems. A declining growth rate in agriculture occurred as available land declined for new agricultural production as well as increased the number of employed rural workers (Rocamora 1981). Additionally, the Philippines export economy declined.

The stagnation in agriculture pushed larger and larger numbers of rural inhabitants into the urban areas. But because industrial sectors were growing at a pace not much faster than in agriculture, there were few urban jobs available (Rocamora 1981:68).

As the export economy began to slow down, no new jobs were being created for the newly urban workers.
Between 1964 and 1969, export receipts grew by only 2.7 percent annually and actually registered declines in 1967 and 1969. As a result, Philippine balance of trade deficits rose from an average of $34 million a year between 1964 and 1966 to $270 million per year between 1967 and 1969. This difficult financial situation was made worse by the net outflow of $2.7 billion dollars in profit remittances, withdraw of investments, and amortization of private sector loans in the period between 1964 and 1972 (Rocamora 1981:68).

As a result, the government relied on a period of heavy, short-term borrowing (Rocamora 1981).

Additionally, both the World Bank and the IMF focused their efforts on developing export-oriented industrialization projects. Crucial to this development in the Filipino economy were Filipino technocrats - those bureaucrats in the Philippine government who embraced Keynesian economic theory and supported the liberalizing of trade policy. These Filipinos worked closely with IMF and World Bank staff to open up the Philippine economy to global free trade policies. As Broad notes,

They were the World Bank counterparts on the inside. They thought like World Bank economists; they shared the philosophy that progress and growth lay in foreign investment and abundant foreign loans. They spoke the same language of mathematic formulas. In brief, they composed a powerful, but not yet hegemonic transnationalist faction of the Marcos government (1988:73).

Yet, as quoted in Bello, Kinley, & Elinson, one Bank specialist noted that rural development was effectively used as a counterinsurgency tool as,
This strategy rests on the assumption that reform can forestall or pre-empt the accumulation of social and political pressures if people are given a stake in the system. Reform thus prevents the occurrence of full-fledged revolution [original emphasis] (1982:25). This economic crisis fueled a growing crisis in the political sphere. During the 1960's, class and nationalist consciousness began to be more pronounced as Filipino lower and middle class citizens, students, farmers, and labor groups began to exercise constitutional rights and began to advocate for anti-elitist and anti-American imperialist policy changes (Bello, Kinley, & Elinson 1982). For the IMF and World Bank, this rise in national sentiment conflicted with their intentions to open up and then encourage more inflow of foreign investment, knowing in consequence that this would essentially destroy what was left of the Philippine's national economic base. Therefore, consequentially, the middle class business entrepreneurs were also being put out of business through newly implemented laws; they also joined the nationalist protests taking place. As Bello, Kinley, & Elinson note, By the late 60's, the social contradictions suppressed by Philippine-style McCarthyism in the 1950's resurfaced in the form of student demonstrations, peasant marches and worker's strikes, and the widespread articulation of nationalist sentiment, even in Congress (1982:8).

This political instability led to a massive disinvestment in the Philippines by foreign interests (Bello, Kinley, &
As a result, World Bank investment in structural adjustment programs increased simultaneously with Marcos' declaration of martial law. In fact, (Bello, Kinley, & Elinson note that,

Between 1970 and 1982, the World Bank became a massive presence in Philippine affairs. Its dramatic entry was provoked by a deep-seated crisis of the postwar social order characterized by an 'elite democratic' state presiding over a stagnant, underdeveloped economy. The World Bank effort had two fundamental objectives: to stabilize the deteriorating political situation and to more thoroughly integrate the Philippine economy into the international capitalist order dominated by the United States (1982:15).

Marcos' declaration of martial law was a sign that the Philippines would be a stable investment for foreign interests. It was also assurance that World Bank and IMF policies would be implemented as,

The abolition of Congress with its competing power centers, was seen as a prerequisite for a more efficient and all-sided penetration of the Philippines by significantly reducing the 'irrationalities' and 'uncertainties' faced by foreign investors and aid agencies (Bello, Kinley, & Elinson 1982:30).

Additionally, the abolition of labor unions insured a source of cheap labor to attract foreign investors back to the Philippines for manufacturing purposes (Bello, Kinley, and Elinson 1982). Once the IMF and World Bank became involved further financially, they established an interagency committee that began to influence industrial finance patterns (Broad 1988). In fact,
Not only would the first financial-sector loan be channeled through the apex institution into universal banks and, finally, into export-oriented industries, but so too would a growing number of future World Bank loans, future regional development bank loans, and future transnational bank loans (Broad 1988:13).

Broad effectively summarizes the impact of these organizations on the economy and development structure of the Philippines in noting that,

Under the weight of the Bank’s and the Fund’s successful policy influence from 1979 to 1982, nationalist and transnationalist factions in Philippine state and private institutions experienced their most dramatic transformation to date, in both absolute and relative terms. Within the state, nationalists lost every key foothold of influence on policy formulation, as transnationalists assumed hegemonic control of all major ministries. Within the private sector, economic nationalist factions whose enterprises depended on domestic markets were decimated as a class. As the industrial-sector policy changes left and ever more concentrated industrial sector in their wake, so, too, universal banking undermined all but a small circle of large banks (1988:13).

Additionally, during this period of time the United States was facing increasing pressure from Congress to limit funding to those governments with high records of human rights violations. The Philippines was one of those countries. Therefore, as U.S. bilateral aid declined, the World Bank increased its aid to make up for the deficit left by the U.S. decrease. Financial aid through the World Bank increased Marcos’ power as he was then able to funnel this international aid towards domestic purposes and shift
domestic funds towards increasing the power of the military forces backing up his regime (Bello, Kinley, & Elinson 1982). As Bello, Kinley, & Elinson note, "Whereas prior to martial law, the Philippines ranked about thirtieth among recipients of Bank loans in cumulative terms, by 1980 it placed eighth among 113 Third World countries" (1982:24). Licensing and import restrictions were lifted in order to cause smaller companies to either merge and grow or collapse into bankruptcy. To do this, the World Bank entered into decision-making territory normally placed within the authority of the Philippines Central Bank, which opposed the lift, with the help of the technocrats supporting the interagency committee established by the World Bank (Broad 1988). The authority of the Central Bank became increasingly undermined. Once the Central Bank began to be consistently undermined by this committee, the head of the Bank resigned and was replaced with a Bank-approved technocrat (Broad 1988).

Therefore, the economy was drastically changed. With the lift in tariff restrictions, foreign imports were becoming cheaper than purchase of domestic products, and the industry developing to replace this loss of jobs was concentrated, through World Bank planning, into apparel, electronics, furniture and wood products, and leather goods...
such as shoes (Broad 1988). As Broad notes, "The Bank understood that poverty and income distribution factors would be secondary to growth and efficiency as objectives of structural adjustment lending" (1988:104). The consequences of not preparing policy to consider the impact of these policies on the poor, primarily landless, Filipino people is strikingly apparent in statistics on Filipino poverty and hunger. In 1975, during the beginning of the lending practices of both international organizations, 46 percent of the population lived below the poverty line. By 1986, 70% lived below the poverty line. Bello, Kinley, & Elinson (1982) pointedly attribute this downfall to the failure of urban and rural development practices and the loss of a foreign market for their exports. As Broad notes,

For workers and peasants, this economic model proved a convincing recruiter for a rapidly growing insurgency. For much of the middle class and portions of the upper classes, it was an important factor in their decision to participate in the overthrow of Marcos (1988:p.4).

Yet, the World Bank and IMF had considered the Philippines a development success. Transnational rather than nationalist economists now dominated the government, wages were depressed to make them competitive with the wages of other Third World country labor standards, and private, foreign economic interests had expanded considerably (Broad 1988). However, as Broad notes,
...the Bank and the Fund refused to take any blame for
the Philippine economic failure - its negative economic
growth rates, its foundering light-manufactured-export
earnings, and its soaring, unpayable debt service.
Instead, the Bank and the Fund, the international
purveyors of structural adjustment, blame the failure
of their Philippine experiment on the political turmoil
that engulfed the country following the assassination
To suggest so is to deceive (1988:xix).

This is the system that Cory Aquino inherited as she was
sworn in as President and during her first year in office.

In fact,

To service the debt, the Aquino administration was
forced to borrow heavily from domestic financial
sources, forcing it to channel much of its budgetary
expenditures from development and social spending to
meeting both domestic and foreign debt obligations. By
1987, some 50 percent of the budget was going to
service the national debt (Bello, Kinley, & Elinson
1982:53)

It was during this time that the negative impact of these
policies on the social, economic, and political environment
of the Philippines spawned the occurrence of the Mendiola
March and Massacre.

Therefore, the Philippine poor suffered increased
poverty and hunger as a result of national dependency on
cash crops in order to gain international trading currency
and attempt to relieve some of its debt to international aid
organizations, other national governments, and transnational
corporation investments. As a result of this economic
arrangement, by the end of the 1970’s, over half of the
farmable land was being used to produce cash crops instead of food. This resulted in malnutrition as a result of lack of purchasing power by poor people in the Philippine local economy and lack of a people-oriented program for agricultural development that would not convert the consumption of food into a dollar-earning practice but based upon needs in local communities (Constantino 1979).

Cash crops as a solution to a country’s debt and participation in the international economic system create a situation in which

Export commodities take priority for irrigation, fertilizers, pesticides or machinery - they also orient the intangible inputs of scientific research and financial credit (George 1977:19).

With cash crops, the poor or economically powerless country rarely owns the technology necessary to process the raw materials and keep some of the revenue attached to the price due to processing fees.

Thus, even if there is an increase in yield as a consequence of improved technology, the net income of peasants has remained the same or even gone down because of the skyrocketing cost of farm inputs (Constantino 1979:49).

Also, it creates a situation where large-scale agribusiness occupies the best land and in many incidents, under-utilizes it by only growing one crop and requires specific, expensive machines for harvest. Overall, then,
this element of world hunger can not be the root cause as it clearly demonstrates that, "The structure of landholdings has far more to do with erasing hunger than the amount of total population [original emphasis]" (George 1977:36).

Additionally, in this approach to world hunger, United States policies like U.S. Public Law 480: "Food for Peace" becomes

...a dumping measure cleverly designed to increase the foreign market of American agricultural commodities. U.S. surplus agricultural products are sold to allied foreign nations which pay for them in local currency. Such payments remain in the country as a special fund which the United States uses to defray part of the expenses of American agencies in the recipient country (useful in helping to prevent a deterioration of the U.S. balance of payments position) and to lend out at low interest rates to American corporations operating in the country (Constantino 1979:54).

Additionally, Constantino notes that,

Such developments indicate that the obsession with dollar-earning exports has made Filipinos victims of 'protein imperialism', that is, the general practice of developed countries of importing high quality protein from poor countries while exporting low quality protein to them. It is estimated that the poor countries as a whole send to the rich countries around 3.5 million tons of high-quality protein while receiving in return 2.5 million tons of grain-based low quality protein... (1979:46).

In such a way, beliefs about the causes and solutions to world hunger are deeply entrenched in the structure of the global economy, which as I have discussed, is dominated by the policies of the United States, national and
international lending organizations, and transnational corporations. In these ways, the investment practices that lead to the usurping of a poor country's national governmental control over its own national economy are minimized. Yet the ability for a country to purchase food or purchase the advanced technology required to grow cash crops and be competitive in the global market is amplified. In this economic and rational approach to the problem of hunger, solutions emphasize the ability to purchase food or the technology that enables one to produce food for a living,

...the demand for food is one of many different needs that people must satisfy with whatever purchasing power they can command. An individual's ability and willingness to pay for food will help define his or her demand (but not need) for food. Demand implies the ability to buy, whereas need is based on nutritional requirements whether or not money is available for buying food (Wennergren 1989:4).

Wennergren explicates the difference in definitions for "need" and "demand" in writing that,

Food need is a normative concept of what requirements would be if all people ate according to some officially defined nutritional standard. Using this concept, aggregate food is defined by the food consumption per person required to meet the nutritional standard and the number of people to be fed. Demand, in contrast, has economic and personal choice facets (1989:4).

This shift in definitions of world hunger into economic terms changes world hunger from a lack of an individual's
basic needs essential to their individual human rights into an abstract concept. A demand, in economics, is calculated in relation to other marketplace terms such as other economic variables as well as facets of personal choice regarding food.

As Constantino notes, once caught up in the activities of the global market,

Instead of concentrating efforts on attaining self-sufficiency in food, the perennial problem of Third World peoples, resources are devoted to the production of export crops which favor a few individuals and corporations (1979:48).

Additionally, George notes that, "The poor rarely control the processing technology or the distribution circuits which alone could add value to the food they produce" (1977:18). This process holds the majority of its people hostage to status quo conditions. Additionally, global market agricultural techniques, technologies, and relief aid tend to place a country into a further state of economic and political dependency that benefits the landed elite and foreign investors as these technological solutions come networked within the industrial food chain. As Constantino notes,

Aid [foreign] rebounds to the interest of its donors because through aid they are able to sell their goods, wield power over the rate and direction of economic growth of their supposed beneficiaries and keep these countries in a state of dependence. The threat of a
withdrawal of aid would mean the virtual collapse of an economy based on it. Aid is thus a tool by which donor countries are able to maximize their profits and secure their long-term interests (1979:53).

Overall, a Westernized ideology of world hunger focuses on abstract concepts organized into an economically rationalized argument. This argument avoids the essential/fundamental question of whether or not the withholding of food is a violation of human rights and avoid hearing the demands of the people who suffer the most under the policies implemented as a result of this belief system. It is a form of victim blaming that pervades Western European and American ideology on the causes of world hunger. As Constantino notes,

For when a big power controls a small nation economically and imposes its political and military influence to the point where the latter loses her right to determine the goals and welfare of her people, human rights are violated on a mass scale (1979:69).

Consequently, these reasons are communicated to the United States public, mostly through indirect media portrayals, and works to distract citizens of these economically powerful nations from taking the appropriate responsibility by acknowledging that it is in response to the policies of the United States government. As George notes,

Here again, 99 percent of us (in developed countries) have nothing to do with how the world economic system is set up, but all of us in the DCs [Developed Countries] profit from it to the degree that Third
World people are subsidizing our breakfasts, lunches, dinners, underwear, shirts, sheets, automobiles, tires, etc., etc., through their cheap labor. This factor is the so-called 'cash crop' that demands so much time, space, and effort in the poor countries (1977:15).

U.S. policies encourage countries to import food making the argument that it is cheaper to import than grow for the local market. The structuring of land ownership becomes even more relevant to the existence of hunger and poverty in a country when one considers that,

Most Third World people live in the countryside ... and most of them are dependent on land for their living. Every poor country, without exception, has a far greater proportion of its population whose only means of livelihood is agriculture than in any other sector (George 1977:15). Additionally, when famine occurs in one of these countries, it causes further land loss by agricultural workers who must sell their land to gain any small purchasing power to apply to food. This means that it is the government or more likely, wealthy landowners less economically impacted by the famine, to buy up the land. As George notes, “Each famine takes more land from the poor and thus sets the stage for the next one,” (1977:24) and places the issues of scarcity of food and command over production of scarce products (such as food) in the control of the government and wealthy (George 1977). As Broad notes, Flood or drought can help to create the conditions under which famine thrives - but they do not create the
human action and inaction that insures that the wealthy alone will eat - come literally hell or high water (1977:25).

Fundamentally, these occurrences in countries caused by the financial control of resources by another, more economically and military powerful one, change the meaning behind some of the fundamental causes of world hunger. Specifically, the social definition of world hunger and its resolution does not include the perspectives of the people experiencing hunger and poverty. It's construction relies on economic and political experts who support a system that forces a country to forgo local markets and compete economically with other countries through the cash crop system.

Popular discourse on the reasons for the existence of poverty and hunger in absolute terms support the unequal distribution of both power and resources both internal and external to a country functioning within the regulations of the IMF and World Bank with debt accumulated from foreign investors. Problems and causes emphasize the inability of people to produce food effectively, or have the money to purchase food or for their government to have the ability to purchase food for the citizens.

Overall, using the Philippines as my example, this historical summary demonstrates how a country's condition of
underdevelopment is inherent to neo-liberal policy implementation and also encourages a repressive governmental regime. As a consequence, this type of relationship of a repressive government in an indebted country to the United States and to international lending organizations leads to suppression of nationalist policies and politicians that would support a growth in a country's domestic economic base and therefore promote sustainability in economic growth.

By placing the emphasis on purchasing power, public perceptions within countries with great economic power of the need for or right to food are turned into economic concepts in economic relationships that are based on economic laws of supply and demand. This definition results in solutions that do not disrupt status quo conditions in suffering countries. This, in turn, shapes the nature of how people in capitalist developing countries are able to recognize and interpret the problem of world hunger.

Religious Institutional Response to Social Injustices and World Hunger: Traditional and Alternative Approaches

A historical debate within European religions exists and plays a crucial role in the framing of the story told here. Traditional views of the purpose of the church and religious work were primarily framed within saving non-
Christian people through conversion and as a non-secular haven from society in which individuals come to reflect upon their faith and the world of the sacred. Opposing views connect religious purpose directly with social action. This section discusses this debate and how it has shaped different ecumenical reactions to issues of social injustice and hunger existing in the world based upon support or rejection of the ideologies framing hunger as a social problem. This review emphasizes this debate among perspectives located within United States culture to better understand the religious and political climate in which interview participants worked during the 1980s.

Classical approaches to Christian religion (both Catholic and Protestant) tended towards an orthodox approach to the relationship between God and human individuals. As Campbell notes,

This perspective resisted the modern questions about historical consciousness, and its understanding of revelation was generally governed by that classical notion of truth which regards truth as information gleaned from an unchanging realm of contemplation and speculation. According to this understanding Christian revelation is a disclosure of divine thought, providing cognitive norms for truth and for authentic human life in the Aristotelian sense of necessary first principles, and faith is a 'genuine assent of the intellect' to the truths thus disclosed. Within this framework, theology is described as the study and explication of these revealed truths, and praxis is a matter of discerning ways in which the theoretical
knowledge thus acquired might be applied in particular historical circumstances (1999:57).

Classical approaches therefore take an orthodox approach to Christianity and view obedience to religious mandate as an adherence to early Christian doctrine and thus look to traditional understandings of the Bible for guidance in action. As Kinnamon notes, "The classical schema had been God-church-world (God works through the Church in the world)" (2003:43). These classical religious ideologies approach world hunger through programs that reflect the myths of the root causes of world hunger, such as being caused by famines or natural disasters, overpopulation, or an individual’s own lack of initiative to gain purchasing power. From this perspective, dedication to the plight of rural peoples and the rural poor is to focus on direct relief.

Thus, supporters of a classical Christian perspective tend to support actions to reduce hunger that is not considered to be politically framed, such as direct relief (such as in response to a famine or natural disaster). In this way, these responses to hunger are not considered to compromise corporate interests and corporate structures impacting hunger and poverty in a community. The meaning behind the problem of hunger from this traditional
perspective claims to be disconnected from political and economic matters involving the United States yet again, this is how hegemony functions. By not supporting the self-development of people going hungry in communities, these activities do represent political stances framed by U.S. interests. Therefore, world hunger has historically been approached within this classical religious perspective through missionary support of high-level agricultural technology such as that put forth in the Green Revolution. In this way, the encouragement to grow "Miracle" rice, the growth of high-yielding grain and corn using expensive pesticides and fertilizers imported from the United States in combination with an encouragement by government and corporate owners to focus on growing cash crops, do not resolve hunger in communities.

This response was dominant in overall approaches to world hunger from the 1950s onward. However, an alternative approach developed in part as for some missionaries, their experiences in the field working on these projects demonstrated that these technologically driven solutions proved to be ineffective at resolving the hunger problem. Their views were also assisted by the development of an alternative religious paradigm concerning the role of the church in alleviating social injustices.
In the 1960’s, a movement towards assessing Christian social responsibility began through Catholic theologians embracing a religious perspective of liberation theology. This perspective provided a way in which Christians could be taught of the ways in which, "religion can be used to legitimate power, and they insist that Christians must establish a clear and critical understanding of the links between faith and political praxis" (Campbell 1999:55)

As Youngblood notes,

The move of Vatican II towards making the Church more relevant in the modern world by becoming involved in man’s struggle to liberate himself from unjust social and political structures clashes with an older ecclesiological orientation of the church that ‘sanctions the distinction of planes between sacred and secular, and underscores the necessity for the official Church to avoid interference in temporal affairs.’ From the ‘distinction of planes’ perspective, ‘faith and religious commitment are seen in more personal and individualistic terms’ in contrast to a social imperative to work for justice and liberation in the world, while the Church is viewed as a ‘haven or sanctuary for those seeking refuge from the problems and cares of secular society’ rather than an institution for mobilization against oppressive social and political structures (Smith as quoted in Youngblood 1982:33-34).

Overall, these perspectives clarified discourse on the growing inequalities in Third World countries through reinterpretations of Vatican II doctrine. This reinterpretation enabled an ideology stressing the relationship between material and sacramental elements of an
individual’s role as church clergy and/or laity throughout the world, although the members of the United States are emphasized for the purposes of this study. Therefore, the development of a new theology had its roots in this proclamation by the Second Vatican Council and became adopted by other denominations in various ways as well, once its discourse began to enter into religious mainstream discussions.

This theology was considered radical theology by traditionalists. It developed from priests and bishops in Latin America who emphasized the combination of Christian witness with the essential need for liberation of the poor who suffer from an industrialized, colonial world “in a situation of enforced dependence and oppression” (Campbell 1999:56). The Second Vatican Council’s declaration for involvement of the Church in the modern world asked Catholics to identify with the poor and afflicted (Campbell 1999). As Campbell notes,

In Latin America this enj oinder has helped to lead many Christians to participate in the struggle to transform the oppressive and dehumanizing aspects of their situation (1999:56).

From this perspective, voices arise to,

...speak from within a situation which has generally been defined by others. Now they struggle not only to speak about the situation for themselves, but also to transform it (Campbell 1999:56).
This development of voices connects the practice of faith to the transformation of social institutions that perpetuate injustice and human suffering by emphasizing the relationship of social injustice in countries that can be considered post-colonial in nature - those with little economic power and a large debt to international creditors. In this way, education about the situation of the poor and information about what the poor and hungry need come from the voices of the poor and are provided to the non-poor, the "outsiders" of the situation. Traditional transfers of education about the poor and about what resources the poor needed to end poverty and hunger faced in their communities, both within and external to the United States, had flowed historically in the opposite direction.

This same debate over the perceived material role of faith also surfaced as an ideology in Protestant missionary and other church work, also at local, national, and international levels. An ecumenical movement began in the mid-1800s with missionaries from different denominations beginning to develop networks between them in order to better meet mission needs and work together in solidarity within the mission enterprise. Gatherings were held in different countries of missionaries of various nationalities
and denominational allegiances to address issues of service (medicine and education), understanding, and Christian witness (Goodall 1964). As Goodall notes,

They were convened for mutual conference regarding the needs and problems of the missionary enterprise and they did much to foster as well as express a unity which over-arched denominational differences (Goodall 1964:5).

These actions led to the development of a new conception of Christian responsibility in public affairs (Goodall 1964). Many religious persons began to recognize a desire for a unity across denominations that moved beyond the unity solely of the sacred (a unity of spirit) to the social and secular (a unity in response to social injustice). This influence of social concern became the focus of what represented Christian witness, or testimony for one’s beliefs. In defining the components of this movement, Kinnamon notes that,

It is important to recall that the ecumenical movement began as a series of somewhat discrete initiatives. Three are usually identified when telling the story of modern ecumenism: (1) the Life and Work movement, which sought to foster interchurch aid, to enable common Christian response to the victims of war, poverty, oppression, and natural disaster, and to call the churches to oppose economic and social injustice; (2) the Faith and Order movement, which continues to work at overcoming obstacles to the mutual recognition of members and ministers, at overcoming barriers to shared celebration of the Eucharist, at helping the churches to express more fully the apostolic faith, and at discovering ways of making decisions together; and (3) the International Missionary Council, which attempted
to promote shared witness and to overcome different understandings and practices of mission and evangelism (2003:38).

By emphasizing the role of Christians in responding to the suffering of people in the world due to social conditions, this new perspective encouraged a reinterpretation of the relationship between God and an individual. A unity across geographic and denominational boundaries encouraged an understanding of the relationship between God and the individual that recognition and experience of unity was more faithfully recognized through work towards justice and peace. As Kinnamon notes,

Ecumenism, according to the previous generation, is primarily a matter of the church getting itself together in order to present the gospel of wholeness to the world. New voices were now contending that it is also a matter (or more of a matter) of the Church participating in God’s mission of wholeness in the world and, thereby, discovering something of its own unity (2003:42).

This connection among missionary organizations across countries beginning in war relief and reconstruction operated from a new interpretation of the Bible emphasizing the notion that,

It is time, said a [WCC] report to Uppsala on the missionary structure of the congregation, that we shifted our thinking to God-world-church. ‘God’s primary relationship is to the world, and it is the world and not the church that is the focus of God’s plan’ (The World Council of Churches in Kinnamon 2003:43).
Here, then, was a developing recognition that unity involved not only individual conversion, but also social redemption (Goodall 1964). Unified approaches to justice and peace efforts through networks of ecumenical organizations had already existed. Most had centered on working together in servicing "...prisoners of war and displaced persons and its concentration on the impending tasks of post-war reconstruction" (Goodall 1964:43). However, as Vermaat notes,

Before the Second World War the ecumenical movement was largely an affair of Western churches. This began to change after 1961. Churches and theologians from Africa, Asia and Latin America increasingly began to influence the ecumenical debate... (Vermaat 1989:3).

As a result, unity across international boundaries involved a "Christian awareness of the most desperate human needs and the desire to respond to them transcend denominational and confessional boundaries" (Goodall 1972:45). This networking began to involve a raised awareness of the problems faced in addressing the social problems existing in poor and powerless communities when they were related to unjust economic and political practices in a country that had previously been a colony of a more powerful, industrialized country. Additionally, in their experiences of working with the poor, "experience of community in persecution, suffering
and resistance forged many unbreakable ties between Roman Catholics and Protestants” (Goodall 1964:8).

As a result of this movement toward unity, mainly Protestant and Catholic religious organizations issued mission statements on their response to understanding social injustice and world hunger, and developed programs that, through congregational funding, attempted to provide solutions to world hunger. These denominations began to unify their efforts through inter-faith networking in specific program areas. Organizations that facilitated this networking began to be developed in the late 1940’s. Additionally, international, denominational voices were organized to promote alternative perspectives than mainstream approaches to alleviating social injustices such as world hunger and other human rights issues. This occurred through the establishment and development activities of organizations such as the World Council of Churches (founded in 1948), and nationally in the United States through the National Council of Churches (founded in 1950). The National Council was actively engaged in social action efforts for justice in the civil rights movement, and then became involved heavily in farm worker movements within the United States as well as internationally.
Within these organizations, dialogue between denominational leaders and lay people occurred around certain issues such as world hunger to study issues that unite as well as divide the Christian community (National Council of Churches in Christ 2004). Their efforts produced many joint programs between denominations to support education, advocacy, and service to oppressed people through a critique of socio-political conditions and structures within and between countries. In this way, unification on inter-faith response to issues also meant that there would be no duplication of the bureaucracy required for each denomination to be able to manage organizational work on social injustice issues such as poverty and hunger both locally and abroad.

Goodall (1972) observes that this sense of unity on social justice issues across religious perspectives is framed within a religious recognition of the connection between the local and everyday to the universal. In this sense,

Like the word 'church' the term 'ecumenical' points to a reality which must be seen to be both universal and particular. These are two inseparable aspects of a single whole. In so far as institutions can embody the life of the Church or the ecumenical movement they need to be both local and worldwide. Each is dependent on the other and necessary to the other (Goodall 1972:105).
From this perspective, working on issues of peace and justice in responding to world hunger is inextricably tied into questioning the relevance of status quo conditions in shaping the nature of the problem. Specifically, it meant looking at the redistribution of food and the redistribution of the means for producing food (McGinnis 1979). As Goodall notes,

"Faced with all that this means in danger to the peace of the world and the well-being of all mankind, the word 'development' has come to stand for one of the great contemporary tasks of Christians, both individually and collectively as the Church. It is for Christians to lead the way in redressing the balance, urging governments to give priority to development projects and pressing economists, social scientists, educationists, and politicians to come to terms with the radical changes needed in the structures of national and international society (1972:48)."

Supporters of this type of approach to recognizing and working to ameliorate world hunger promote an understanding of the impact of the industrialized food system. Specifically, some of these organizations emphasize the use of the industrialized food system to link economically powerful, industrialized countries to less economically powerful countries who have a high debt into dependent situations that perpetuate human suffering on a mass scale. Programs such as these promote, within denominations, a varying degree of congregational education on food issues with support of programmatic goals through the use of funds
collected from denomination collection plates and church fundraisers. In the 1980’s, the established programs and organizations across denominations committed to this perspective chose to actively engage congregations in this dialogue in order to teach/educate them about the impact of United States involvement in world hunger issues. Some of these programs tended to emphasize education, lifestyle change, and public policy decision-making more than direct relief, yet all organizations saw how different denominational responses could be networked and work in conjunction with one another. McGinnis eloquently describes this emphasis on education and consciousness-raising activities related to attitude towards motivation to act:

In terms of its importance for action, if policies for food self-reliance are to be advocated and adopted, then attitudes will have to change. Both policy-makers and the general public whose attitudes often shape policies must come to realize that the poor can feed themselves if allowed to do so. Generally, the economically well off conclude that the economically deprived are incapable of helping themselves. This is especially true in societies where personal worth is largely equated with one’s position and possessions. This kind of perception leads to a view that the only answer to world hunger is a combination of First World food aid and First World technology. But it is this combination of ingredients that is actually part of the problem...(1979:26)

This movement, therefore in part, represented the from the position that spoke against U.S. policy and beyond direct relief efforts. development of an alternative framework for
understanding Christian adherence and declaration of faith that is framed within liberal ideals of responding to social justice issues as a Christian community. Together, both perspectives compete for legitimacy within Christian communities in defining the true relationship of God to individuals. As such, these competing perspectives also inform specific institutionalized religious responses to world hunger. Organizations supporting the first perspective frame the meaning of world hunger to reflect the dominant definitions for the causes of hunger and dominant solutions that denies a frame of political involvement in its activities to help the poor. The second perspective frames the meaning for world hunger based upon a socio-political and historical analysis of the relationships between power and powerlessness and the poor and the rich that are reflected in and across nations/countries and trade policies.

I frame the discussion of this thesis on experiences of participants with this approach to education for two reasons. First, my mother was working for a United States-based denomination’s hunger program. Her job was, as an educator and administrator, to help translate the meaning of poverty and hunger. Rather, she spoke from a position that suggested people become aware of their local connections to
global issues, social injustices, and world hunger. She also suggested how church people could change lifestyles and raise awareness about these issues as well as support programs that enabled people to keep their land as well as develop self-sustaining community resources. She introduced to mainstream congregations how a politicized arena such as world trade could be considered from a Christian perspective - the right to dignity, self-sustainability, and justice for the poor and oppressed. Among other duties, she worked both directly and indirectly on promoting this message of the Christian response to people in economic crisis to her own and other congregations in the United States. Due to the role of politics and economics that her teaching required, her activities represented radical and Communist activities to many people.

Second, the trip she participated in to the Philippines was arranged by a United States-based organization supporting educational efforts towards understanding the position of rural farmers and agricultural issues in communities both located within and outside of the United States. I paraphrase an internal document explaining organizational goals that I will keep confidential to this paper. However, it shows that this organization supported constituency education as helpful in congregational
understanding how structural analysis and faith can explain how people lose family lands. Additionally, it provides an example of how churches can work with the poor as an expression of unity and faith, and that poor people can and should decide what support they find helpful to the people outside of their situation who want to help. This organization focused on organizing consciousness-raising activities through exposure or the experience of bringing individuals who have met with poor people to talk about land, food, and justice and listened to what they needed, and seen their movement, then reporting back to congregational constituencies. This information provides the essential points of the historical context in which the work of my mother and her experiences in the Philippines can be framed for understanding.

In this way, overall, my story through this research is a story of responses from people located in the dominant/colonial country that is also located on the periphery of the mainstream economic, political, and religious discourses. These interviewee accounts also struggled to speak out in the United States about the situation of the industrialized, more economically powerful country for themselves as well as attempted to also
transform it from within the perspective of churches in United States culture.

In this chapter, I have discussed a history of colonialism and resistance in the Philippines and how globalization theories and neo-colonial practices are helpful in interpreting this history. I have also explained how these histories connect with the work activities of interviewees institutionally organized by the religious groups of which they were a part. Additionally, I discussed how these practices and overall history are related to the institutional responses to hunger and poverty and the overall ecumenical debate over then appropriate response to these issues during the 1980s. In the next chapter, I will describe the research methods used in this project, their strengths, and their weaknesses.
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

This research project investigates the relationship between personal experiences of events and public descriptions of events. As such, this research attempts to provide responses to five research questions, which I will repeat, from Chapter I for this section.

1. What consistencies and contradictions exist between the newspaper accounting of the event and interviewee accounts?

2. What historical discourses did each type of account include when informing me of the significant events and issues surrounding the occurrence of the Mendiola March?

3. How, using examples from their lives and through the context of their church work, did interviewees describe the relationship between the United States and the Philippines?

4. What, if at all, did participants identify as either social structural barriers or aids existing for them
within the United States that influenced their ability to do their work in the during the 1980s?

5. What can a sociological comparison of these accounts reveal about the role of power in shaping the placement of experience in the study of history?

This chapter discusses how these questions will be answered. First, I review the project research design and data collection procedures, involving individual interviews and newspaper articles. Next I discuss the components of data analysis using critical discourse analysis techniques. In this section, I discuss the methodological relevance of this type of reflexive research within the social sciences, especially when studying the influence of media depictions on the social construction of reality and textual creations of history. Lastly, I discuss some of the strengths and weaknesses of this project.

Research Design and Data Collection

The research design for this project included critical discourse analysis and individual interviews. Data collection included the use of articles from a U.S. national newspaper and from interviews with people who had been part of the group from the United States on that trip. My
interest was to demonstrate processes in the social construction of knowledge about the Mendiola march and United States involvement in the Philippines. Put differently, I was interested in the construction of social problems in the Philippines as presented to the United States public by the press and the dominant as well as alternative constructions that appeared through experiential accounts as well as my own involvement as a researcher investigating this issue.

The role of this type of document analysis of newspaper articles is appropriately summarized by Fetterman (1989) who notes that researchers can analyze patterns within texts and search for the key events and themes that are memorialized because they are in print. Therefore, critical discourse analysis of these public documents revealed extensive information about the publicly available constructions of key local, national, and international organizations involved in the Philippines and in the march. In addition, newspaper documents revealed how the press constructed information about individuals, their issues, their organizational social network involvement, and their socio-historical and political situations. Documents were analyzed in order to discuss the patterns of meaning framed within them.
Semi-structured interviews, performed either face-to-face or by telephone, were used to gather oral history information from interviewees. In this oral history research, I investigated the social, political, and economic conditions that influenced peoples' work activities, perceptions of social justice issues in the Philippines, and their reaction to the march at Mendiola in 1987. Oral history interviews offered rich descriptions of participant experiences, thoughts, and activities related to their observations and experiences in the Philippines. As Marshall & Rossman note, "One purpose of qualitative methods is to discover important questions, processes, and relationships, not to test them" (1989:43). Qualitative research methods are exploratory and descriptive. They enable a researcher to stress context, setting, and the subject's frame of reference (Marshall & Rossman 1989). As Rubin & Rubin note, Qualitative research is not looking for principles that are true all the time and in all conditions, like laws of physics; rather, the goal is understanding of special circumstances, how and why things actually happen in a complex world. Knowledge in qualitative interviewing is situational and conditional. The underlying assumption is that if you cannot understand something in the specific first, you cannot understand in the general later (1995:38).

As Grele adds, "By careful observation and understanding of this [interviewing] experience we can add a depth to our historical understanding which is never revealed in the
written record" (1998:48). This research represents a piece of social history that challenges readers to ask what can be learned about an event and its surrounding issues through juxtaposing people's reporting of their experiences with public descriptions of the same event and its surrounding issues.

**The Newspaper Articles**

Data analyzed were articles from one national newspaper, the New York Times. I chose the New York Times because of its international popularity and its general reputation as representative of general national media reporting on international news. I also chose the New York Times because it is a national newspaper that is popularly considered to be sophisticated in reporting international news and is furthermore, considered to be a liberal media resource. New York Times articles were collected using the on-line database Lexus-Nexus. I selected articles that carried descriptions of the incident as it's main subject matter. This yielded me six articles occurring from January 23rd until January 26th, 1987. Therefore, the articles that are analyzed for this project are those six published in the New York Times on January 23, 24, 25, and 26 that describe
the demonstration, police/military shootings, and the direct aftermath.

I investigated these articles to see how the incident was described in relation to other subjects in the article. The topics chosen for my analysis were informed by their presence in connection to descriptions of the march, the topics developing from my review of the literature, and my personal knowledge about my mother's work. I have always known that her work had involved connecting with other churches to challenge social injustices occurring in the world that led to world poverty and hunger.

Specifically, I investigated how the newspaper articles constructed certain definitions, theories, and overall descriptions by depending upon certain resources for information, such as official sources (government, military) to discuss the relevance of the groups involved at the event and to introduce the issues connected to the event and its aftermath. I searched this information for evidence of the relationships I had discovered from my literature review to see how their presence in the articles might connect, negate, or support the issues and perspectives I discovered to be important to Philippine affairs. For example, resistance to imperialist conditions, social inequalities between groups, issues of land reform, and the relationship
of the poverty and hunger to international and national lending and development trends. These topics were investigated to understand how they might contribute to a more robust and reflexive understanding of the occurrence of the march by including these elements. I assessed the themes developing across articles and analyzed the existence of consistency and contradiction in these definitions and descriptions that produced the media framing of these issues. Therefore, these articles were analyzed to uncover the existence of dominant frames for interpreting the incident that occurred.

The Interviews

Oral history subjects in this study were asked to participate in semi-structured interviews with the researcher. Each interview lasted approximately two hours and was comprised of approximately 18 questions (See Appendix A). I used a snowball sampling design to recruit people first by contacting the sponsoring organization and then, through their suggestions, found interview participants who suggested others to contact. I contacted 8 people. Six people agreed to the interview. Five people were interviewed face-to-face and one person was interviewed over the telephone. These interviews were my attempt to gain a
more robust understanding of why my mother had been present on that trip and how her work and other life experiences had brought her, as well as the other interviewees, there for the trip.

During the interview, people were asked to describe their beliefs and perceptions of the purposes of the tour, what they learned from the tour, what they saw at the Filipino march, and their experiences with these issues in relation to their work in the United States. Additionally, interviewees were asked to describe their organizational work in the 1980’s, their experiences at this work and their insights on how the political, social, and economic environments of the United States impacted their organizational goals and other aspects of their life. I asked them these questions because I felt that their responses would enable me to look at what cultural resources they authorized as being important to their understanding of their experiences. I also wanted them to describe to me which resources they utilized to understand their work and the types of groups with whom they were networked within that time period.

There are inherent weaknesses in using such a small number of interviews and articles for this project that must be mentioned. First, this research project has only
collected a small number of people's memory-based, self-reports on their lives. Therefore, there are great limitations to this research if one attempts to use it to make traditional sociological generalizations. In other words, because I only analyzed a few articles and could only, at this point, interview six people, my analysis accepts that self-reported memories impact reliability in this specific study. Yet, only using small N number enabled me to perform a triangulated, in-depth analysis of the histories, issues, and discourses brought forth through interviewee statements and newspaper article accounts. This type of analysis enabled me to investigate a logical comparison of accounts as "...comparative historical analyses proceed through logical juxtapositions of aspects of small numbers of cases" (Ragin & Becker 1992:109).

Critical Discourse Analysis and the Media

Critical discourse analysis was used as the foundation for my analysis of the newspaper articles as it enabled me to display "those features of a text that are most interesting from a critical perspective, those that appear to be textual manipulations serving non-democratic purposes" (Huckin n.d.:3). In what constitutes the bulk of article
and interviewee comparisons, I searched for themes in the foregrounding, backgrounding, and omission of topics. I also exposed the patterns developing from the repeated use of authorized subjects within each type of account to discuss the relevance of different subjects (issues, groups, and individuals) to understanding this event and its surrounding issues.

Additionally, a major tenant of critical discourse analysis is investigating how the genre in which a text has been written can facilitate understandings for how hegemony functions in specific types of text. Therefore, I first provide a discussion of the relationship between the media genre and the practice of hegemony. Additionally, I discuss why interviewee accounts can be considered relevant as texts to be investigated using critical discourse analysis techniques by looking at how textualized, experiential frames inform understandings that may or may not lead to social action.

In order to investigate the relevance of the news media genre in interpreting a hegemonic reality and, for some, resistance to these interpretations, I want to go back to the same authors I introduced in my theory section: Gitlin, Tuchman, and Smith. I reintroduce these authors to showcase their relevance to the methodological framework of this
project. Then, I expand upon their relevance of experiential understandings of events and the connection of language and power to collective social action utilizing the works of Goffman 1970; Benford & Snow 2000; and Gamson 1995.

The Production of Text: Media Articles and Discourse

Huckins notes that all text belongs to a particular genre, in that all texts manifest characteristics that serve a particular purpose. Specifically, he notes that,

This genre orientation often allows the analyst to see why certain kinds of statements appear in the text and how they might serve the purposes of the text-producer, as encoded in that genre (n.d.:5).

Much has been written about the genre of news media information, and particularly, about print media descriptions. Tremendous financial pressures shape the production of news by nature of the production process that moves a story from a journalist or reporter to a write-up that is presented to public audiences and sides with power through it’s emphasis on economic production and market concerns. Ownership of the press by a few individuals and corporations controls the dominant flow of information from the media to mass audiences. Therefore, news media plays a
powerful role in the construction of hegemonic ideology.

Specifically, Tuchman notes that,

Working distinctions among legitimate newsmakers, quasi-legitimate newsmakers, and the amorphous public imply gradations in whose truth-claims may be reported and framed as fact. Again, the power of legitimate sources comes into play (1978:92).

Power shapes the discourse of news. Tuchman’s research effectively demonstrates how the act of news work is an act of constructing reality through professionalism, organizational routines, and ties to legitimated institutions (Tuchman 1978). Ultimately, she concludes that, “...through its routine practices and the claims of news professionals to arbitrate knowledge and to present factual accounts, news legitimates the status quo” (1978:14). For Tuchman, making news is a negotiated enterprise (Tuchman 1978). In her work, she notes that,

News is located, gathered, and disseminated by professionals working in organizations. Thus it is inevitably a product of news workers drawing upon institutional processes and conforming to institutional practices. ... Accordingly, news is the product of a social institution, and it is embedded in relationships with other institutions. It is a product of professionalism and it claims the right to interpret everyday occurrences to citizens and other professionals alike (1973:4-5).

Additionally, research by Gitlin led him to conclude that,

...the owners and managers of the major media are committed to the maintenance of the going system in its main outlines: committed, that is to say, to private property relations which honor the prerogatives of
capital; committed to a national security State, committed to reform of selected violations of the moral code through selective action by state agencies; and committed to approving individual success within corporate and bureaucratic structures (1980:258).

Smith (1990) discusses the consequence of this activity upon the construction of public knowledge of an issue, as well as the public discourse that follows once the constructed accounts are spread by mass forms of communication. She discusses,

...how the ideas produced by a ruling class may dominate and penetrate the social consciousness of the society in general, and thus may effectively control the social process of consciousness in ways that deny expression to the actual experience people have in the working relations of their everyday world (Smith 1987:55).

Texts, then, are actively part of the social relations making up mass communication and public opinion and can be analyzed as such. To Smith, structures of power (law, media, government, and education) construct interpretations that turn people as subjects into abstract objects. This occurs as they invoke standardized, general forms of knowledge and institutional procedures by relying on textually-mediated discourse (e.g. newspapers and other types of accounts organized through formal protocols, practices, rules and regulations) about people and issues that are processed through mainstream practices and used as a resource for understanding issues. In this way, the
articles describing the Mendiola march and the issues surrounding an understanding of its occurrences, deal with understanding the issue by emphasizing ahistorical and abstract connections between the United States and the Philippines.

The Production of Text: Interviews and Remembered Accounts

In his discussion on frame analysis, Goffman (1974) also offers methodological insights into the conditions by which individuals live through self-interpretation and multiple realities that they themselves create, tend to create meaning by prioritizing some interpretations of reality over others, which in essence, creates the conditions of reality. Therefore, he deals with the organization of experience in terms of trying to

...isolate some of the basic frameworks of understanding available to our society for making sense out of events and to analyze the special vulnerabilities to which these frames of reference are subject (Goffman 1974:10).

By vulnerabilities, he is discussing "what it is about our sense of what is going on that makes it so vulnerable to the need for these various rereadings" (Goffman 1974:10). Here, he is discussing how these rereadings impact the
organization of experience, as "something that an individual actor can take into his mind – and not the organization of society" (Goffman 1974:13). Thus, dominant viewpoints develop, as frames represent a primary schemata for interpretation rendering an event meaningful (Goffman 1974). Therefore, the existence of dominant views creates frames that legitimate and shift public attention towards some interpretations of social events over others. In this way, frames can be seen as clusters of definitions that enable people to locate, perceive, identify, label and define occurrences, events and daily experiences in peoples' lives (Brush 2001). In other words, frames guide people in their attributing meaning to their experiences and these frames are guided by selected discourses. When people draw on frames to use them to understand their experiences, they are ultimately supporting and creating the boundaries for the discussion as set by dominant discourses. As Goffman notes,

"Taken all together, the primary frameworks of a particular social group constitute a central element of its culture. Especially insofar as understandings emerge concerning principal classes of schemata, the relations of these classes to one another, and the sum total of forces and agents that these interpretive designs acknowledge to be loose in the world. One must try to form an image of a group's framework of frameworks – its belief system, its 'cosmology' (1974:27)."
He writes further about how individuals learn a locus of social control that is related to certain types of action, types of "doing," or rational control, from socialization from childhood throughout adulthood. Essentially, he notes that,

The apparent locus of control exerted in guiding an act provides a perspective on failures to control and indeed a suggestion of how we distinguish among types of doing. ... Observe that one of the consequences of this learning program is the transformation of the world into a place that is appreciably governed by, and understandable in terms of social frameworks (1974:33).

In one sense, further consideration of this issue points to the argument that the activities of news media encourages public passivity and receptiveness to a limited frame for interpretation and understanding which then becomes a part of historical records and public understanding of the issue in a historical setting. Now, learning itself is tied to selected interpretations, vocabularies and events - the values and practices in a culture that ultimately benefits those in power (Benford & Snow 2000). In another sense, further consideration of this issue points to the ability of individuals to struggle to make sense of the world. Taking this point further, as Benford and Snow note, framing as meaning construction implies that this type of signifying work "...is contentious in the sense that it involves the generation of interpretive
frames that not only differ from existing ones but that may also challenge them" (2000:614).

These challenges take the form of collective action frames which can, as Gamson notes, “bridge public discourse and people’s experiential knowledge, integrating them in a coherent frame that supports and sustains collective action” (1995:85).

By producing these interviews as text, I can assess the impact of experience on interpretations of the connections between the United States, the Philippines, and social justice issues such as poverty and hunger. In producing an interview in such a manner,

The transcriptions are frozen in time and abstracted from their base in a social interaction. The lived face-to-face conversation becomes fixated into transcripts. A transcript is a transgression, a transformation of one narrative mode — oral discourse — into another narrative mode — written discourse. To transcribe means to transform, to change from one form to another. ... The transcriptions are detemporalized; a living, ongoing conversation is frozen into a written text. The words of the conversation, fleeting as the steps of an improvised dance, are fixated into static written words, open to repeated public inspections. The words of the transcripts take on a solidity that was not intended in the immediate conversational context. The flow of conversation, with its open horizon of directions and meanings to be followed up, is replaced by the fixated, stable written text (Kvale 1996:166-67).

Transforming the interviews in this manner enabled me to perform a critical discourse analysis on both interviewee
and press accounts utilizing the same discourse analysis plan. In doing this, I searched for references made by interviewees to understandings of what was going on in the Philippines through their direct experiences. Therefore, I searched for how their experiential accounts, developed from working at the individual and group level, were used by interviewees to make connections between the Philippines and the United States direct, individual, and concrete. This is then a perspective in contrast to the abstract position promoted by the practice of journalism and represented in the newspaper articles.

**The Comparison of Accounts Using Discourse Analysis**

With this knowledge of the characteristics of news media genre and media frames and the processes by which individuals use their experiences to frame their understanding of an issue, I can then analyze how certain events, words, meanings, ideas, and definitions were selected and amplified. This will then enable me to analyze what issues were neglected and suppressed in both types of accounts. Here, As Gamson notes, "...media discourse is a cultural resource to use in understanding and talking about
an issue, but it is only one of several available" (1995:86). Gamson (1995) also notes that for many people, their experiences influence whether people, in talking about a complicated public issue, stick to the frames of media discourse for understanding and discussing an issue versus their use of multiple resources, including individual experience, to construct meaning about an issue or event.

A comparison of authorized voices and subjects provided me with information on what main topics and reporting of activities and experiences surrounding the March and the issues each type of account attached as relevant to a correct interpretation of the events that day. What resulted was a more robust frame for understanding this event and its surrounding issues from these multiple resources as "Any single resource has its limits. A frame has a more solid foundation when it is based on a combination of cultural and personal resources" (Gamson 1995:87).

In this way, I compared and contrasted newspaper and interviewee accounts in order to discover what dominant and alternative discourses are offered by drawing from multiple cultural resources in order to understand this event and my mother's witness. In this way, I as author authorized and textualized interviewee accounts using my sociological
interpretation and compared them to the mainstream accounts represented in the newspaper articles.

By bringing together these different accounts into an investigation, I was able to compare how their different resources created different frameworks for understanding and therefore conclusions to those offered through the mainstream media regarding the relationship of the United States to the Philippines. In these ways, the interviewee accounts and historical research offered additional perspectives that I used as resources for understanding the event and the surrounding issues from a standpoint located within the United States. Overall, this type of interpretation guided me towards investigating how dominant and alternative voices are authorized in the social construction of each type of account. Specifically, I use the tools of critical discourse analysis to investigate how these accounts support different conclusions about the relationship of the United States to the Philippines, at the individual to structural level.
Authorized Subjects/Voices Technique

If one looks critically at the implications of the media genre in the construction and perpetuation of hegemonic knowledge, one can see how textual framing relies upon certain subject voices as primary resources that are authorized, through their selection, in constructing this account for others. In this sense, some voices and characters presented in media accounts carry with them specific legitimacy in defining the situation.

Smith (1990) discusses the consequences of this reliance upon primary voices and resources. She asks readers to investigate who is the voice allocated the privilege of defining the situation and what how other sources of possible disjunctive information are ruled out in the process of building information into "what is known". Additionally, Smith discusses how the different personages in the account (reader, interviewer, respondent, author),

...identify different levels of responsibility for making the account and the various contributions of various persons at each. In effect, they yield a role structure for describing the social organization of the account (1990:22).
Here, like Gamson, Smith guides her readers into multiple levels of reality in the construction of an account and portrays it as a dynamic process. Within the media genre, due to the norms of its profession, journalists investigate within parameters many times not of their choice (such as when facing the editorial process). The voices representing normative standards and perspectives are located within approved "official sources" (such as government, police, and organizational representatives) resulting from the collection and reporting of information to the public using common journalistic practices.

The authorized accounts play roles in constructing a frame for meaning by providing an individual (whether or reader or listener) with specific points of reference in order to interpret an event or issue. The authorized account, is authorized by nature of their ability to define the situation due to their position in the social order and the method of communication (mass media). For example, a norm that the relationship of the United States to the Philippines is a distanced one in which the United States must help the military and government maintain governmental control. The descriptions of the political and social situation in the Philippines can be seen as developing from the journalist’s omnipresent descriptions and from the
voices of government and military officials. All other secondary voices and actions such as those of peasants, marchers, and my interviewee participants are defined by these authorized subjects as deviant.

In this way, certain action stands as the norm in terms of which another action can then be recognized as deviating from it (Smith 1990). The norm is provided by the authorized voice/account and can therefore disqualify the unauthorized subject being defined from participating in the construction of facts about herself, himself, the event, or the issues surrounding the event (Smith 1990).

Essentially, Smith writes that an authorized voice, in defining a situation, is privileged in not having to take into account the set of resources for understanding and making an interpretation of an event that are only available to the disqualified subject (Smith 1990). Ultimately, then, authorized voices produce and legitimate a restricted set of resources available to people for interpreting events and social action (Smith 1990). My analysis of whose voices are presented in the newspapers as authorized, such as government, military, and other organizational spokespersons and the characters utilized within this voice construct the analysis frame for interpreting the relationship of the United States to the Philippines and the Mendiola march. An
analysis of subheadings became particularly important here, as subheadings constructed a frame for interpretation of the incident and therefore provides specific resources by which an American reader interprets the event.

It is also important in such an analysis to be able to think critically about how secondary subjects or issues are presented as articulating their point of view (such as the point of view of the marchers). Therefore, one must pay attention to how their reflections on their actions represented verses those of the authoritative voices speaking for them in the story.

Additionally, the journalist's voice in this account provides specific, omniscient, third person narrative in the article and is the primary authority in constructing the account. This journalistic prerogative has the effect of presenting all information in this style as objective facts. He includes statements about the incident and the relationship between the U.S. and the Philippines without revealing the resources used in gathering the information or exposing him/herself as the author of the statement. The statements exist as evidence with no named source provided as offering up those accounts. Therefore, the journalist is the voice in the construction of the account that is assumed to be providing the objective context upon which a reader
can depend. As previously noted, journalists, due to the structure of their occupation, are dependent upon many types of official sources.

One must also look at how these scenarios are used by authorized subjects to frame the story as well as pay attention to the subjects and issues absent from these discussions. As a result, a researcher exposes

...the intersection of the extended social relations of ruling through an actual experience of reading. Hence analysis focuses on just that intersection, on how the reader operates the text to enter the objectified modes of knowing characteristic of the relations of ruling. It is a two-way street, a method of exploring relations in which we are active and which govern us (Smith 1990:5).

In response to the portrayal of the Mendiola march and U.S.-Philippine relations offered up by the press, interviewees offer another type of account. Whereas their voices fell out of the categories for those authorized to speak about the situation, they represent unauthorized accounts in the newspaper article and media genre frame, but not in this study. In this project I am treating their voices and perspectives as authorized and knowledgeable in being able to discuss the relationship between the United States and the Philippines, and the events surrounding the Mendiola march.
The interviewees also rely upon certain people and events as resources in the construction of their accounts as well to negotiate a meaning about the event and the relationship between the United States and the Philippines. Unlike the articles, they have the additional resource of experience to draw upon – the experiences they had in the Philippines and the experiences in life that had brought them to be a participant on that trip. Critical discourse analysis on their interviews show how participants utilized both alternative and dominant cultural resources to create a meaning about their experiences for their interview with me.

In doing so, they rely on experiences they had within the Philippines, within the United States, and within other countries that directly connected them in a relationship with the people and groups with whom they met and interacted. Experience in this way entails adding some overlapping and new interpretations to inform my understanding about this event as well as what had brought my mother to be on that trip as a church representative.

Therefore, this type of critical analysis of the discourse in articles and interviewee accounts represents different ideological processes and options as resources. As Blommaert & Bulcaen note,
The way in which discourse is being represented, responed, or rewritten sheds light on the emergence of new orders of discourse, struggles over normativity, attempts at control, and resistance against regimes of power (2000:449).

Textual framing involves the use of different types of subjects and topics that are authorized through different means. In the articles, authorized subjects are used to legitimate the topics and perspectives included in newspaper articles as legitimate sources providing factual information. In my interviews, I am using people as resources whose perspectives on the topic have been made invisible in dominant discourse about U.S. relationships to other countries - in this case, the Philippines, and the march to Mendiola.

**Foregrounding and Backgrounding Techniques**

Foregrounding and backgrounding are discourse analysis techniques used to provide detail about which topics are selected and amplified and which ones are suppressed in each type of account. Analysis of the foregrounding and backgrounding of newspaper and interviewee accounts were based on topic ordering and the overall subject matter.

For the articles included in this project, an analysis of the patterns in the main title and subheading titles enabled me to determine the issues and topics the journalist
was highlighting and ordering into a framework to provide meaningful interpretation of the event to readers. I also analyzed the journalist’s description of the event by breaking the narrative down to describe the processes of foregrounding and backgrounding that occurs through the narrative voices of the journalist and the sources upon which he/she relies.

I also analyzed the trends of authorized voices, and in what subjects and perspectives were represented as primary and secondary sources of information in order to construct a frame for meaning that produces legitimized discourse in the news media genre. The impact of foregrounding and backgrounding around dominant discourse exchanges and their relationship to one another results from their cumulative effect in constructing an interpretive frame (Smith 1990). These then become patterns by which dominant and alternative interpretations can be tracked and analyzed for how they frame and construct patterns of meaning for reader interpretations.

The analysis of foregrounding and backgrounding in this report study the groups involved in the march and the topics framed as important by the accounts. Additionally, my questions posed to interviewees foreground the importance I placed on their experiences working on social justice issues.
in the 1980’s as informing their understanding of what was happening in the Philippines a being connected in various ways, to their experiences in the United States.

Omission Techniques

The use of omission in an account also frames the meaning a reader can take from an event. Using the information discovered from the literature review, and the analysis of both interviews and articles, I investigate the disappearance of both people and issues as subjects in the newspaper article accounts. I will use the qualitative interviews to both guide and inform this analysis to discover what contexts the interview participants use to frame their description of their experiences in the Philippines.

Article omissions about the event and the relationship between the United States and the Philippines will be compared and contrasted to interviewee accounts to search for patterns of difference between these accounts. In such a way, by bringing in interview accounts to the framing of the march, I authorize the topics they want to discuss as valid. Then I search for ways that these two types of accounts frame the story based upon how interviewee
accounts can contribute to what was not mentioned by the press.

Discussion

As such, comparison of accounts using the information gathered from these techniques can guide the reader towards alternative meanings that are available but are hidden or minimized by the dominant discourses presented through mass media. This comparison enabled me to investigate what discourses exist that respond to the dominant frames for interpreting the issues and events that are described in the articles and interviews. This revealed overall how the process of authorizing certain voices and discourses as either legitimate or illegitimate occurs in constructing an understanding of an event using different resources. Dominant resources ultimately support and create the boundaries for the discussion as set by dominant discourses on the activities and issues surrounding this event in the Philippines to audiences in the United States. Alternative resources identified and represented by interviewees who connected issues occurring within the United States with other issues such as loss of family farms, structural racism and sexism, and hunger as being the consequences of these
unequal relationships on people's lives. In this way, interview participants contributed to an understanding of what the newspaper accounts make invisible - primarily through patterns that developed from their collective accounting of their experiential connections with people and groups not represented (or represented negatively) by the mainstream media examples selected for this project. I do this by showing patterns of silencing, minimizing, and amplification within the article construction of meanings compared to the interviewee accounts.

Using the information gathered from a critical discourse analysis of both types of accounts, I analyzed the consistencies, contradictions, and differences that exist in interpretive frames for the event and its surrounding issues. Additionally, I searched within each account for evidence of interpretive frames that people draw upon in order to understand the relationship of the United States to the Philippines, searching for indicators of imperialism as well as resistance to this imperialism located within both accounts.

If all of newspaper work is being provided to support the hegemonic messages and support status quo conditions in society, the article text should authorize people in power to account for and create meaning around the Mendiola march.
and the relationship between the United States and the Philippines. It does not have any other type of authority (personal experience, historical analysis, scientific/social scientific analysis) to report in any other way. Thus, the media genre is institutionally constrained in what can be reported by writers within its framework.

The interviewees are not constrained by this authority in their interpretations but are constrained by their positions as both religious affiliation and of living within the United States. Therefore, regarding interviewee accounts, "The actual events can be looked upon as a set of resources upon which the respondent drew in creating for herself and the interviewer an account of what happened." (Smith 1990:17)

Overall, I analyzed the content of participant responses by discussing the use of authorized voices and topics that are primarily foregrounded in interviewee accounts. I prioritized the use of foregrounding in the responses of interviewee participants over the other uses of backgrounding and omission. I did this in order to be able to compare more concisely what people said to what was framed in the literature review and newspaper articles. In this way, my analysis emphasizes how these accounts represent different frames of reference and interchange
exchange points for gathering information; different resources by which topics are interrelated in specific ways to construct meaning. However, for the interview analysis, I primarily used these techniques to show what issues were amplified and how these issues compare to the cumulative accounting provided by the newspaper article texts.

Project Strengths and Weaknesses

The nature of this research project may be problematic for sociologists grounded in traditional rules for social science research. Contemporary critical writings on social life have exposed as problematic the social scientific prioritization of specific types of knowledge. Traditionally, social scientists primarily representing functionalist standpoints,

...have taken it for granted that modern science is the standard for objective inquiry and assumed that scientific knowledge is somehow special and different from other kinds of knowledge (Clarke and Gerson 1990:180).

Additionally, traditional/classical social science theory (e.g. Marx 1983, Durkheim 1982) emphasized the impact of dominant institutions and social processes on individuals. They assumed that people passively internalized dominant
norms and values in society. Traditional sociological studies of individuals also assumed that,

…the underlying subjective elements of human actions involved are taken for granted or deemed to be irrelevant with respect to the scientific purpose at hand ... and therefore, are disregarded [by social scientists] (Schutz 1962:35).

This view began to be debated in the late 1960s and early 1970s. As Gouldner eloquently noted,

Every social theory has both personal and political relevance, which, according to the technical canons of social theory, it is not supposed to have. Both the man and the politics are commonly screened out in what is deemed the proper presentation of presumably 'autonomous' social theory (1970:41).

Pointing directly at scientific claims to objectivity, he suggests that, “Sociologists must surrender their human but elitist assumption that others believe out of need whereas they believe because of the dictates of logic and reason” [Original emphasis] (Gouldner 1970:26).

Smith (1990) has pointed out that social scientists, in order to gain knowledge of the social world, often work within traditional structures and concepts in order to explain specific activities occurring within society. By adopting this traditional method of studying phenomena, social scientists actually work to rationalize and justify the ruling order promoted by current ideology (Smith 1990). Smith states that,
The governing of our society is done in abstract concepts and symbols, and sociology helps create them by transposing the actualities of people's lives and experience into the conceptual currency with which they can be governed (1990:14).

In other words, social scientists are taught to think sociologically in certain ways, and therefore practice sociological inquiry using the traditional methods they have been taught. Students of the social sciences taught from traditional perspectives are told what topics are relevant for study, and how these topics can be fit into a preconceived conceptual framework. Personal feelings and experiences are disregarded due to the objective position that members of the discipline are expected to take. Social scientists then become dependent on others for the meanings of different representations of reality. When they study a topic, they end up entering into a conceptually ordered investigation, often without analyzing how something becomes observable to them. Boundaries of inquiry are set within a framework of what has already been established (Smith 1990).

Smith notes that,

Sociological methods of analyzing experience and of writing society produce an objectified version that subsumes people's actual speech and what they have to tell about themselves; its statements eliminate the presence of subjects as agents in sociological texts; it converts people from subjects to objects of investigation (1990:31).
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Therefore, a stance has been taken within the social sciences which assumes that concepts and frameworks occur before actual behavior. When this happens, activity in society becomes relevant only to the extent with which a particular person performing an action fits within a preconceived framework of explanation.

This type of objectified knowledge discards the possibility that knowledge can be located in the feelings of people engaged within the activities and the relations occurring around the topic of study. Further, an abstract conceptual framework encourages a disassociation and, to some extent, a certain disregard for the context of the people working within the actual circumstances of a situation.

Sandra Harding also offers support for this perspective in her discussion suggesting that there must be a movement towards more reliable science in the social sciences. She notes that,

If scientific ideals (and ideas) and social formations co-evolve ... then critically re-evaluating the ideals should be able to make a contribution to critically re-evaluating the discouraging contemporary relations between sciences and society ...[for] maximizing objectivity and enlarging democratic tendencies (Harding 1998:130).
Harding's work on the construction of meaning for scientific objectivity explores how science begins within the context of justification through the scientific methods after a problem has been identified. She juxtaposes this formal beginning with subjective beginnings - the social relational factors influencing construction of the research question or problem under investigation, or how the problem came to be identified in the first place. In her work, she argues that the beginning of scientific work has to be right there at the identification of the problem. Therefore, the history, values, and cultural affiliations of the researcher are themselves contexts that must be analyzed (Harding 1998). Specifically, she notes that,

> Now the 'context of discovery' - sciences' locations in the natural world, and their interests, discursive resources, and ways of producing knowledge - are to be added to the phenomena to be analyzed with this rehabilitative kind of scientific rationality, objectivity and method (Harding 1998:191).

Therefore, she wants to examine how objectivity as a research goal can be updated so that it is more useful in understanding nature and social relations (Harding 1998). She encourages researchers to practice "robust reflexivity" especially when projects are conducted from the standpoint of others in order to investigate the borders and edges of cultural resources. This enables a researcher to
investigate the boundaries and limitations of these resources and where they might run out or come into conflict with one another (Harding 1998).

Other authors have contributed to this discussion as well. Specifically, the work of Joan Scott (1992) explores how experience is historicized. Scott notes that historical explanation cannot separate experience from history, as experience is a subject’s history (Scott 1992). She then builds upon this issue by discussing the role of historians, and their relationship to past events as, "...the relationship between the power of the historian’s analytic frame and the events that are the object of his or her study" (1992:37). For the person and for the historian, sociologist, or researcher, experience is known and interpreted using discourses historically, socially, and politically available. The study of experience therefore requires that studies be based upon both the person one studies and the researcher who produces knowledge of the past based on experience as sociologist, researcher, historian (Scott 1992). According to Scott, then, experience is discursive (Scott 1992). She argues that experience is so much a part of narratives that one must analyze the operations of experience, its structured context, as well as redefine its
meaning to describe its role in creating history (Scott 1992). She argues that this can occur by a researcher...

...focusing on processes of identity production, insisting on the discursive nature of 'experience' and on the politics of its construction. Experience is at once always already an interpretation and is in need of interpretation (Scott 1992:37).

Traditional interpretations of experience remove the sociologist, historian, psychologist from critical scrutiny as active producers of knowledge (Scott 1992). These traditional interpretations are what allow for "objectivity" and "establishes a realm of reality outside of discourse and it authorizes the historian who has access to it" (Scott 1992:32). Alternatively, Geertz writes that using experience in research in this manner informs a researcher's capacity to build theory, as

...the essential talk of theory building here is not to codify abstract regularities but to make thick description possible, not to generalize across cases but to generalize with them. ... In ethnography, the office of theory is to provide a vocabulary in which what symbolic interaction has to say about itself - that is, about the role of culture in human life - can be expressed. ... It is an argument that to rework the pattern of social relationships is to rearrange the coordinates of the experienced world. Society's forms are culture's substance (1973:26-28).

In this way, my historical research and comparison of accounts reveals the dynamic process involved in how social relationships are expressed and how some constructions over others are left recorded in permanent, textual history.
Therefore, in this chapter I have described the overall research design and its strengths and weaknesses. Additionally, I have described its philosophical strengths and weaknesses of this project as it challenges traditional notions of social science research. In the next chapter, I will outline the results of the analysis of the newspaper articles.
CHAPTER V

RESEARCH RESULTS: ARTICLE ANALYSIS

Introduction

In this chapter, I present the results of my discourse analysis of six New York Times articles. Five articles appear in the foreign section of the paper and one appears in the financial section. More detailed descriptions of each article's characteristics are provided in the introduction to each in this analysis. Seth Mydans, special correspondent to the New York Times, authors five of these articles, and the fifth article, is produced by Reuters news service and is the article located in the financial section. Specifically for this analysis, I investigate how the journalist foregrounds, backgrounds, or omits people, subjects, or issues through the choice to use some authorized subjects over others to convey the meaning of the event. Thus, a hegemonic interpretation of events is prioritized and constructed by the newspaper accounts rather than other potential interpretations. The literature review enables this analysis by providing background information on events and social conditions in the Philippines not provided
by the articles. In this way, I use these techniques as well as the information I presented in the literature review, to investigate how article descriptions conform to dominant discourses and interpretations regarding the Philippine political and economic climate and the U.S. relationship to the Philippines.

Analysis of January 23rd 1987 Article

Article Summary

This was the first article to appear in the New York Times describing the incident to United States readers. It is also the longest article at 1,255 words. It appears on Page 1 of the Foreign Desk. The headline title is "Troops in Manila Kill 12 in Crowd at Leftist Rally" and it has two subtitles underneath: "Aquino's First Incident" and "94 Wounded in Rapid Gunfire as 10,000 Call for Change - Peace Talks Halted" (Mydan 1987a:A1). The author is identified as Seth Mydan, and comes with three pictures. One picture shows the crowd kneeling on the ground with flags and banners still in the air and the other foregrounds a man pulling a body along the ground with two bodies lying on the ground in front of him. A little map is also included that points to where Manila is located in the Philippines.
has an even smaller map inset within it pointing to where
the event occurred in relation to where the president’s
palace is located.

Body headings place the structure of the topics in
order of importance for readers. First, the author provides
a description of what happened at the event by describing
the act of the military shooting into the crowd. In this
first section of the article, the act by the police and
military of firing into the crowd is framed within the
context of demonstrators “seeking a confrontation” and
marching for land reform (Mydan 1987a:A1). This section
describes the gunfire as occurring after the farmers pushed
through a line of the military.

10,000 leftist marchers, many of them peasant farmers
demanding changes in land policy and apparently
seeking a confrontation, pushed through the first line
of a heavy police and military cordon near the
presidential palace (Mydan 1987a:A1).

This first section is important because it foregrounds a
number of things - that this is the first such incident to
occur since Aquino came to power, and foregrounds the
marchers as seeking a confrontation by pushing into the
military line. In this way, the issue is framed to
highlight the aggressiveness of the marchers within the
opening sentences, therefore framing that description of
the marchers as a central reason explaining why the event
occurred. This already then sets the stage for the
backgrounding of marcher concerns and also omits the
possibility of the military as being potential agents in
seeking a confrontation. From this point forward, official
sources are used to qualify the military as on the defense
and the marchers as on the offense.

Next, the article discusses “Peace Talks Suspended”
(Mydan 1987a:Al). Here, the journalist reported that the
suspension of peace talks between communist and government
negotiators as also happening as “a separate development”
but that the “events” heighten an already tense atmosphere
surrounding the vote on the Philippine constitution that has
“sharply divided the country” (Mydan 1987a:Al). Here,
although he foregrounds his definition that these are
separate developments in Philippine happenings, his choice
to include the suspension of peace talks with communists
connects these two events together, although no context is
yet established by which this relationship is explainable –
as making meaningful sense. Yet he uses both incidents to
stress that these activities are contributing to further
ambiguity as to whether or not the vote will occur.

Following, the third section titled “Fear of Right-Wing
Coup” adds another group in conflict to the government – a
“right wing coup” is introduced as a concern of other
military members (Mydan 1987a:A1). The President’s television address follows and is therefore placed secondary to military sources describing the event. She is quoted as warning viewers that attempts to prevent the vote will occur and that the event will be used to destabilize the government. Here, she is describing how reactions to the shooting will hurt the government’s goals, that people must remain calm, and that group attacks on the government will intensify before the vote (Mydan 1987a). Here she is also stressing how the government is knowledgeable about what is happening and the importance of it remaining in control in defining and acting in response to the incident — in control over the definition of the situation. What gets omitted here then is the possibility that groups with legitimate concerns about why the shooting occurred will try to publicly voice these concerns which she has now delegitimized.

The fourth section, titled “Blood on the Hands” stresses that the violence occurring is the government’s fault (Mydan 1987a:A1). Here, Aquino’s presidential rival and former defense minister, criticizes Aquino as inept at governing next to a report that an Enrile supporter has released evidence that Aquino was trying to manipulate the commission drawing up the constitution. However, the
article provides no substantial evidence of how this was happening. Here, the article is foregrounding the attacks on Aquino’s presidency.

The fifth section is titled “Maximum Tolerance,” and this is where the event begins to be described in some detail (Mydan 1987a:A1). Now we have the context of the communist negotiations, heightened tension before the constitutional vote, and a variety of groups critical of Aquino through which to begin understanding how the shootings occurred. Here, officials describe the activities of the military and police as exercising maximum tolerance against the demonstrators, who a general is quoted as accusing the marchers of firing two shots at the military and police. Here then, the official sources foreground the marchers as aggressive and instigating the conflict (Mydan 1987a). The sixth section titled “Rushing and Pushing” provides further detail about the violence of the crowd and the military as shooting after being shot at, having rocks thrown at them, and after being hit by steel bars and other weapons (Mydan 1987a:A1). The seventh section, titled “Rocks and Sticks Hurling” describes the demonstrators as a “swarming mass” falling to the ground after throwing rocks, and as leaving the ground “littered with hundreds of rubber
sandals, propaganda materials and crude weapons” (Mydan 1987a:A1).

In the eighth section, titled “Comment on Killing,” the Communist negotiator is brought in to foreground how the military will blame the communists for the incident (Mydan 1987a:A1). And indeed, the journalist is complicit in this framing as he then cites military sources referring to the incident as a “pattern of destabilization by the left,” connecting Communism with an ambiguous referral to “the left” (Mydan 1987a:A1). The military’s perspective on a coordinated effort at destabilization is also supported by the journalist who writes that there were evidence of elements of the extreme right and left at the demonstration yet the only evidence he refers to is the propaganda pamphlets on the left. The right-wing group is itself left undefined, although the author has hinted previously that the right wing has the support of certain members of the military (Mydan 1987a). Therefore, here we see the shift away from the possibility of the incident being caused by a pattern of destabilization by the military and placed upon farmers, communists, and the left.

The last two sections titled “A Warning of Violence,” and “A Provocative Act” highlight quotes from both the demonstration leader singled out by the press as advocating
for violence, with directions to blame the government if violence occurs (Mydan 1987a:A1). These statements are followed by more from military sources that justify military actions due to the perception that the demonstrators were attacking them.

Overall, the article arrangement of topics places heavy emphasis on descriptions of the marchers as violent, as uncoordinated, as asking for ambiguous goals, and as the initiators of the violence against the military. The article repeatedly frames the incident as a attempt to destabilize the government by the "left" defined so far as the marchers and as the Communist Party involved in peace talks with the government. In these ways, the military is framed as staying within the institutional boundaries set to do their job in protecting the palace and the marchers are blamed for the violence that occurred. Therefore, in this first article, the framework for justifying the account of people supporting status quo conditions, through the voices of military and government officials, is already established as the norm through which all other activities and descriptions will be compared.
Authorized Subjects/Voices

This journalist relies upon military and police officials as well as other reporters, to substantiate his description of the event and the surrounding issues. Specifically, the journalist relies primarily on military sources for eyewitness accounts of the event. As secondary voices, he utilizes the statements of Aquino, of her political rival Enrile, of a communist negotiator who has called off the peace talks, and of other reporters to report on the conditions and issues surrounding the march after the shootings had occurred (Mydan 1987a). Therefore, people in power, representative of both government and military, are the authoritative voices describing both marcher issues and characteristics and activities. The subheading topics foreground issues to order a description of the incident that will favor an official response by the government and military. These groups, who are also the definers of the situation (used as the information resources by the journalist), are thus legitimated and authorized to provide the factual accounting of what happened. Officials respond by defining the act of the march rather than the possibility of the act of the shooting of the people as the identified attempt to destabilize the Aquino government. The demonstrators are not allowed to define the issues for which
they were marching to the palace, or their reactions and testimonials of the event afterwards.

The 10-13,000 farmers that marched, as "unofficial" sources, are denied a voice in accounting for what happened. The words of the demonstrators, who they were, what happened at the demonstration, and their reaction to the shooting are absent from the article. Backgrounding therefore occurs around the issues of the demonstrators, which are generalized and connected directly with the context of the marchers pushing through the military line. Only two sentences, both made by the journalists' observations, state the demonstrators' issues creating the march - demonstrators were demanding changes in land policy and seeking land changes (Mydan 1987a). Therefore, the authorized voices explain that the violence occurred because of the activities of the marchers, leaving out the possibility that the violence may have occurred from the activities of the military. Additionally, any further interpretations of the events through the words of the demonstrators are absent. Their voice is only included in the journalists' framing of why the farmers initiated the violence. However, this demonstrates how the authorized subjects are allowed to "speak for" the demonstrators by being the sole voices speaking for their concerns within the article. They are
described more simplistically and minimized more than any other potential source of information the journalist chose to use. The next section addresses these issues more specifically by investigating the foregrounding and backgrounding of topics within the article.

Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques

Military and police voices, in essence the teller of the tales, substantiate each other through a succession of different quotes by military officials which build an interpretation of the event that frames the situation as an issue of Aquino's ability to effectively run her government. In this way, the reasons for the demonstration as identified by the march participants gets backgrounded, made invisible, and this complicated meaning, due to the complicated history it represents of struggle between these groups, gets reduced to the purpose of violence and government destabilization. The military is described as acting appropriately, and the initiation on their part in the shootings is backgrounded by the issue of their practicing tolerance in the handling of the incident.

It came when the front line of about 10,000 leftist marchers, many of them peasant farmers demanding changes in land policy and apparently seeking a confrontation, pushed through the line of a heavy
police and military cordon near the presidential palace (Mydan 1987a:A1).

As a result, the main issue of the article gets turned or spun and the article foregrounds the relevance of the question of whether or not Aquino can maintain control of her military and government. Aquino, various military sources, and a representative of the Communists Party provide comments substantiating this concern. Overall, the marchers, as legitimate people with legitimate concerns, their human rights, and the land reform issues they were attempting to promote through the demonstration are quickly backgrounded and then omitted, as the military sources repeatedly state the position of the marchers as a violet attempt to destabilize the government. In this way, their portrayal as an uncontrollable, escalating, and violent mass is amplified.

The Demonstrators

In descriptions of the incident, official sources are used to foreground, from multiple testimonials, the framing of the demonstrators as aggressive, violent, and initiators of violence that resulted in the shooting and killing of 18 people. In fact, all descriptions of demonstrators are attached to aggressive or violent actions as described by
the military sources used by the journalist as resources in determining what facts must be reported in order for the occurrence to be understood. "They fired at us. They rushed on us. They were trying to run over the security elements" (Mydan 1987a:A1).

The journalist provides two quotes that also foreground a description of marchers as advocating violence, while omitting any quotes that might provide some of the reasons for the march. The first quote is from an unidentified demonstrator who told reporters that,

Before the march began, some participants told reporters they planned to seek a confrontation in a march on the palace (Mydan 1987a:A1).

The second quote came from the leader of a farmer's organization who made a statement that troops must lift the barricade to the palace or, "We will pierce it and blood will flow" (Mydan 1987a:A1). Through these quotes, the marchers substantiate the claims made about them by the military sources and the general descriptions of the event provided by the journalist.

Military sources at the event foregrounded their attempts to stop the marchers. They stated that,

We fired into the air but they kept on rushing and pushing at us," he said. "Some of our men were hit with steel bars, lead pipes and wooden truncheons. (Mydan 1987a:A1).
Here the framing of the article is repeatedly emphasizing the actions of the marchers as foregrounding the military reaction as the last response to other attempts to stop the crowd before the shooting occurred.

Marcher descriptions by authorized subjects entail that they represent both the politically extreme right and left of the country, as critical of the Aquino government, and threatening violence if she did not respond to their demands (Mydan 1987a). The journalist quotes one of the leaders in the march to substantiate this claim:

Jaime Tadeo, the leader of the farmer’s group, warned of violence if troops did not lift their barricade. ‘We will pierce it and blood will flow,’ he said. ‘If this happens we should not be blamed. It is the President who should take the blame’ (Mydan 1987a:A1).

This piece of the article is interesting because as the leader of the march, there is a great possibility that Mr. Tadeo also outlined a justification for the march which is absent from this account. He also is quoted as being prepared to blame the individual President rather than her perceived protectors, the military, as the culprits of the violence (Mydan 1987a). The foregrounding of this blame to be placed on the president rather than other groups such as the military isolates the causes of the marchers to not reflect any other cause for the march than to upset her
presidency. In this way, the marcher's reasons for the
march are simplified into one focus - to destabilize Aquino.

Additionally, official sources foreground only their
actions, as military and government officials as authorized
spokespeople are used to describe the standpoint of the
marchers to New York Times readers. No quotes are provided
from march participants that explain their experiences or
concerns that would expand on what concerns about land
reform, the context and subject matter of the march
entailed. In this way, the issue of land reform is
minimized as the cause of the march and destabilization is
foregrounded in its place.

The marchers are described as unorganized, as a mass,
and as litterers (Mydan 1987a). The police activities are
repeatedly foregrounded as a necessary response to the
threat of the crowd.

As the shooting tapered off, the police fired tear gas
and the demonstrators fled, some dragging wounded
friends behind them. They left the ground littered
with hundreds of rubber sandals, protest placards,
propaganda pamphlets, rocks, metal bars and wooden
staves, some with nails protruding from them. A half
dozens bodies lay in pools of blood, some shot in the
head. One was shot in the back. Most lay only a few
yards from the police line (Mydan 1987a:A1).

These images directly precede the paragraph mentioning the
dead, and they are foregrounded in the imagery of the
article as being the unfortunate consequence of military
necessarily having to protect the palace from wild people out to destroy the government structure. The meaning frame for the farmers becomes linked to agitation, destabilization, wild, and unruly. In this way, their activities are portrayed as anarchy and disorder, leaving the military no choice but to respond in the way that they did in order to do their job, maintain order, and keep institutions running.

The Military

In many ways, the journalist contextualizes the military as a group and their activities in ways that the marchers are not granted. Descriptions of police defending the palace are foregrounded as following institutional practices, that they were crouched behind shields, firing warning shots, and protecting themselves and that palace. The farmers are not granted the legitimacy of descriptions that show them acting in a process, as the march representing the whole context of their complaints as is the military.

The descriptions of police following institutional instruction far outnumber the descriptions of their shooting or, for that matter, of the crowd trying to protect themselves from the military.
The outbreak of violence Thursday began when demonstrators seeking land changes pushed against the shields of riot policemen massed at the Mendiola Bridge, 300 yards from Malacanang Palace. Each shield was stenciled in yellow with the announced policy of Mrs. Aquino, "Maximum Tolerance." Most of the shooting appeared to come from a line of marines who were firing into the air from their ranks behind the riot police (Mydan 1987a:A1).

Further, there is no determination of who in the military did the shooting - the article backgrounds responsibility. The incident becomes a subjectless killing of (at the time of this article) "12" farmers and the injuring of "94" people (Mydan 1987a).

General Montano said he did not know who had fired into the crowd. Police officers, marines and plainclothes troops with automatic rifles were seen firing their weapons (Mydan 1987a:A1).

These descriptions by authorized subjects foreground a depiction of their actions that leave no one in the military as accountable. This sets the frame of the article towards placing accountability on the marchers in order to have the story make logical sense. The claims of the military sources are substantiated through their own justification of their response to protect the palace, government, and Aquino and their authorized claims making of marcher perspectives, which all but disappear in these accounts. Overall, they are described as security elements being attacked by an unruly crowd.
The journalist also foregrounded the military as already being on high alert in preparation for a "right-wing" coup that would come from other members of the military. Yet this detail, while being raised to demonstrate the heightened tension of the military is quickly backgrounded as it is attached to the additional governmental concern that leftist groups would also work to destabilize the government, and that this march is representative of these attempts by leftist groups. In this way, journalist inclusion of comments foregrounding the military concern of "right-wing" groups are neutralized by the following statement by the journalist that,

Military officials said they had been provoked by the demonstrators as part of what they said was a pattern of destabilization by the left (Mydan 1987a:Al).

Here, the journalist has backgrounded the importance of the possible right-wing coup to frame concern of government destabilization tactics by the marchers. This possibility is not pursued in the overall description of the event, while emphasis is placed heavily on portraying the marchers as violent and as initiating the violence that takes place.

Three members of the military and police force are used as resources to describe the event as it occurred. All three foreground the violent activities of the demonstrators and in doing so, justify the violent response
of the police and military, and reflects the passion of the conflict between the military and the groups represented in the march.

'We have tolerated them for so long. Don’t think we will stand by and wait for them to swamp Malacanang,' he said. 'Over my dead body.' (Mydan 1987a:A1).

This quote, while foregrounding the activities of the military as protection, also reveals that there is a history between the groups that has existed over time. Therefore, this history could be impacting the general’s definition of the situation – that the military is getting exasperated in a sense, as they can only tolerate the relationship for so long until they react. In this way, the military’s perspective and response is defined as the norm that the marchers have breached.

Finally, there is one quote included that authorizes an interpretation of the event that goes against mainstream definitions and descriptions.

General Montano said it was also possible that some military elements seeking to wreck peace efforts, had fired directly at the demonstrators. 'As far as I’m concerned, we did exercise maximum tolerance against these wild men," said General Montano, who was wearing a helmet (Mydan 1987a:A1).

Here we have a possible alternative definition of the meaning of the march that is just as possible as the one foregrounded repeatedly in the article. Yet this quote is...
immediately neutralized by its author through a reminder to the reader that the military as a group exercised tolerance towards the "wild men" marchers (Mydan 1987a).

The Government

To be noted, Government response is the first official reaction to the killings mentioned in the article (Mydan 1987a). However, these quotes are summarized from a television address by Aquino and are framed as abstracted from the experiences of the military sources, foregrounded as coming from the frontlines and as essentially eye-witness accounts. The journalist reports the president as having assigned an independent investigation panel to address the issue and warning viewers that groups will exploit the incident in an attempt to destabilize the government (Mydan 1987a). In this way, she is calling for order and showing how she is establishing order through institutional channels. She is not quoted as describing the issues surrounding the incident, the military involvement, the marchers, or the violence that occurred in any way. Rather, her message is her advocating that the government must stand for law and order.

In a television address late Thursday, after meeting with her top military and civilian advisors, the President urged calm and said an independent panel
would investigate the killings. Today, she canceled her scheduled public appearances. ‘There will be those who seek to exploit this tragic incident for their own objectives,’ she said. ‘In the period before the plebiscite, attempts to destabilize the government and defeat our democratic aims will intensify. We are prepared for this contingency. We shall have law and order throughout the land’ (Mydan 1987a:A1).

In this way, the issues of the marchers become omitted as relevant to the discussion of the march, backgrounded to the more immediate concerns of these sources - that the plebiscite must take place, and that destabilization is a threat to the goal of democracy. By articulating the symbol of democracy, the article is able to link the farmers’ issues as anti-democracy and then is able to connect the marchers, the violence, and government destabilization to the Communist Party.

The Communists

The journalist links the demonstration and shootings to the Communist party of the Philippines by foregrounding an introduction of the incident with the suspension of peace talks between the government and communist negotiators occurring while a 60-day cease-fire was in effect.

In a separate development, Government and Communist negotiators suspended peace talks indefinitely Thursday, saying they had received threats to their lives. They said a 60-day cease-fire that expires
Feb. 8 remains in effect and that the lines of communication remain open between them, despite security conditions the Communist side say were destructive to the talks (Mydan 1987a:A1).

The journalist describes how the communist negotiator has stated that the incident, as well as threats to the lives of negotiators, had caused the suspension of peace talks. The negotiator is also quoted as stating that this is an attempt by the military to destabilize peace talks.

He called the killings 'Part of a pattern by the military to destabilize the situation and blame it on us.' (Mydan 1987a:A1).

In this way, the incident is connected with the marchers regarding threats to lives and the military is then able to respond that the marchers represent the same threat that the Communist Party represents to destabilization of the government. This is exactly the interpretation the journalist has organized in the telling of "what really happened" using official sources. Overall, these resources describe marchers as leftist, as part of a larger destabilization plan by the left and Communists, and connected directly with the success or failure of the peace talks between the Communist Party and the government.
Aquino’s Political Rival

The government is also presented as ineffective by the journalists’ use of quotes from Jose Enrile, the former Defense Minister and political rival of Aquino for presidency. He foregrounds how the government is to blame for what happened at the demonstration while also accusing Aquino of operating under covert instructions from the U.S. government to manipulate the decisions of the independent panel creating the new constitution.

An ally of Mr. Enrile ... released to news organizations a document he described as a transcript of a private telephone conversation between Mrs. Aquino and an aid in Manila during the President’s visit to the United States last September. In the purported conversation, the President appears to hint at attempts to manipulate the work of an independent commission drawing up a new Philippine Constitution (Mydan 1987a:A1).

Here, Enrile is used to denounce the constitution as biased by Aquino and as being manipulated by the United States. The article describes him as Aquino’s only strong political rival in the upcoming elections. His opinion on the situation implies that if he had been in charge, the situation would have been better handled.

‘There is blood on the hands of this Government,’” the former Defense Minister, Juan Ponce Enrile, told a reporter today. Mr. Enrile, who has become the President’s main political rival, said there was ‘a failure of policy and correct analysis of the situation.’ (Mydan 1987a:A1).
Here, one might wonder what other possibilities he is referring to here. Would he have allowed the crowd to pass? Or, does he mean that he would have had control over the crowd? Although his standpoint is an alternative one, in that he does not represent government or military whose voices are the normalized authorities in this article, he still labeled the marchers as deviating from the norm of what should be occurring. By including him as an official source, the journalist again centers the frame for interpretation of the incident around the deviance of marchers and the necessity for government control as ratified by the upcoming constitutional vote.

Overall, in this first article describing the event and its surrounding issues the journalist lays a basic framework for interpreting the events and the surrounding issues described in the articles following its occurrence. Overall, the military and government are authorized as being the experts who can best describe what happened and its implications, as this first article has backgounded the reasons for the march to be less of a priority to the story than what happens now to the government after the march. Foregrounding is used to transform the march from an activity based upon past grievances into an incident that is
the first in a series of aggressive attempts by groups to destabilize the government.

Analysis of January 24th 1987 Article (1st)

Article Summary

The next article detailing the events surrounding the march, and the headline reads, "Philippine Army Chief Says Troops Overreacted" (Mydan 1987b:1-4). It is a shorter article, but one of relatively good length at 877 words. It has no picture or subtitles, and appeared on Page 4 of the Foreign Desk but as section 1, so it is located not as prominently within the papers as the first article. The author is again identified as Seth Mydan. There are no pictures.

Body headings place the structure of the topics in order of importance for readers. Under the title description, the journalist frames the events occurring at the demonstration by foregrounding its occurrence in relation to the government preparing for more violence to occur around the constitutional voting time period, and that this potential for violence is related to why the troops fired into the crowd. In the opening sentence of this article, the journalist states that the country is preparing
for more violence before the constitutional vote and connects this topic within the same sentence, to the Chief of Staff, General Fidel V. Ramos, stating that the troops overreacted in shooting the demonstrators (Mydan 1987b). Here we can see how the journalist construction is providing a certain context for interpreting the violence of the police and military that explains their actions as reasonable although not necessarily appropriate, due to the political tensions already existing in the country. This section then provides more detail about these issues. The General is next quoted as stating that the violence resulted from a “lack of dialogue” and overreaction by his troops, which he labels as “peacekeeping forces” (Mydan 1987b:1-4). So the purpose of the military is foregrounded as peacekeeping, backgrounding their potential role in the violence that occurred, and backgrounding any definitions of the marchers as a group concerned about maintaining peace and non-violence. The journalist then connects this issue with the resignation of a government negotiator in the communist peace talks over the killings and then discusses warnings by “leftist groups” of more demonstrations and strikes (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

Continuing within the framework of this first section, the journalist begins a wider construction of Aquino
opponents by describing them as representative of extreme left and right wing political groups. By foregrounding these groups, the journalist backgrounds the relevance of Filipinos in the "center" as relevant to the accounting of the tensions existing around the constitutional vote or in identifying with the concerns of either political side foregrounded in this account (Mydan 1987b). In this way, any centrist position disappears from the account.

The journalist references both groups as "sharing the goal of destabilizing the Government" (Mydan 1987b:1-4). In this way, he uses official sources to foreground the relevance of marcher actions as representing attempts and desires to destabilize the government, therefore omitting any other possibilities for why the march occurred that does not involve rejection of the current government. Additionally, he uses the foregrounding of these two groups to emphasize how they may be working together to achieve a common goal of government destabilization before the constitutional vote. In this way, the goals and purposes of people's actions are presented as being the same. By combining the goals of these two groups, this foregrounding of their groups omits any potential differences in their positions and concerns regarding their views of the government and the changes that they would like to see occur.
in the country after martial law had been abolished. A government negotiator in the talks with the Communist party is mentioned next stating that the incidents have caused her to resign as she cannot support the government’s approach to the incident (Mydan 1987b). By foregrounding her decision, the journalist reinforces the connections between the peace talks and the march and the Communist Party and the marchers. This inclusion of her account also emphasizes the incident’s occurrence as a reflection of failure of government activities and policies rather than as a possible failure in military response. This then backgrounds the relevance of potential disputes occurring within the military as an institution in its own right, as a separate power, with internal conflicts that may have played a role in the violence that occurred.

The journalist describes the demonstrators as “including” farmers, therefore foregrounding that they were only one part of the groups participating. Therefore, the reader is not informed of whom else participated. Yet, due to the foregrounding of the incident as canceling the peace talks between the government and the Communist Party, the reader can infer that the Communist Party was the more prominent group represented in the march (Mydan 1987b). As in the previous article, they are described as demanding
changes in land redistribution and as marching aggressively to the palace when the troops fired upon the crowd. The description of the shooting is preceded by a description of aggressive demonstrators creating, as with the previous article, causality of the shooting to be the marcher's activities. The journalist then provides a statement that neutralizes the military actions by referencing a government spokesperson that states that the police and military were also struck by a stone and wounded by bullets (Mydan 1987b). This statement confirms the media interpretation of the conflict, provided by official sources authorized to provide this information, describing the use of lethal weapons as a choice made by both sides.

Next, the journalist foregrounds some of the formal activities of Aquino to portray her response to the demonstration - that she's cancelled her public schedule and ordered the release of demonstrators, and created a commission to investigate the killings (Mydan 1987b). However, no direct or indirect quotes are provided for her voice in foregrounding these activities as representative of her overall standpoint on the issue. These activities are then placed in relation to three direct quotes from the government negotiator for the peace talks with the communists who uses the incident to describe Aquino and the
current government as worse than when Marcos had been president. Aquino is now being blamed directly for the killings by another government official and the formulation of a committee to investigate the issues is described as the sole act in response to the shooting (Mydan 1987b). The possibilities that she might have had other reactions or worked to resolve this issue in any other way is not suggested in this account.

The connection between the incident and the ongoing peace talks are further strengthened in this section. Here, the journalist foregrounds military sources stating that the march was coincided with the cancellation of peace talks by the Communist Party in a coordinated attempt "by the left" against the government (Mydan 1987b:1-4). This, in essence, and based upon military sources, connects both groups and both incidents together - producing a meaning that brands the farmers' goals as Communist goals to American readers.

The second section, identified by the subheading title of, "'Maximum Tolerance' Policy," appears almost two-thirds into the overall article (Mydan 1987b:1-4). In this section, the journalist switches from a discussion of the potential of increasing violence by leftist groups to describe the response of the military to the event (Mydan 1987b). He discusses how the general ordered all commanders
to review crowd control procedures, and this is the first sentence and subject under this section and as such, this issue is foregrounded as important compared to the content following it. However, the content following discusses how farmer’s groups are going to block highways bringing food to Manila, how the peace talk cancellation is connected to a cease-fire, and how opponents of Aquino from both left and right are blaming her for the killings (Mydan 1987b). In this way, the journalist is foregrounding, using primarily military sources, how this incident demonstrates Aquino’s incompetence as a leader.

This issue of incompetence is framed within the third section, whose subheading is, “Questions on Leadership” (Mydan 1987b:1-4). This section is entirely devoted to reactions from Aquino’s rival for president, Enrile. The quotes the journalist uses are Enrile’s own that criticize Aquino’s ability to lead the Philippines (Mydan 1987b). Rather than Aquino responding to his critical comments, the journalist quotes a “palace source” stating that the government had been unprepared by the “aggressiveness” of the demonstrators, therefore substantiating Enrile’s comments that the Government was unprepared and the overall message that the demonstrators were aggressive (Mydan 1987b:1-4). In this way, by foregrounding direct quotes of
Enrile but not Aquino, Aquino’s comments are backgrounded to Enrile’s statements, therefore supporting his challenge to the presidency to act more decisively towards efforts at destabilization. Next, the journalist ties general fear of another coup as a potential threat coming from both Marcos and Enrile supporters within the military, thereby showing that there are certain sections of the military are connected to both Enrile and Marcos (Mydan 1987b). However, they are not identified directly as representing the "right wing opponents," therefore Enrile’s ties with the military are omitted as a potential factor informing his perspective on this issue and in this account (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

The last section, titled “Barrage of Criticism,” announces that a dozen leftist groups are now criticizing Aquino’s administration in response to the shooting, blaming Aquino for the violence which demonstrates she is no different than Marcos in handling violence against people (Mydan 1987b:1-4). Here they also criticize her platform for democratic liberalism as false. The journalist includes a quote each from two groups, Bayan and the National Democratic Front, to substantiate this criticism from “left-wing” groups (Mydan 1987b:1-4). The National Democratic Front is identified as the Communist side of the peace talks. Therefore, these groups are foregrounded in ways
that tie them all together and place them under the label as Communist.

In these ways, the Presidential standpoint is being backgrounded to numerous groups and individuals presented as highly critical of her government. What gets both backgrounded and at some points omitted from the account, as framed through the military officials being the primary voices authorized to explain the standpoints of others, is what the military potentially have invested into the adopting of their interpretation of this issue. Their involvement in this debate over the meaning of the incident is focused solely on justifying their actions against the marchers. This omits the stake of the military in outcomes of this event that may effect the power they could lose if the peace talks were successful or if the communist or farmer organization standpoints were legitimized publicly by the president.

Authorized Subjects/Voices

As with the preceding article, the characters providing witness and corroboration to the journalist's comments are primarily military and police "official" sources. The Chief of Staff, General Ramos, is telling the main story to the journalist (Mydan 1987b). All other groups mentioned within
the article, with the exception of government representatives, are cited as criticizing the Aquino government. Specifically, the journalist includes statements from government and military officials, a government negotiator in the peace talks with Communist Party members, and her political opponent, Enrile, all very critical of her personally and her government (Mydan 1987b). This article, predominantly uses government and military sources to back up the journalists' claim that the incident has drawn harsh criticism from a variety of constituencies in the Philippines.

To expand upon this definition of response to Aquino’s decision-making, the journalist presents the comments of three “leftist” organizations: the “militant farmer’s group” who led the march, Bayan, the second a “leftist umbrella group” Bayan, and the National Democratic Front, now identified by the journalist as the group representing “the Communist side in the peace talks” with the Government (Mydan 1987b:1-4). The journalist writes, that,

Both the far right and the far left in the country, which now appear to share the goal of destabilizing the Government, have reacted with harsh criticism of President Corazon C. Aquino, who plans to hold a plebiscite on a new constitution on Feb. 2 (Mydan 1987b:1-4).
All groups representing different positions on the issue, beyond those representing Aquino and her position, are quoted as critical of the Government. The journalist writes that,

The harsh new criticism of Mrs. Aquino from the left wing added a new element to the tension in Manila,” and also that, “Even after the killing of a leftist labor union leader, Rolando Olalia last November, his left-wing supporters refrained from blaming the President. Now, in a barrage of criticism, a dozen groups issued statements (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

When looking at the ordering of people and topics in the body of the article, readers first hear from the Chief of Staff, next from a negotiator for the government with the communists, next from Enrile, and last, from the “far left” (Mydan 1987b:1-4). Yet, as for the criticism from the “far right” no direct voices representing this position are included in the article. Only the leftist groups are identified specifically and the “right” groups are implied, therefore their role in this incident is minimized. The journalist takes the job, in this article, of discussing how extreme groups are targeting the constitutional day of election in order to disrupt the government. However, he only focuses on the activities of groups representing the leftist position, yet he implies that there is also criticism coming from extreme right-wing political groups, which we can only discover, from indirect reference, that
means the military who support Marcos and Enrile (Mydan 1987b).

**Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques**

The foregrounding of topics by use of official police, military, and government sources frame the meaning of this march solely as an attempt at destabilization to disrupt the vote on the new constitution. Although the constitution and vote are foregrounded as that which is being destabilized, the article content omits any details about the content of the constitution, and the possibility that its content is controversial. The journalist writes that,

> As the Philippine government braced for more violence in the 10 days before a vote on a proposed constitution, the armed forces Chief of Staff said today that his troops overreacted when they fired into a crowd of protestors Thursday (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

Here, then, the journalist connects and uses foregrounding to frame the actions of the military and police within a context of fear over more violence concerning the constitutional vote.

The demonstrators are also described as violent and as initiating the conflict thereby providing an interpretive framework that indicates violence was exchanged equally on both sides of military and marchers before the military
opened fire (Mydan 1987b). "Twelve people were killed and scores of demonstrators wounded in the confrontation Thursday near the presidential palace" (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

The groups described as most critical of the shooting by the journalist and official sources, are also described as extreme, aggressive, left wing, Communist, and militant.

The National Democratic Front, which represents the Communist side in the peace talks, said, 'The Aquino Government has ripped off its mask of democratic liberalism and bared itself to be no more than the deceitful successor to the fascist-Marcos dictatorship (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

The military is described as exercising maximum tolerance but having overreacted in tense political times. The incident is also connected to the suspension of peace talks between the government and communist negotiators.

Backgrounding of the issues and experiences of the marchers occurs through the foregrounding of these official responses to the incident and reaction by different groups. Here we can overall see how the journalist begins the article by connecting the violence of the military turned into an "overreaction" by troops trying to keep the peace at a demonstration during tense political times (Mydan 1987b:1-4). In this way, the demonstrators are depicted as a homogenous group with the same interests in destabilizing the government. Additionally, and the topic of land reform
is backgrounded as an urgent or relevant issue in explaining the reasoning for the demonstration and framed to be representative of an issue selected by these groups to use as a platform in their bigger purpose and activities to destabilize the government.

The Peace Talk Negotiators

This article frames the demonstration as directly influencing the suspension of talks between Government and Communist negotiations. Specifically, a government negotiator resigns, denouncing the position of the government and comparing the incident unfavorably to Marcos government atrocities. She is quoted as resigning because she can no longer support the government.

But one of the Government’s three negotiators in talks with the Communists resigned today, protesting the killings. She said she had found it ‘increasingly difficult to defend the position of the Government.’ And leftist groups warned of new demonstrations and protest strikes (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

The position of the Communists are cited by the journalist as involving economic critique through Marxist rhetoric and as the beginnings of an “aggressive posture” by the left as the reasons for the suspension of peace talks (Mydan 1987b:1-4). The journalist writes that,

The Communist negotiators, citing threats to their lives, return underground after the suspension of talks
Thursday. The demonstration Thursday coincided with the suspension of peace talks with the Communists and marked what appeared to be the opening of an aggressive posture by the left against the Aquino Government (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

In this way, the suspension of talks is blamed on the communist negotiators, and its cause is emphasized as the attempt by the party to be more aggressive to the government. The journalist foregrounds the aggressive stance of the communist negotiators before mentioning that the communists reported threats to their lives (Mydan 1987b). Here, then, we can see how the journalist guides the reader to consider the end the suspension of negotiations as an aggressive act by the communist representatives coordinated with other radical groups who were involved in the march.

The journalist also quotes the negotiator on the government's side as speaking against the government as she, "issued a statement calling the killings 'far more despicable' than any during the years of Mrs. Aquino's predecessor, Ferdinand Marcos" (Mydan 1987b:1-4). Here, the violence is being blamed on Aquino rather than on the overall government or the military. Her motivations for doing so are not investigated. She is take at face value as a reliable source and also is authorized to speak for what the incident represents although no farmers participating in
the march have yet been asked to provide their account of what it represents. Therefore, military is not being held accountable by anyone in this description.

Here, the connection between the suspension of the peace talks as representing aggressiveness rather than fear for lives or disruptions to the process caused by any other group than the Communist Party is backgrounded. The journalist writes that,

Military intelligence sources said they had information that the breakdown in talks and a stepped-up period of planned strikes and rallies like the one Thursday were part of a new, more militant approach (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

Their acts as representative of an aggressive stance is authorized solely by military sources, which the article authorizes as legitimate sources in accurately representing the position of the Communist negotiators and Party.

The Military

In this article, the military sources, particularly the Chief of Staff, continue to frame the story as one in which “peace-keeping troops overreacted” due to a “lack of dialogue” and an aggressive stance by marchers (Mydan 1987b:1-4). The journalist therefore connects the meaning of this incident to government fears of more violence or more incidents like this one. He also describes the troops
as being unprepared to react to the violence supposedly initiated by the marchers, although their descriptions of violence are solely reported by government and military sources (Mydan 1987b).

A palace source said the government had been unprepared for the aggressive approach of the demonstrators, despite warnings by their leaders. He said violent comment was not always followed with violent action (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

As with the previous article, the incident is described by the journalist as involving an exchange of violence between marchers and military members.

The dead and wounded included farmers demanding changes in land distribution. When the thousands of protestors marched aggressively against the ranks of the riot police officers and marines guarding Malacanang Palace, the troops opened fire without warning. A Government spokesman, Teodoro Benigno, said today that bullets in the confrontation also wounded three troops and that one was struck by a stone. The National Bureau of Investigation said most of those killed or wounded were struck by pistol shots fired at close range (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

In this way, violence as initiated by both sides, and presumed to be of equal force, is foregrounded in understanding the actions that occurred.

The journalist also describes the military as taking the necessary steps to investigate who was responsible for the “overreaction” by requiring that troops review their crowd control protocols (Mydan 1987b).
General Ramos ordered all service commanders today to review their crowd-control procedures and to conform with the Government's stated policy of 'maximum tolerance (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

No individuals are identified as the shooters and the general response to the military is a review of procedures rather than any type of reprimand or punishment. In this way, the journalist is foregrounding that the military and police are following protocol in response to the incident. Yet, the journalist does not raise the potential role of the military as involved in a crime, in murder, or as having any stake in the outcome of the portrayals of what the massacre represents to different national and international audiences.

The Government

Government officials are the next dominant group authorizing the account the journalist presents as these officials are represented frequently in the article in order to frame understanding of the incident and support the definitions of the marchers promoted by the military source accounts. Overall, the journalists' descriptions of the government official response to the incident foregrounds an interpretation that coincides with military official descriptions. The government is portrayed as also not being
at the event (Mydan 1987b:1-4). Therefore, they also rely on the military to account for what happened as well. In this way, the possibility that the government asked for witnesses to the demonstration and shooting not representing military officials is omitted from the account.

The government is described as establishing a commission to investigate what happened.

Mrs. Aquino canceled her public schedule today and ordered the release of any demonstrators arrested Thursday. Her office said she would proceed with a planned trip outside Manila on Saturday. The President also created a special commission to investigate the incident (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

The appointment of a special commission by Aquino as a response to the incident is important in two ways. First, a bureaucratic investigation will abstract the events into institutionalized discourse and processes that will ultimately defend the institution’s continued power. This can happen through institutional processes as the experience of the march is abstracted into institutionally organized discourse by bureaucrats who are committed to keeping the institution of government running yet still need to account for the incident in some formally organized manner. This, implies also that the military institution must be kept running as well. Therefore, the investigation that occurs cannot result in a report that targets either the military
or the government as perpetrating the violence. Hegemony requires that institutions retain their power in society in order to reinforce status quo conditions. Alternative interpretations of any incident that could potentially place the power of an institution in jeopardy must therefore be subsumed. In this way, the voices representing these institutionalized structures are authorized to tell the story of “what really happened” in ways that groups not supportive of these structures are denied. If these alternative voices had been legitimized by the government formally reported as relying on other people’s descriptions that did not reflect the same interpretation coming from military sources, the commission then would have had the authority to investigate the military’s involvement in the incident. This would have created a fissure in the government and military institutions as military officials were in prominent government positions and therefore could have been also involved indirectly with the commission’s activities.

Aquino Opponents on the “Right”

The opponents of the Aquino Government on the “right” although foregrounded as important in relation to the march, for the most, part go unidentified. However, a
military source is used to suggest that this group includes members of the military loyal to Enrile and Marcos and that these are the people the military and government fear will attempt a coup (Mydan 1987b).

A military source said the armed forces remained on alert against any possible aggressive move by soldiers backing Mr. Enrile and armed forces loyal to former President Ferdinand E. Marcos (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

These groups are described as working in conjunction with the "extreme left" to destabilize the government. This foregrounding of the goals of both groups as being similar backgrounds the differences between the groups that may exist, and also backgrounds the relevance of the military as having enough potential power to initiate a takeover of the government. Here then the distinctions between each group are blurred and their relative power as individual groups in being able to act upon a plan of destabilization is not distinguished.

Both the far right and the far left in the country, which now appear to share the goal of destabilizing the government, have reacted with harsh criticism of President Corazon Aquino, who plans to hold a plebiscite on a new constitution on Feb. 2 (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

By combining elements of the military with the goals of leftist groups, the actual power carried by the military to influence all possible situations as well as a potential
link between Enrile's political campaign to changes in military power is backgrounded as relevant to the account.

**Aquino Opponents on the "Left"**

Although ambiguously defining the characters involved in the "right wing" movement against Aquino, the article does include multiple descriptions of the "Left wing supporters" critical of the Aquino Government. This essentially foregrounds them as the groups most representative of any potential threat to the Aquino government and links the marchers into having the goal of government destabilization.

This comment is augmented by a quote from a statement issued by the communist group represented in the peace talks. They are quoted in stating that,

> The National Democratic Front, which represents the Communist side in the peace talks, said, 'The Aquino Government has ripped off its mask of democratic liberalism and bared itself to be no more than the deceitful successor to the fascist-Marcos dictatorship.' (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

No quotes from these groups are described as coming from people who actually participated in the march although the demonstrators are now being differentiated into representing specific groups, rather than just a homogenous mass of people. Yet by foregrounding quotes from these
groups that are strongly emotional and provocative, the journalist discredits their standpoints by emphasizing the emotive rather than rational processes that exist and could represent that which is potentially opposed by these groups.

The public leader of the march is identified as a "militant farmer's group" who are now threatening to start a food strike (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

The militant farmer's group that led the demonstration Thursday said it would plan an agricultural strike and the blocking of highways that bring food to Manila (Mydan 1987b:1-4).

Here their cause for planning this strike is not given, and this reporting therefore delegitimizes the position of the farmers even further than before. Groups are also described as preparing for another such demonstration but the journalist does not report the purposes of this march. The reader is not provided with information on whether it is supposed to be peaceful or to initiate conflict, whether it is in response to the previous march or a continuation of efforts to destabilize the government. The reader is left with no information except that provided in the accounts by military officials who label the primary reason for the activities of these groups as destabilization. "Several groups have announced a mass protest rally Monday
at the site of the killings" (Mydan 1987b:1-4). In these ways, the responses by these groups that appear to be irrational are foregrounded in the journalists' account, therefore omitting the possibility that these groups had other perspectives useful to a reader in understanding their reactions to the massacre.

Overall, this article directly links the marcher's goals to Communist Party goals, and through its repeated descriptions of the activities and the perspectives of each group as filtered through military and government resources. Their activities are thus defined as part of a new, more militant approach to negotiations with the government. In this way, their actions are consistently depicted as wrong and unjustifiable while the journalist frames the response of the government and military as neither good nor bad, appropriate or inappropriate. In this way, the perspectives of the marchers are omitted from the account as legitimate in any way. They are portrayed by official sources as a dangerous and continuing threat to the ongoing attempts by government (and backed by military) to ensure that the constitutional vote takes place which will ratify the government's power.
Article Summary

This third article introduces the financial consequences of this unrest in the Philippines on international lenders, one of which is the United States. The headline title is, "Creditors to Reschedule $870 Million Manila Debt (Mydan 1987c:1-39). This article appears on page 39, section 1, of the Financial Desk and is relatively short at 550 words. The author is unidentified and is from Reuters news service rather than from a New York Times correspondent.

The first section under the main title describes how the agreement by Western nations to reschedule the debt owed to them is a show of support by Western creditor nations for President Aquino's government (Mydan 1987c). The second paragraph under the heading describes how the Paris Club agreed to the rescheduling after negotiations with the Philippine Finance Minister. Here, the journalist also describes the Paris Club as rescheduling a debt agreement with Brazil as well. A delay of payments was granted with five years of grace. This is looked at as the Club welcoming economic recovery in the Philippines (Mydan 1987c:1-39). In this first paragraph, the journalist
clarifies that the United States backs President Aquino’s position and is powerful enough to influence how their debt will be renegotiated in order to assist her in maintaining order in her country.

Under the first subheading, “Rescheduled Debt Described,” the journalist describes how this $870 million was due the following year as a payment of the Philippine’s total debt of 27.8 billion (Mydan 1987c:1-39). The restructuring is foregrounded as very important in giving the Philippine government a five-year grace period before payments on this year’s debt are due to be made. Reduction in payments is minimal – the Philippines will owe the entire principal but only 70% of the interest. This, the reader is informed, is a better deal than had been negotiated under Marcos’ rule in 1994 that had rescheduled the debt with 60% of the interest being paid (Mydan 1987c). So, an agreement that is advantageous to the Paris Club, which increases the burden of debt on the Philippines, is foregrounded as support for Aquino’s efforts at economic recovery, whereas the impossibility of the Philippines ever being able to pay off the debt is omitted. Thus, the neo-colonial practices operating as a result of this debt and renegotiations enable the Philippines to borrow more money for economic recovery. However, the dependency, hunger, and poverty that result
from this cycle are not mentioned as a possible and historical consequence of these negotiations.

Under the second subheading, titled "Short of Expectation," the journalist reports that the agreement "fell short" of Manila's expectations for a longer grace period and repayment rescheduling (Mydan 1987c:1-39). Here, the journalist quotes the Philippines central bank as stating the deal was negotiated due to a deferment of a debt to Austria, created from former business negotiations with an associate of the former president Marcos owning a coal company (Mydan 1987c). Here again, finance administrators are foregrounded as stating this re-negotiation will help the Philippines with other negotiations on rescheduling 3.6 billion dollars of the Philippine foreign debt with a 12-bank advisory committee in the Philippines (Mydan 1987c).

Notably absent in this article is any mention of who this committee is or who's interests it represents, omitting the possibility that the committee has any other interest in this renegotiation than in helping the economy of the Philippines. In this way, the article presents a very typical colonial attitude of the colonizer helping the colonized attain self-sufficiency as it appears they can not do it on their own and that the process must be coordinated and controlled by the more powerful country.
Japan and the United States are described as offering Aquino support due to the "strategic importance of stability in her country" (Mydan 1987c:1-39). The journalist then reports how the Philippines will meet with the World Bank the following week in order to ask for increased "official development aid" of $2 billion after borrowing 1.4 billion in 1986 (Mydan 1987c:1-39). Next, the Mendiola violence is mentioned in that it happened after the meeting for the renegotiation of this debt had begun. The massacre is described as a riot in which people got killed by troops and in which Aquino has promised to investigate (Mydan 1987c). The last sentence describes how Aquino had been elected less than a year ago, had pledged wide-ranging reforms, and now faces a vote on the new constitution within the next week and a half (Mydan 1987c). This vote, according to these articles has been described as a vote of confidence in her role as president. Therefore, here we see the interests of Japan and United States impact on the Philippines foregrounded, and the needs of the Philippines beyond this change in financial aid re-structuring backgrounded as important to the Philippines. The information provided in the literature review regarding how these lending issues impact the structure of the economy enabled me to recognize how the dependency of the Philippines on this debt
renegotiation reinforced the continued power of these nations and their investors over trade policies operating under the new government.

**Authorized Subjects/Voices**

As journalists are dependent upon many types of official sources, in this incident, this journalist relies upon representatives from the Paris Club, the French Finance Ministry, and the Philippine central bank in order to report on the rescheduling on Philippine debt payment to foreign creditors (Mydan 1987c). What is missing here is every voice other than the government talking about how aid can be best used - any plan at all. Instead, information is provided on what banking sources, the Philippine bank, Finance Ministry officials and diplomatic sources negotiate with the Paris Club, and implement a Paris Club "pact" or "agreement" before consulting other foreign creditors or the World Bank (Mydan 1987c:1-39). The journalist utilizes a third person perspective and reports using all official financing sources for information.
Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques: The Paris Club/Foreign Creditors

The sources relied upon by the journalist to write this article primarily consist of voices who represent the Paris Club, described as an informal group of people representing the financial interests of creditor nations.

Western creditor nations agreed today to a rescheduling of $870 million of the Philippines' official foreign debt in what appeared to be a show of support for President Corazon Aquino, just as she is facing a crisis at home (Mydan 1987c:1-39). Their commentary on the negotiations are foregrounded in that their efforts to re-negotiate the debt owed to them by the Philippines represents a sign of support for Aquino. These negotiations are foregrounded as a positive step for the Philippine government as they are portrayed as the factor that most influence the government's ability to stabilize trade activities and processes in the Philippine economy (Mydan 1987c). Therefore, their financial concerns and interests are portrayed as support for the Aquino government when Aquino needs this support most. Therefore, what is foregrounded by this description is that these countries are going to help her with the crisis she faces at home. What is omitted is any other type of support that Aquino might need or might have asked for beyond the restructuring of debt negotiations to help her maintain her
position as president other than that coming from foreign banks. What also is omitted due to the foregrounding of these other issues by the journalist, but can be concluded from the literature review, is the possibility that these negotiations by the Paris Club have caused the conditions that preceded the crisis in the first place. These conditions themselves such as hunger, poverty, unemployment, and loss of land, are omitted from all accounts as relevant to a description of “what happened.”

This negotiation is described as a prerequisite to other negotiations that had been stalled, provide the Philippines with more financial aid for “development,” and improve the status of negotiations with other creditors as well as protecting the interests of the United States and Japan (Mydan 1987c).

In Paris, diplomatic sources said the debt talks had been held in a relaxed atmosphere, with political factors strongly in favor of an accord. They said the United States and Japan in particular had shown support for Mrs. Aquino’s administration, stressing the strategic importance of stability in her country (Mydan 1987c:1-39).

The economic and political context, in other words, the colonial context in which the Philippines accumulated such a debt (such as international lending organizations, foreign creditors, and a corrupt government) is absent. Philippine debt is attributed to no cause, except in reference to the
forgiveness of Austria of a debt accumulated by a corrupt associate of Marcos (Mydan 1987c).

The Philippine Bank and Associates

Statements from Philippine Central Bank and Finance Ministry officials are foregrounded here as agreeing that the re-negotiation of the debt reflects other countries’ commitment to economic recovery efforts. Yet resistance to the outcome of these negotiations is backgrounded as the journalist reports that the deal “fell short of the expectations” of Philippine officials (Mydan 1987c:1-39). Although this comment reflects some possible dissention by Philippine officials over the debt renegotiations, this potential dissenting opinion is neutralized as the journalist foregrounds the bank’s alignment with the reported opinion of the Paris Club regarding the negotiations.

‘The conclusion of the agreement was facilitated by the strong support of all the members of the Paris Club to contribute to the economic recovery efforts of the Philippine Government,’ the bank said (Mydan 1987c:1-39).

The journalist also foregrounds these negotiations as relevant to further Philippine negotiations with the World Bank to ask for more development aid. Here, the Philippines is presented as needing to first clear up debt negotiations.
with the Paris Club, with other foreign creditors, in order to be able to negotiate with the World Bank, who will provide them with further lending, in other words, further debt (Mydan 1987c).

The journalist foregrounds how debt relief will aid further negotiations in noting that,

The Philippines will next week meet a World Bank group of 13 donor nations and is expected to ask for an increase in official development aid estimated at $2 billion this year, up from 1.4 billion in 1986 (Mydan 1987c:1-39).

What gets backgrounded here is any possibility that Marcos used this money wrongly to reinforce his own or the military’s power, and that it is this potential misuse of funds that has created the need for Aquino to borrow more. Additionally, the quotes foreground how this renegotiation represents a show of support, while backgrounding how the Paris Club will make more money off this debt by rescheduling it with an increased amount of interest to be paid than what was required in the original agreement. The journalist quotes a Philippine bank spokesperson as stating that,

‘This reflects an improvement over the previous rescheduling agreement in 1984 because the amount of interest to be rescheduled has been increased from 60 to 70 percent.’ (Mydan 1987c:1-39).
Here we have the Philippine Bank official agreeing that the deal is better than before because the Philippine national bank and government now must pay 10% more back than what was scheduled only three years earlier (Mydan 1987c). This statement clearly reflects that the Philippine bureaucrat is caught up in neo-colonial politics and ideology that is distributed to United States readers on this issue as appropriate, as he reports that paying countries back more money is an improvement in his government’s debt negotiations. What is also omitted from this account is any pressure that the Aquino government faced by these investors if disagreeing or refusing to negotiate a new deal with them as part of her presidency.

The Marchers and Aquino’s Government

The rescheduling of debt is described in the article account as a response to the political instability in the Philippines with an overall message that debt restructuring will encourage economic recovery. The march is used here to demonstrate the current instability in government as acted out in the street.

After the Paris debt meeting began Thursday in the conference center of the French Foreign Ministry, 12 people were killed in riots near Mrs. Aquino’s palace when troops fired on thousands of farmers demanding land reform. Mrs. Aquino, who came to power 11 months...
ago pledging wide-ranging reforms, faces a plebiscite on a new constitution on Feb. 2. She cancelled all engagements today to meet advisors and promised an investigation into the shooting (Mydan 1987c:1-39).

In this way, the description of the march and massacre is used to foreground the relevance of debt negotiation and the reality of political instability in the Philippines. Additionally, this renegotiation of debt is foregrounded as helping Aquino resolve problems external to the country in order to foreground establishing governmental order in the Philippines.

Analysis of January 25th 1987 Article

Article Summary

This fourth article is a shorter summary of previous articles reported on by Seth Mydans and Mydans is also the author of this article. It’s headline title is “The Philippines; Maximum Tolerance Is Put to the Test.” It is located in the “Week in Review Desk,” in section 4 of the newspaper (Mydan 1987:4-1). There are no subheadings. There is one picture, which shows three Filipino bodies lying askew in a littered area, and they are described as demonstrators felled by soldier’s bullets. They are not identified as individuals.
This is a relatively short article summarizing the position of the newspaper journalist on the events that have been reported upon in the last week (specifically, those two articles I have already analyzed). Topics that the journalist puts forth appear in the following order: a description of the shooting, a description of the marchers, the importance of the constitutional vote about to take place, attempts by extreme groups to destabilize the government, the troops described as overreacting to the demonstrators, fears of a right-wing coup, and the Communist negotiators returning to the underground after the suspension of peace talks (Mydan 1987d). The journalist frames this information through a conclusion that suggests these events will prevent Aquino from being able to successfully negotiate with the Communists and find a non-violent solution before the end of the cease-fire. Here we see all of the threads introduced in the previous articles articulated in connection with one another to present an accumulated accounting of this event as an urgent challenge to Aquino’s power (Mydan 1987d:4-1).

Authorized Subjects/Voices

In this article, the journalist is the predominant voice by summarizing the events that have taken place.
Overall, the journalist substantiates all previous voices and groups of authority that have defined the situation in the previous articles by drawing on his previous work to summarize these perspectives. The journalist ties all pre-conceived conceptions of the role of the military and government in responding to the situation. He also describes the political climate in which these events took place as being tense and unstable, with groups coming together in a unified attempt to disrupt the constitutional vote and destabilize the government. As such, the groups mentioned within this article will not be separated by categories to discuss foregrounding and backgrounding occurring between them as article topics but will be analyzed together.

Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques: A Summary

In this summary, the journalist takes all previous groups and topics surrounding the issue as presented in the previous articles, and presents these official sources in his third person, omniscient reporting voice to reinforce the main points of the previous three articles.

Many marchers were peasant farmers, demanding changes in land policy. But the opposition that took part was broad-based, and it appeared that the country's left
wing was joining the extreme right in an attempt to destabilize the Aquino government at a crucial time. In eight days, the Philippines is to vote on a proposed constitution that would give the Government a legal basis and lay the framework for democratic rule (Mydan 1987d:4-1).

Here, the media construction foregrounds the event as a planned attempt to destabilize the Aquino government days before the new constitution is to be voted upon. This overall definition is supported through past, more detailed descriptions of these issues in previous articles. The journalist ties all groups and issues together as the legitimate and most important summary of events occurring in the Philippines that week. Overall, this interpretation is framed as the legitimate one, omitting the possibilities of alternative understandings for the meaning of this event as possibly proposed by other groups, such as considering it an act of violence committed by the military against Filipino citizens with legitimate concerns.

Again, descriptions of the military as peacekeepers, although overreacting ones, are foregrounded to explain their role in the violence that occurred which backgrounds or minimizes the possibility that their actions might have been conscious choices on their part to fire into the crowd.

In any case, said Gen. Fidel V. Ramos, the armed forces Chief of Staff, his troops had ‘overreacted to the situation.’ The police earlier said the marchers had fired shots at the troops, who were protected by
shields stenciled with the Government’s slogan, ‘maximum tolerance’ (Mydan 1987d:4-1).

Here we see the summary of the military descriptions which foreground their role as the victims of an attack by the marchers. To substantiate this frame, the journalist uses a previous quote from Aquino referring generally to the public in her previous televised address that,

‘In the period before the plebiscite, attempts to destabilize the government and defeat our democratic aims will intensify,’ Mrs. Aquino warned in a televised address hours after the violence. ‘We are prepared for this contingency. We shall have order throughout our land.’ (Mydan 1987d:4-1).

In this way, the possibility of the military shootings as representing violence for any other reasons than to protect the palace is omitted from a normative understanding of the events that took place that day. Aquino’s message within this article’s context transfers her message which could have in its earlier context, been addressed at either military or marchers, now placed within this context, appears to be addressed at the marchers, placing them at fault for the incident that occurred. In other words, in this article, her message implies that the marchers, not the military, acted inappropriately and aggressively in order to destabilize the government. Whereas in the January 23rd article, when this quote was first used, it was foregrounded as a response and statement that incidents such as the
shooting would not be tolerated. Now it is placed in the context of Aquino advocating that further activities like the march will not be tolerated (Mydan 1987d).

This preface is the used to inform the reader that the “maximum tolerance” to be put to the test by police will now apply to a second march and demonstration that will occur at the same place as the previous one (Mydan 1987d:4-1). Backgrounding, then, that maximum tolerance was put to the test before and failed because a massacre of people occurred. Therefore, the second march, rather than the first, is described as putting the military to a test of their tolerance which will demonstrate their true tolerance of the issues and people.

Finally, the journalist constructs the incident as a coordinated effort by leftist groups to prevent Aquino from formally becoming the Philippines’ president.

Even before the security forces braced for a leftist response to the killings on Thursday, they were on alert because of rumors of a coup attempt by right-wing military elements. Several groups have said they will hold another rally tomorrow. Mrs. Aquino’s leftist opponents said that Thursday’s killings were proof that her government was repressive, while the right contended that the incident proved she was incompetent (Mydan 1987d:4-1).

Aquino’s opportunity to negotiate with the Communist party is seen described as failed due to their pulling out of the negotiations.
The day of the protest march, in what intelligence sources said may have been part of a coordinated turn against the Aquino government by the left wing, the talks were indefinitely suspended. A 60-day cease-fire that expires Feb. 8 remained in effect. But the prospects for a resumption of talks and extension of the truce, the centerpiece of Mrs. Aquino's policy of reconciliation, have severely dimmed (Mydan 1987d:4-1).

The journalist portrays her policy of reconciliation, a large part of her political platform, as ineffective in resolving the problems of the Philippines.

In this way, the information provided by the previous articles is summarized to conclude that the march was an attempt by farmers to destabilize the government. They are reportedly doing this to reject the constitution and the democratic framework that it represents. What is backgrounded by this depiction is the possibility that the marchers represented a variety of groups democratically advocating for specific concerns surrounding the problems caused by current land distribution in the Philippines and their legitimate ideas for land reform to settle these issues. Government and military fear of right-wing groups, mentioned briefly in previous articles, is omitted from this summary account. Therefore, this summary article again accounts for the event by explaining that it is the groups on the "left," in cahoots with the Communist Party, all of whom do not support Aquino. What is omitted is any
possibility that these groups do not want to destabilize the
government and the possibility that the military may have
potential interests in not wanting these negotiations to
take place, or for the marcher perspectives to be publicly
legitimized.

Analysis of January 26th 1987 Article (1st)

Article Summary

This fifth article is the first to provide some context
and description of the participants in the march that day as
well as their families, yet these topics are backrounded to
the concerns and reactions of leftist groups to the event.
Its headline title is “Toll is 18 in Manila Shooting;
Leftist Chief Eases Criticism” (Mydan 1987e:A2). It appears
on page 2 section A of the Foreign Desk section of the
paper. There is a picture included of a line of people
looking at a row of coffins and the caption describes the
picture as mourners in Manila paying last respects to
victims killed by security forces during a demonstration
outside of Malacanang Palace (Mydan 1987e). This is a
shorter article as well, located in the top half quarter of
the newspaper page and is 508 words long.
In the first part of this article, the journalist confirms that the death toll has risen, and that a leftist group has eased its criticism of the Aquino government, issuing statements that she is not to blame for the violence that occurred (Mydan 1987e). There is no reasoning for why the group has come to this conclusion or whom they believe is responsible instead of Aquino. However, this comment is neutralized, backgrounding any potential attempts at reconciliation over definitions for the causes of the massacre by a following quote. The group is quoted as stating that any people are hurt or injured at a second rally to be held the following day at the site of the killings, that it will represent government insensitivity to the poor (Mydan 1987e). The Chief of Staff is brought up as with previous articles to be quoted as stating how the military advocated “maximum tolerance.” Organizers of a second march are quoted as stating that they hoped to meet with Aquino in a second, peaceful demonstration (Mydan 1987e:A2). A short description of the marchers is then given, with the journalist not citing where this additional information (not mentioned in the previous articles) has come from (Mydan 1987e).

In the second section, with a subheading title of, “Mournful Scene at Church,” families of the murdered are
described as coming into Manila from rural areas of the
country to claim the bodies of those killed (Mydan
1987e:A2). The journalist describes the scene as "mournful"
and importantly, the journalist uses quotes from family
members that foreground the marcher activities as violating
norms or expectations of family members by participating in
the march (Mydan 1987e). These quotes are included in the
following section under identified groups using
foregrounding, backgrounding, and omission techniques. In
this way, the journalist authorizes these voices to
demonstrate that marchers were not supposed to be
participating in that march according to their own community
members.

Overall, this description of the families coming to
claim the bodies shows how the marchers were not supported
by members of their family or community, therefore
foregrounding the concerns of the marchers as illegitimate
and as not being shared by their family or by community
members.

Authorized Subjects/Voices

Here, the main voice telling the story is the
journalist. He relies on official governmental sources to
summarize information about the event and then goes into
some detail describing the marchers as young farmers advocating for better conditions for farmers. As with previous articles, the conditions under which the marchers perceived the demonstration as a necessary way to get the attention of the government, or the conditions by which they were led to protest remain hidden (Mydan 1987e). The activities and events that led up to the march and the shooting continue to be left to official sources, primarily military, to describe. Farmer voices and a “leftist umbrella group,” as well as voices from family members remain secondary voices in the article (Mydan 1987e:A2). However, they are authorized in order for their viewpoints to be discredited by the journalist accounts. Leftist groups are quoted as advocating for action against the government, and discredited as they, “compared the Government unfavorably to ‘its fascist predecessor’” (Mydan 1987e:A2). Family members are utilized to discredit the goals of the marchers in terms of their “having not known” or in stating that they were “not sure why they did [go to the march]” (Mydan 1987e:A2). In this way, the goals of the march are discredited as not being supported by a marcher’s community. Therefore, these quotes are only authorized to appear in this account to reinforce the dominant interpretation of events - the military being provoked by an
aggressive and potentially violent crowd in a time of heightened political tension. In this way, the leftist group described and quoted is presented as representing the political arm of the march and the farmers are portrayed as ignorant of and isolated from the conditions for which the demonstrators marched.

**Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques**

In this article, the journalist highlights some of the context surrounding the aftermath of the shooting foregrounding what he thinks is important to discuss about the responses of the leftist groups, the military, and near the conclusion of the article, the families of those murdered. Overall, his summary of these groups and use of their voices legitimizes the overall accumulative construction of the story that the incident represents coordinated efforts to destabilize the government.

**The Leftists**

In this article, a leftist group is quoted stating that the group is less critical of the Aquino Government because they do not think she was responsible for the killings (Mydan 1987e). This is followed by a quote
warning that if there are any more shootings at the second
march, this will demonstrate that the groups will initiate
more action, which previous articles have built upon and
create an overall picture and definition of all actions by
these groups as violent.

Since the shootings, when Government troopers opened
fire on a farmer’s rally, the left has harshly
criticized the Aquino Government. … But a Bayan
leader, Leandro Alejandro, said today that the group
was withdrawing its criticism of the President because
‘we do not believe that she was directly responsible’
for the killings. However, he said, ‘if one more
rallyist or bystander is killed tomorrow, then you can
expect more decisive action from our end (Mydan
1987e:A2).

Interestingly, the spokesperson for this group foregrounds
the issue of how incidents of violence on the part of the
military represents the Government’s insensitivity to the
poor of the Philippines (Mydan 1987e:A2). Therefore, their
described “easing” of criticism of Aquino does not place
the blame for the violence onto any other group and is also
neutralized by a comment that appears as though the group
is threatening the government with further violence. In
this way, the possibility that the group was attempting to
reconcile differences with the government’s definition of
the situation is backgrounded and they are portrayed as an
isolated group with isolated, ambiguous concerns.
'One more killing will be enough to convince us that this Government is totally insensitive to the plight of the poor,' he [Bayan leader] said (Mydan 1987e:A2).

He reports that a leftist group is now less critical of her government because they believe she is not directly responsible for the killings and that the people must be able to march in a rally and that more violence will directly represent insensitivity to the poor (Mydan 1987e). Here is the first direct mention of the march in relation to people being poor, rather than as Communists, militant farmers, or leftist groups. Here this individual is clearly making connections between the government, the military, and practices that are insensitive to the poor. Yet, previous foregrounding of the groups this individual represents and the article emphasis on these activities as destabilization attempts. Therefore, the implications of this statement are effectively neutralized. Rather than appear as relevant claims, his words appear as though his speaking for the plight of the poor is yet another attempt by groups to heighten tensions rather than express legitimate concerns. This is the first mention of economic suffering at an individual level, and as represented solely as an issue of marchers, in all descriptions of the event and its surrounding issues in all articles I analyzed for this project.
The Military

The military perspective as an overall group remains the same as previous articles in foregrounding that the military supports the governmental policy of maximum tolerance. This continued foregrounding and accumulating definition of military response to the event backgrounds any possibilities that other agendas were at work to create the conflict than the dominant interpretation placing blame on the marchers in their attempt to destabilize the government.

The armed forces Chief of Staff Gen. Fidel V. Ramos, admitted on Friday that his troops had overreacted when the protestors tried to force their way through a military cordon around the presidential palace. General Ramos, reiterating Government policy, said today that his troops would attempt to show restraint at the rally Monday. ‘We want to let everyone know that the policy of the military is maximum tolerance,’ he said, ‘especially now that we have a democracy.’ (Mydan 1987e:A2).

This description, repeated throughout articles, emphasizes that the military are peacekeepers, not murderers or tyrants, who operate a policy emphasizing tolerance. He also quotes the military to foreground their stated commitment to democracy, implying that the other groups were not also supporting democracy through their protesting activities. Again, this account, as with most others, frames the military actions as peacekeepers by...
foregrounding the usual policy of the military to be one promoting tolerance. The issue of the military involvement in the event as representing specific members interested in destabilizing the government, is omitted and the emphasis on understanding the military’s actions emphasize their attempt as a group to be tolerant of the marchers while protecting the palace.

Marchers and Their Families

At the end off the article, family members of those murdered are quoted and the scene in which they have arrived to claim their murdered relatives is described. Marchers are described as young farmers in their 20’s and their family members are being quoted as ignorant of any purpose for the march or in knowing that the victim had been at the march in the first place.

Most of the victims were men and women in their 20’s and 30’s from farming and fishing villages a few hours from Manila. The rally was called to agitate for better conditions for farmers and other rural workers (Mydan 1987e:A2).

Family members of those murdered are presented as being unknowledgeable about the purpose of the march and about their relative’s involvement in the march. The journalist describes and quotes two family members in this manner.
Foregrounding the reactions of these families in particular, he writes that,

The family of Roberto Caylao, a 28-year-old farmer, arrived at the church from Battaan after hearing on the radio that he was among the dead. ‘His face was very sad when he left us,’ said his mother Alicia, a vegetable farmer. ‘His wife asked him not to go, and his brother too,’ she said. ‘I’m not sure why they did’ (Mydan 1987e:A2).

Next, he writes that,

Miguel Aribe, sitting by the coffin of his 19-year-old daughter Adelpha, said he had not known that she had left work on a coconut plantation to travel to Manila. He said it was only when he saw a photograph of her body in a newspaper two days after the incident that he learned of her death. ‘I recognized her right away’ (Mydan 1987e:A2).

Here then, the journalist offers some perspectives from the category he has placed the marchers within, as farmers, but through farmers and relatives that are not presented as having the same concerns as those that marched, therefore minimizing the still ambiguous reasons and context for the demonstration by marchers. He also uses these quotes to evoke the emotional nature of the family’s response to the event - not as anger but as sadness. No other group in this collection of articles, including Aquino, is described in these terms. As such, by foregrounding specific emotions in which to frame the family feelings, the journalist also discounts their perspectives as authorized and knowledgeable enough to speak about the issues involved.
in the representation of this event within the political and economic climate of the Philippines.

Overall, then, as in all previous articles, the event is framed based upon the actions of the farmers rather than the issues concerning them, while military sources are able to present the issues surrounding their actions to shoot into the crowd. The description of the scene at the church containing the bodies of those murdered is framed through the journalist interviewing family members that were against the marcher going or unaware of their participation and upon reading the paper or listening to the radio, coming to claim the bodies. As family members are portrayed as being either ignorant or disapproving of marcher participation in the event, the journalist uses their standpoints to further discredit the marchers but also the families - by foregrounding them as ignorant and emotional they are depicted as not knowledgeable about the situation. Therefore, family members are only useful for discussing, through their lack of knowledge about the issues, the lack of representation of people like them as participants in the march. In other words, their presence in the article provides readers with another normative group of characters to which the activities of the marchers can be compared to as representing non-normative behavior. Additionally, their
inclusion in the article implies that only family members came to mourn the bodies rather than other community members as well. In this way, the demonstrators are unable and the military is enabled to justify their response to the situation.

Analysis of January 26th 1987 Article (2nd)

Article Summary

In this last article, we see the primary framing for interpreting this article foregrounded as the central theme. It is titled "Test for Aquino: Will the Center Hold?" and is authored by Seth Mydan (Mydan 1987f:A1). It is also the second longest article at 912 words to describe the march and identify surrounding issues contained in this sample of articles. It is located on the first page of the Foreign Desk, in the first section, therefore given much prominence in the foreign news section of the paper.

In the first section, under the title heading, the journalist describes, referencing a Philippine journalists' opinion, how Aquino must make more decisive moves as a leader of the Philippines. The journalist foregrounds how she must fight challenges from both the politically left and right or else she will be unable to defend her presidency.
(Mydan 1987f). The march and massacre are then mentioned as an example that could mark "the downhill slide of the centrist Aquino government" (Mydan 1987f:A1). Here, the incident is clearly being connected to the debate as framed within the articles over Aquino's capability to be president of the Philippines. This quote also identifies her position as representing the position of the center, who, beyond brief mention in this article, have not been mentioned as a significant group with significant stakes in the outcome of this conflict between the government and other groups. Therefore, the potential differences in opinion between an invisible middle class and the government are omitted as the government is now represented by the journalist as representing this perspective. This also posits the demands or interests of either right or leftist groups as in opposition to people with more moderate political stances.

In the second section, under the subheading of "Mandate on the Line," the journalist describes how the constitution will put her previous "popular vote" in which she took the place of Marcos "on the line" for another election (Mydan 1987f:A1). The journalist then describes how she is now losing "supporters in the center" because her policy of reconciliation between the government and the Communist Party has been undermined by the shooting of the
demonstrators at the Mendiola bridge (Mydan 1987f:Al). She is indirectly quoted as having warned the Philippine public that more violence is to be expected in an attempt to disrupt the vote. This comment is reinforced in the article by the journalist foregrounding the position of the left in calling her repressive and in the right calling her incompetent. Here, again, the issues of two groups that have historically represented opposite goals for the government are placed into the same category as opposing Aquino as president, yet no direct quotes have been provided that directly state this to be true of leftist groups. The journalist interprets criticism of the government over the march as destabilization efforts in any form and the potential differences existing between leftist and right-wing group criticisms are backgrounded in order to accomplish this definition that prioritizes that the vote must take place over all other subjects.

In the third section, titled, “Heady Optimism Wanes,” the journalist foregrounds parts of Philippine history detailing how the “moderate center” had been victoriously united against Marcos and has been the group primarily responsible for implemented Aquino as leader through a popular vote (Mydan 1987f:Al). Yet the journalist describes how this group is now being forced out of decision-making
due to the lack of reconciliation between the Communist Party and right-wing groups. The journalist cites the resignation of the government negotiator and the resignation of the leaders of a presidential commission on human rights as supporting his framing of what the incident at Mendiola represents this to be true (Mydan 1987f). Again, the involvement of the Communist Party is foregrounded as being a significant player in these negotiations, with their causes and purposes outlined by official sources. Yet who represents the right wing groups, although suggested by the journalist to include certain members of the military loyal to Marcos or Enrile, for the most part still goes unidentified in these accounts.

The journalist foregrounds the relevance of a shifting in attitude by leftist groups towards Aquino to frame understandings of actions by these groups. He writes about how they originally did not participate in supporting her campaign for president, but seemed to support her after the overthrow of Marcos. Now they are described as taking part, along with the extreme right, in discrediting her ability to manage to find a peaceful solution and reconciliation to the polarized groups within the country (Mydan 1987f:A1).

Overall, the inclusion of this description of these groups foregrounds their position as vacillating between
options and unpredictable. In this way, the concerns they had are omitted as relevant to their current stance as portrayed by the articles.

In the fourth section, titled, “Meeting of Left and Right,” the journalist describes how Filipinos representing centrist positions desire Aquino to have more direction and be more decisive in her decision-making regarding the opposition she faces (Mydan 1987f:A1). A writer is quoted as stating that Aquino has lost an opportunity to “make some real changes” but what those changes are supposed to be from this voice authorized to represent the moderate center are not provided in the account (Mydan 1987f:A1). In this way, the journalist foregrounds dissatisfaction with Aquino but omits any direct quote by a representative of the moderate center that reveals what has caused this dissatisfaction. The journalist then discusses how Aquino’s response to all challenges to her government has been to form investigative commissions and that these actions are insufficient. In this way, her position and decision-making as president is foregrounded as being challenged by Filipinos, yet no substantive issues concerning her policies are actually discussed that would provide more information on what issues Filipinos representing the moderate center define as important issues to them. The journalist describes how
these centrist positions are being undermined by the conflicts occurring between left and right wing groups, who are described as having no aversion to violence unlike Aquino. Overall, the message in this paragraph foregrounded by the journalist is that Aquino must exert her power over conflicting groups or she will lose her presidency. Again, the possibility that the military is included as a group conflicted over her presidency is backgrounded in order to foreground the threat represented by the leftist groups, which at this point are made to be synonymous with the Communist Party.

The end of the article details how the President’s attempt at negotiations and reconciliation between disputing groups through an open-door policy has in fact made the situation worse. This is reportedly because she has allowed too many groups to “capitalize” on this opportunity to voice their grievances and “seize as much advantage as they can” (Mydan 1987f:A1). By describing these groups in such a way, Aquino’s attempts to move the groups towards peace are minimized as ineffective policies and the concerns of the groups she has been meeting with are minimized by the stated journalist assumption that these groups are there only to take advantage of Aquino. In this way, Aquino’s attempt to listen to people in her country is foregrounded to appear
not only to be failing, but as making the political situation of the country even worse. It ends with the journalist leaving her success or failure up to the reader to determine, although he does foreground that it has been either good timing or good luck, rather than her capacities to lead the Philippines, that have helped get her through troubled situations in the past.

Authorized Subjects/Voices

The journalist is the primary authoritative voice and he uses this position to summarize all points made in the previous articles. All other positions outlined in the previous article are mentioned to support the newest position introduced as critical of Aquino as a leader: the moderate center. This newest position is used to frame a reporting that the center losing faith could mark the decline of her presidency and popularity. In this article, the journalist has full creative control over summarizing the events he has been discussing in previous articles. He uses only two direct quotes throughout and both come from representatives of the center.
Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques

The primary message provided by the journalist is that the unsteady government of Aquino is going to fail unless she acts more decisively towards the groups opposing her. These groups have been defined in a cumulative accounting built up from previous articles as the extreme right, the extreme left (including the demonstrating "militant" farmers), the leftist groups, and the Communist group represented by the National Democratic Front (Mydan 1987f). The journalist foregrounds the important position support of the center holds for Aquino's future political career by foregrounding the role of politically moderate Filipinos in enabling Aquino's victory over Marcos. The journalist represents their position now to be one in which they feel "democracy should not be so passive" (Mydan 1987f:Al).

Overall, the reality of the social conditions upon which Aquino is basing her decisions are minimized by an emphasis on her personal popularity with people and certain negative personality characteristics such as her passiveness or indecisiveness. For example, the journalist foregrounds this interpretation in writing that,

Despite her new troubles, most people expect the President's popularity to carry the day and the charter to be ratified. But events may have gone too far now to be solved by the adoption of a disputed
constitution. Whether through good timing or remarkable luck, Mrs. Aquino has defused a series of challenges over the last 11 months, and she may set sail free again next month (Mydan 1987f:Al).

Therefore it is through timing or luck, rather than political skill, that Aquino will be able to survive these threats to her leadership. This undermines the potential difficulties Aquino had in claiming power back away from those traditionally in charge of certain social institutions that potentially wielded their power to undermine her reconciliation attempts or other policy decisions. Overall, her efforts to reconcile disagreements between groups are portrayed as ineffective, and the power differentials between these groups and their historical influence on government decisions is omitted from having any bearing in these activities. All leftist groups are quoted directly as critical of the government based upon economic terms and their standpoints are minimized through the journalist and official source labeling them as representing extreme positions (Mydan 1987f).

As a result, the journalist backgrounds all historical context by which groups were viewing her presidency, due to her speeches advocating her political platform. As the literature review reveals, this was a time in which groups whom had faced decades of conflict and severe abuse and
oppression by military members and plantation owner guards protecting those that have both political and economic power. The marchers went to face the politically and economically powerful members of society, the government and Congress, all wealthy landowners being protected by a fragmented military. They had acted based upon the promise that had been created by Aquino winning the popular vote and the understanding of a cease-fire in order to place their claims, however ambiguously described in the article series, for their president to consider in her decision-making.

Government Negotiations and Presidential Power

The journalist describes the government as facing much criticism from the left, right, and center political groups. This criticism is reported as stemming from her lack of decisive moves in response to groups and events meant to destabilize her government. The journalist writes that,

In short, the revolution Mrs. Aquino led a year ago remains incomplete. A repressive regime was removed, but her Government did not take decisive control of the antagonistic forces that had been set loose (Mydan 1987f:A1).

The journalist also writes about how chaotic the atmosphere is in the Philippines, due to the up-coming election, with
Aquino again stating that groups attempting to destabilize her will not be tolerated (Mydan 1987f).

Here, Aquino is presented as having no tolerance for rebellious activities while military sources used in the article and backed up through previous article descriptions, emphasize their position of tolerance. Therefore, the group that Aquino is directing her words to does not logically fit with the descriptions of the military activities or military position, and the military is being described as supportive of Aquino as the new president. Overall, this accumulative account of the relationship between Aquino and the military leads to an inference that she is talking about groups other than the military.

The President has put her popular mandate on the line in a plebiscite set for Feb. 2 on a proposed constitution. She herself has warned that the coming week will be a dangerous one, as her opponents seek to destabilize her Government and invalidate the vote” (Mydan 1987f:A1).

Additionally, by discussing the beginning loss of support from the center, the journalist implies that unless Aquino begins to act more aggressively towards these groups, her role as leader for the Philippines may end.

Although her opponents on both sides have now indulged themselves in calling her a dictator, some of her well-wishers say she may not be dictatorial enough (Mydan 1987f:A1).
The journalist also foregrounds descriptions of Aquino’s reconciliation efforts put into practice as fueling a situation in which the president’s efforts are being taken advantage of by groups that will not improve the political climate. He writes that,

The President’s efforts at reconciliation with the Communists, the Moslem separatists and other challengers, and her lack of retaliation against some of those in the military who have plotted against her, seem only to have fueled the conflicts. Each group, down to the local warlords, armed religious fanatics, and militant squatters, has sought to capitalize on what Mrs. Aquino calls the ‘democratic space’ she has created and to seize as much advantage as it can (Mydan 1987f:A1).

Overall, this article centers the discussion on how Aquino’s campaign will not succeed without the support of the moderate center. The journalist writes that,

Although her opponents on both sides have now indulged themselves in calling her a dictator, some of her well-wishers say she may not be dictatorial enough. ‘She has let slip the brilliant opportunity of her revolutionary Government to make some real changes,’ said F. Sionil Jose, a leading writer. ‘It makes me angry because I’ve waited for this moment all my life.’ (Mydan 1987f:A1).

The journalist also connects Aquino’s lack of decisiveness to the ability of the left to be more aggressive towards her and the newly formed government after Marcos.

The radical leftists and Communists, who sat out her popular revolution, were preempted by her commitment to democracy and human rights and her promises of reform. Over the first months of her presidency, while right-wing forces continued to agitate against her, the left
fell relatively quiet, voicing support for her ideals and admitting a tactical error in having failed to support her. There were signs last week that the left may finally have turned against her, provoking violence with an aggressive protest and suspending indefinitely the peace talks that are the heart of a cease-fire that expires next month (Mydan 1987f:A1).

The journalist foregrounds these issues to demonstrate how the shootings by the military represent Aquino’s policy of reconciliation towards these groups as failed and to undermine interpretations of these groups as legitimate in their expectations, inquiries, or responses to government activities and definitions of the Mendiola massacre.

Leftist and Communist Groups

This article foregrounds the actions of the Communists and leftist groups as representing their support of violent change in turning against the new Aquino government. This article, then, builds upon the information and assumptions presented in previous articles that are treated as facts or truth, and emphasizes that Aquino must respond decisively to these groups or lose her presidency (Mydan 1987f). He writes that,

After Thursday’s killings, there were suggestions here that the extremes of right and left, neither of which shares Mr. Aquino’s aversion to violence, had found themselves in a tacit alliance to squeeze out the moderate center. Their tactics of violence are difficult ones for her to oppose within the processes of democracy. But even her supporters, frustrated by
what they say is a lack of decisiveness and direction in her Government, now say there is no need for democracy to be so passive (Mydan 1987f:A1).

Therefore, the position of the moderate center is being constructed by the foregrounding that extreme groups are trying to take away the power of this moderate center group to get what they need from the new government. In this way, the constructed goals for this group representing moderate political viewpoints, is foregrounded as having different and conflicting goals with those goals of either the extreme left or extreme right. Therefore, the journalist is using some voices described as representing moderate positions to reinforce the overall interpretation provided for these events by the cumulative story offered by the newspaper articles.

The journalist also minimizes the groups that are struggling to raise issues important to them by labeling them as warlords, fanatics, and squatters trying to take advantage of the president’s policy of democratic space. He writes about how,

Each group, down to local warlords, armed religious fanatics and militant squatters, has sought to capitalize on what Mrs. Aquino calls the 'democratic space' she has created and to seize as much advantage as it can (Mydan 1987f:A1).

In this way, the journalist is able to background the needs or requests of groups approaching Aquino with concerns as
violating norms, as taking advantage of her position and offering, by making any potential requests. Thus, her power as a president is described as inefficient and undermined by groups seeking change, although the actual changes being requested are omitted from the account.

People Representing the “Center”

The “moderate center” is described as the group that enabled Aquino to rise to power, as the position that she represents within her government, and the group that can take away Aquino’s power if she loses their support because she cannot effectively work on reconciliation between competing groups.

Even some of her supporters in the center seem to have begun to lose faith in her. In protest against the killings, one member of her peace-negotiating panel with the Communists has resigned, along with the leaders of a presidential commission on human rights (Mydan 1987f:A1).

This is the journalists’ last group introduced to the reader and it is described as being the most important. The group is described as having the most impact on whether Aquino will be able to maintain her presidency, institute a democratic constitution, and lead the country towards economic and political stability and away from the
instability caused by the clamoring of extreme groups. He writes that,

One year ago, the improbable victory of the moderate center halted for a moment an increasing polarization of the nation, raising hopes for a nonviolent solution to its deep divisions. Now the President’s policy of reconciliation is under its most severe test (Mydan 1987f:A1).

Overall, the journalist depicts all groups critical of Aquino as unified in their attempts to destabilize the government, as a failure of Aquino's policy of reconciliation, and as advocating violent responses verses Aquino's position advocating non-violence. In this way, the journalist depicts non-violence as weak when associated with Aquino yet as appropriate when it is requested by the moderate center or when the military is stating that it was exercising in order to protect the palace. The journalist's use of these authorities prioritizes the perspectives of those already having some degree of established power in society. As a result, those groups historically excluded from power yet most impacted by these arrangements of power, are being prevented from adopting a cultural legitimacy to be included in Aquino's governmental decision-making and policy construction. This process by which groups other than those described as representing mainstream concerns are made invisible, is justified to the
American public through the cumulative impact of these discourses upon reader constructions of the event.

Article Analysis Conclusions

Overall, then, the journalist, using the structure of the newspaper writing genre constructs an interpretation that provides a foundation for understanding the event as part of a series of issues and events in the Philippines that official sources are relating to very specific political agendas and events. Investigating the foregrounding, backgrounding, and omission of people, issues, and incidents from these accounts demonstrates how the author of the articles framed the events to symbolize a country in need of U.S. help to establish order and facing confrontations from communists and other extreme groups. The event becomes a symbol which all official sources can use as a platform, which all politically authoritative voices can react against and use to back their different political standpoints.

The description of the event, then, represents a dominant interpretation presented by the journalist’s sources. Yes, these articles do report what happened at the event and frame what we can know about it. Yet when we look
at who does the telling over time, we can discover that the legitimate speakers involved in these discussions represent very specific political and ideological positions constructed/orchestrated by the journalist’s sources through arrangement within and between a series of stories, producing a cumulative effect on interpretations. This framework appears through the voices and subjects in the article who build upon each other’s statements to emphasize that the event represents an attempt to destabilize the government by extreme groups through militant activities.

The situation of the marchers is only hinted at through the journalist’s voice making vague reference to land policy reform and better working conditions for farmers. Most of these comments are neutralized by a sentence following that describes the behavior of marchers as aggressive and involving groups with “extreme” political perspectives and activities. The issues leading up to the march simply do not exist, nor the activities of the marchers during the days preceding the march. Additionally, nowhere in these articles does the journalist interview or document asking a participant in the march to detail the issues that led to the demonstration. Therefore, readers are left with no information from the demonstrators themselves that would inform them of the reasons for the demonstration. While 10-
30,000 people participated in the march, the American paper quotes not one in order to comment on the march in its aftermath. Instead, official sources are drawn on to create an official reaction which directs readers towards the political instability of the government and the struggle of the new government to exercise "maximum tolerance" towards extreme groups who, through military takeover or Communist negotiations, have the potential for further government destabilization.

Military officials, Aquino, Aquino's primary opponent in the presidential elections, and negotiators for the government and the Communist Party all provide their reaction to the event and the issues it involves that concern them throughout each article. For Aquino, it involves a concern that the event will be used to destabilize the government under her control. For her political opponent Enrile, it is a sign of weakness in the President that she does not have control over the military. For the military, it is because the marchers were too aggressive and were purportedly attacking the military as well, and for the communists, it is an attempt by the military to destabilize the Aquino administration and blame the communists. Only the communist group negotiator offers an alternative perspective on the event, mentioning that it
would be used by the military to blame the communists for the violence. In doing so, the march and shooting become another step in the struggle for Aquino to rebuild her government, in which now, the Communists will not be negotiating any further.

Therefore, the dominant frame built by the journalists through reliance on official sources is that the event happened at a time of increased violence. The Communists stop their peace talks for fear of their lives, the government is on alert and the military is preparing for a right-wing coup attempt from within itself while also trying to protect Aquino. Aquino is planning her presidential campaign and trying to protect herself from character attacks from her opposing candidate, Enrile. Moreover, it is the leftist groups, speaking out against the murders that get described the most as being the aggressors with militant attitudes who do not support the government. One is the left to wonder what has occurred that is omitted from the incident portrayal through these accumulated accounts for its occurrence. In other words, beyond the general question of what militant means for these groups, the greater question that is made invisible in these accounts of farmer activities, is what situations existed and what activities had already occurred that had caused a militant response to
the government. What social conditions had led the marchers to take such a strongly presented position concerning land reform issues? A discussion of this issue, the most directly described reason for the marcher's activities, is subsumed by all other depictions of the event.

As such, the possible interpretation of these events as representing the military as the aggressors in the attack and the demonstrators as victims is minimized throughout the succession of official voices building the interpretation of the event through the journalist frame. The left and Communists are repeatedly described as representing a potential disruption of the vote rather than as potentially advocating for specific concerns to be addressed by the new government as part of Aquino's reconciliation policy. The event, rather than stand for itself as an act of violence against a crowd demonstrating for reasons that have complicated historical roots regarding land distribution and its connection to the distribution of power, is constructed as representing a moment in which Aquino's ability to lead is questioned.

Further, through the construction of this framework, a debate is created around what should be the relationship between the government and other groups that may be critical or make requests for change. These groups are also
presented as opposing the government due to their criticism of it. Through the absence of identity regarding who the "right" represent, much of the debate centers on "leftist" groups criticizing democracy and neo-liberalism, rather than as informed positions coming from people who suffer or witness suffering as a result of these policies.

In this way, a reader is guided to interpret the event as an act by an unruly crowd made up of radical groups in order to destabilize the Philippine government and that the United States government is helping Aquino through this process financially as best it can. In this way, the issue of land reform becomes backgrounded or even omitted in interpretations of this event. A reader is not provided with more than a mention of land reform through official sources, whether as represented through military, government, journalist, or leftist group accounts mentioned in these articles. Instead, according to these viewpoints, the issues the demonstrators raised such as land reform are directly connected to violence and aggressiveness by protestors, through leftist groups attacking Aquino, and in relation to a more militant stance and canceling of negotiations by the Communist Party.

The journalist reports on the activities of the "militant farmers' group," such as their threatening a food
strike, rather than discuss the potential issues related to agriculture and land that frame the farmers' motivations for participating in the demonstration. Yet the literature review very clearly foregrounds some of the social conditions related to land reform issues that could have been expressed by the journalist as relevant to the marchers and their activities. Protests against social conditions for rural people such as high poverty and hunger rates, atrocities committed against them by the military and paramilitary armies of landowners, and the historical imperialist practices that forced people off of their lands could have all been issues being raised and represented by the demonstration.

The demonstration also represented a historical significance not mentioned in the articles but mentioned in the literature review. Historical movements against imperialist oppression are a part of Philippine history and in nationalist historical consciousness. This historical consciousness frames the United States as the main culprit in imperialist maneuvers in the Philippines. As such, the connection between imperialism and poverty in the Philippines is primarily due to U.S. corporate lending and development practices there. By omitting these connections as relevant to understanding the protest, the journalist
denies the relevance of the United States position of power in Philippine affairs as related to the concerns and activities of all groups discussed in the articles. In this article, the journalist ties the reaction by these groups to a criticism of "democratic liberalism."

In doing so, this article constructs the meaning of the shootings of the demonstrators into a debate over Aquino economic policy. Specifically, the article frames the meaning of the event to question Aquino’s power over the communist and leftist groups versus those that would implement "democracy" (or capitalism since with this democratic implementation comes development aid and favors such as rescheduling international debt). The potential consequences for Aquino if she acts in a way that the United States does not support is also omitted and the relationship between the countries as unequal in power is not described as influencing her decisions regarding her negotiations with these groups. In this way, the issues up for discussion become centered on the efforts of extreme groups to disrupt the constitutional process rather than the potentially problematic relationships existing between the powerful and powerless in the Philippines and as involving the United States. Aquino’s position becomes separated from the concerns of the groups critical of her, although the
potential of her position to also be separated from groups not critical of her is omitted as well. As a result, the journalist constructs the meaning of the incident as a march in which the military, in protecting the palace from harm, overreacted to the situation. This subsumes the possibility of the role of the military as an active party attempting to destabilize the government during the short period of time before the constitutional vote.

Overall, the message that develops with which a reader has to draw on as a resource represents a description of the situation and a social construction of reality in certain neo-colonial terms. These issues are all described as requiring military support and responses. Yet, in order to implement security and safety of the palace against groups, the military will need continued financial aid from international lending organizations and other countries, and specific continued funding from the United States. Based upon what we can know about the economic, post-colonial relationship between the Philippines and the United States, it logically follows that this aid could not be gotten without the intervention and assistance of the United States.

In this way, the articles report information that frames a justification of violent solutions to these
problems, the necessity of military intervention, and the minimization of peaceful solutions or reconciliation policies and peace talks. This is done by the journalist emphasizing economic concerns and treating perspectives that do not fit into the dominant discourse on relations between the United States and the Philippines (e.g. the marchers and their issues) as threats to the stability of the country. These non-traditional perspectives are further marginalized through descriptions of how these approaches lead to behavior that will worsen rather than improve conditions in the Philippines. Other voices that contradict dominant interpretations are framed primarily as representing leftist concerns, such as those representing Communist negotiators and farmers, are placed as adversaries to the dominant position (the government) and represent a perspective that threatens the power of the United States. However, the United States and official sources within the Philippines have total control in defining in relation to them, to the march, and to the future of the Philippines. This, all the more, creates a framework that supports military solutions to the scenario. In this way, the media genre, through its reliance on dominant frameworks of interpretation and resources that support status quo conditions, focus the discussion away from describing how imperialism, existing
through unequal trading relationships, leads to the suffering of many of the poorest Filipinos. Rather, the media frames emphasize the need for the government, military, and international lending groups to take action in order to stabilize the economy and the control of the government over its people.

Therefore, in this chapter, I have demonstrated how authorized voices relied upon by the journalist describe the relationship of the United States to the Philippines in colonial and neo-colonial terms. Additionally, I have demonstrated that the authorized voices and subjects present in the articles whose voices the reader is relying upon for information, frame the marchers and the event as an attempt by leftist and Communist groups to destabilize the government, and as such, destabilize the power of the military. In the next chapter, I will discuss the results of the discourse analysis of the interviewee statements and then compare and contrast the results to the results of the newspaper article analysis.
CHAPTER VI

INTERVIEWEE ACCOUNTS

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I demonstrated how the framing of the incident through the newspaper article depictions represents a discourse primarily informed by those voices authorized through the structure of media work and journalist practice, supported by powerful institutions in the social structure. As such, the journalist relies upon and editorial decisions support certain voices authorized to describe what happened. These voices name the concerns of the military, government, and both U.S. and Filipino bank representatives, all of whom are prominent in the depicting of the events. Therefore, these voices are foregrounded in the newspaper content on discussions of why the shooting happened verses why the march happened. In this way, the article's collective account represented by all six articles, emphasizes consequences to the government and backgrounds the consequences to the Filipino people to whom the statements are referencing, and in fact, makes the account of the marchers invisible.
Consequently, a dialogue beginning from the newspaper's accounting for the event and its surrounding issues tends to frame the consequences of this incident to be the negative impact it will have on the Philippine economy, government, and military and international debt relations between the Philippine Bank and its global creditors. It logically follows then that the articles create a discourse that results in the need for military and economic interventions that are typical tools of neo-colonial control. In these ways, the newspaper articles represent dominant cultural codes for U.S. readers to use when interpreting international events and the relationship between the United States and countries who are greatly financially indebted to U.S. investors and international aid and development organizations that is inherently colonial.

Using the information I gathered from the literature review and my analysis of the articles, I asked myself, if the articles represent a discourse emphasizing dominant cultural codes for U.S. citizens on foreign relations between the United States and the Philippines. If so, then what alternative framing could the interviewees bring in for consideration? What conclusions did interviewees draw from not only their experiences in the Philippines, but about the work that had brought them together to participate on that
trip in general? Additionally, how could my literature review enable me to see even more meaning in each perspective?

In this way, the interviews enabled me to develop a better understanding of some of the more general experiences my mother had gone through in working on social justice issues through the church in the 1980s and be expanded upon through the stories of participant life experiences. I had always, to varying degrees throughout my life, understood her standpoint on issues of social justice, to be radical because of her anti-corporate perspective and attitude towards world hunger. I knew this from the reaction of some members of the local church community and even by some members of my family who marginalized her ideas and stigmatized her work by labeling it communist. As a result, I felt the interviews would tie in and add to my understanding of what had happened in the life of my mother and others as revealed through the lives of others doing this type of work as well.

Because the interviewee accounts provide descriptions that are experientially based, their work to interpret these events and the surrounding issues develop from different frameworks. They rely more on self than structural editing of their responses to me and they rely on different
resources for information than those informing a journalist, such as their experiences and their religious beliefs and their commitments to human rights and social justice.

Because they have these different resources to draw on, and because my questions emphasized their work activities, their experiences in the Philippines become framed within the context of their work on social justice issues. Consequently, their perspectives draw on resources not recognized by people in the process of constructing mainstream news as legitimate, reliable sources of information. However, because I am prioritizing their experiences as essential to my understanding of this event as sociological, I am authorizing their voices in culture as standpoints important to depictions of this event.

My questions asked them to explain their purposes, reasons, causes, and explanations for the event and their work activities. This enabled me to investigate how interview participants framed their issues - what voices they authorized and what incidents in history they used as resources in constructing their understandings in explaining them to me. Specifically, what issues for them did they foreground as important to understanding what was happening in the Philippines and how these ideas were related to them.
- the relationship between what they saw and their own lives.

In this way, I as a writer and researcher played a significant role in the foregrounding as well as backgrounding of groups and topics discussed by participants just by nature of my constructing the questions and guiding the interview through a semi-structured format. Here then, my interviewing practice, although structuring the accounts in a particular way, is distinct from the journalist's practice, as I am drawing on different resources: my literature review, my sociological perspective, and the memories of my mother's work.

I am of course, now involved in the project analysis, and therefore am also drawing on my analysis of the newspaper articles in order to see how each account is similar or different than the others. Therefore, this analysis combines my voice as the first to be authorized in detailing this account, as I asked participants specific questions about their trip through which they organized their responses. However, since the interviews were semi-structured, there was a lot of room for people to talk about what they specifically experienced and felt. My research job was to organize these responses into themes and discuss the foregrounding and backgrounding in responses. In this
way, I organized interviewee responses into my research questions asked people to organize their stories into two general sections. This chapter is therefore organized by each main topic that I wanted to investigate through my interview questioning. As stated throughout this document, the small sample utilized to discuss these issues represent an approach to a case study that, ...seeks to point out merely that a given phenomenon exists [original emphasis] in some setting, as opposed to an analysis of its causes (Ragin & Becker 1992:105). As such, this investigation approaches the research in probabilistic rather than deterministic terms (Ragin & Becker 1992).

All people that participated were representing board members or staff of the organization that sponsored the trip, which was customary. Board members represented roles as workers in ecumenical organizations targeting hunger and social justice issues as well as community member representatives. The organization that sponsored the trip is a non-profit group supported by different denominations and organized through a national church council. The purpose of the organization is to establish networks between different types of people’s organizations and development programs targeting poor, rural, hungry, and many times landless people living within the United States or abroad.
This organization is therefore described through participant remarks as well as the separate types of ecumenical organizations that were networked with this sponsor organization and represented on its board. Overall, each person interviewed participated in a wide range of work activities that were organized around social justice issues, most of which were linked to organizing people in order to effectively address poverty and hunger issues at the local, national, and international levels.

The first section discusses and analyzes responses to my questions involving the structural circumstances that brought people together as well as their experiences on that trip: the organizations that each person represented, the purpose of the trip, and what happened on the day of the march to Mendiola. The second section discusses and analyzes responses to my questions involving more subjective, experiential reflections on their work in the 1980s: the political climate of the 1980s and its impact on their work, their positions as Americans doing this work, and the impact of these experiences on their lives. I end this chapter with an overall analysis of the information provided through interviewee accounts. As such, I authorized their voices to be legitimate speakers about the event in the Philippines, and the resources they used in
understanding the relationship of their lives to the occurrence of this historic event as compared to the discourse located within the newspaper text.

I interviewed three women and three men for this project. Half of the participants were working in roles as educators within church organizations targeting different congregations concerning the church’s responsibility to play an active role in engaging issues of social injustice and half worked as organizers of different people’s movements. Together, they represented a wide range of constituents supporting the role of the church in illuminating social justice issues surrounding hunger and poverty through support of the church. They were public speakers, administrators who could provide funding for projects, and some were individuals who had received this type of support that helped them as part of a community group to organize around a particular issue. They were individuals who worked through the sponsoring organization strengthen the networking between different groups of people and organizations that could be used as resources to direct to small organizing groups. I present their responses using pseudonyms for each person: Nancy, Jean, Donna, Walden, Bruce, and Darwin. I want to note here that most participants pointed out to me that they did not care
if I identified them in the project. One pointedly noted that by needing to erase their public identities in order to document their accounts, that this was also the work of ruling structures in keeping alternative voices and perspectives illegitimate in U.S. culture. However, in order to complete the requirements of this degree and because I had no idea who I was going to interview, what subjects would be brought up, or how people might need to be protected, I kept their pseudonyms. I organized their responses around the central themes I saw arising in responses to my questions. As such, not every person's voice is represented in each of these analysis sections, as some people had less or more to say about certain issues than others. So new voices appear in the analysis as their discussions become relevant in conjunction to other responses.

Section I: Organizational Ties and Trip Experiences

Section I: Authorized Subjects/Voices

I asked participants to talk with me about the organization they had been representing at the time of the trip and speak a little bit about the work that they were doing at the time. I also asked them about the purpose of
the trip and their experiences in the Philippines, specifically those experiences that informed them of what happened at the Mendiola march. I foregrounded this topic in order for them to be able to introduce themselves through their organizational connections and work at the time. It also enabled them to detail the different types of groups and organizations that had come together for a common purpose through their participation on the trip. Therefore, this information provided me with a good glimpse of the types of inter-organizational networks and activities within the ecumenical community that were connected through the organization sponsoring the trip.

The voices authorized in their introduction to their work were the voices of the churches they represented, of the organization sponsoring the trip, and the voices of the people they met, including members of the group that marched to Mendiola.

Interviewees authorized four voices in answering my questions concerning their work, the purpose of the trip, and their experiences in the Philippines. First, they authorized their own voices in expressing their personal, individualized purposes for making the trip as legitimate and meaningful. Second, some discussed the purpose of the trip from the standpoint of their organizational role,
therefore as an organizational representative for their particular group in what this trip would enable them to do based upon what they expected to learn. Third, they discussed it from the standpoint of the sponsoring organization. Fourth, they discussed it from the perspective of the poor or landless people organizing in local communities around hunger and justice issues that they met on this trip with respect to who they met on the trip. They also referred to their past experiences as well as from those people they had met on other international trips of this nature as well as in their work within their local communities with people organizing to confront poverty, hunger, and other social injustice issues.

In such a way, interviewees authorized and legitimated the voices of the poor and rural farmers, some of whom participated in the march to Mendiola, as well as other groups of Filipinos organizing for various civil rights activities during this time of government leadership transfer. Through foregrounding and backgrounding techniques, they authorize the churches they worked for, the networks of which they were part, and the standpoints of the people they worked with and met - the poor, people's movement activists (both national and international movements), the U.S. government, and the position of the
sponsoring organization. As such, they weave a tale connecting the United States to not only the Philippines, but other countries as well and they demonstrate this connection through their interactions with people in their everyday lives and the consequences of these actions for them.

Section I: Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques

In this first section, interviewees discussed their organizational affiliation and the purpose of the trip. They also discussed the purpose or reasoning for the march as they understood it and who they talked to in order to get this picture of the reasons for the event, and then lastly, provided a description from eye witnesses of the march and massacre. Overall, the interview participants authorized voices in traditional institutions (church) as well as non-traditional roles (such as the marchers, farmers, and people experiencing poverty) and used their roles in non-traditional ways in order to emphasize the issues that the marchers were attempting to get addressed by the government. They framed marcher perspectives based upon the people they met while on the trip as well as from their past work on hunger and social justice issues in other countries. In
this way, the interviewees discuss the context in which the
march took place based upon the needs and concerns of the
people most directly suffering from the policies of land
reform.

Interviewee Group/Organizational Affiliations in 1987

When participants began to talk about their
organizational work during the 1980s, they tended to begin
to foreground four issues relevant to their explanations for
the work in which they were involved. First, they
foregrounded the importance of defining social injustices as
stemming from the unequal distribution of power and
resources as critical to their work. Here, they also
foregrounded their role as educators and networkers working
with different church committees to educate different
constituencies (church administration and congregations or
policy makers) about this approach to hunger and poverty.
Here, they described a goal to support solutions not only
alleviating the problem of hunger but also enabling
communities to move towards long-term sustainability through
agricultural projects identified by the community as needed.
Second, they foregrounded the need for financial support of
grassroots organizing both within and external to the United
States through church collection monies that adopted aspects
of this definition of hunger. Third, they relied upon
discourse describing social inequalities to explain their
work on poverty and hunger issues, explaining that social
injustices and poverty issues (including inaccurate
definitions and ineffective solutions) stem from
systematically occurring racism, sexism, and classism
implemented through the imperialist practices of U.S.
foreign policies. Fourth, they discussed the importance of
establishing both institutional and individual networks
between organizations and groups trying to help people
organize their community to change these issues.

Contesting Mainstream Definitions of Poverty and
Hunger: Causes and Solutions. Interview respondents
discussed how their definitions of poverty hunger, its
causes, and its solutions differed from mainstream public
depictions, and the programs and ideologies supporting
government attempts to construct these issues. Participants
discussed how their definitions for the causes and solutions
to poverty and hunger represented a critical analysis of
those social structural factors that reinforce unequal
distributions of power and resources throughout a society
(both nationally and internationally). All foregrounded the
connection of these social structural factors to power and
inequality existing from local to national and international community levels. They also foregrounded the importance of solutions to these issues that advocated education and structural change in order to identify what they considered to be the root causes of poverty and hunger.

For instance, Nancy foregrounded the role of educating congregations to facilitating peoples' understanding within a church of how social change regarding hunger and poverty issues could occur. She emphasized the importance of discussing these perspectives to combat general media definitions of hunger and poverty.

As particular things came up we would highlight them because we thought that was an opportunity to start making the global local connections in people's minds. And so every opportunity was taken to share how it happened, not just to say 'oh we need to flood it with money.' And a lot of your local televised relief efforts don't have the opportunity to work with people long-term. They can only give you some kind of flash picture of the starving babies to get the money to roll in but they're not there to help you understand why we continue having starving babies. And that's the role we thought we played within the churches.

In this way, she foregrounded the role of the church as a place in which these local to global connections between people and social conditions could be foregrounded rather than the general media images which did not make this same connection. She brought up another crucial point in discussing how her organization was involved in more
directly political positions due to its emphasis on self-sustainability in communities.

We gave small grants to some of those agencies that weren’t hunger programs because some of the work they did related directly to viable hunger programs. In other words, saving black farms in the south. The Federation of Southern Cooperatives helped organize black farmers to get better prices, to maintain their lands, not to be done in by banks. And yes it’s a step or two removed from development assistance or relief, direct relief, but it is maintaining people’s ability to feed themselves. And that’s what hunger programs should be.

Here Nancy was challenging the dominant definitions of and solutions towards world hunger as involving a lack of food resolved through direct relief efforts - exporting food to feed people. As discussed in the literature review, I demonstrated how food aid is used as a form of coercion and object of control because it places a country in further dependency to the country that has provided the food. Rather, she encouraged congregation members to understand the relationship between control over land by multinational corporations or banks, and readjustment policies concerning agricultural production in communities to loss of power to develop food for local community consumption, therefore instigating hunger and poverty through this structural power arrangement. These changes resulted in poor people in primarily rural lifestyles losing the ability to be able to feed themselves. In this way, she connected how
readjustment practices and trade policies organized primarily by the United States within its own continent as well as abroad forced small farmers out of business by encouraging the consolidation of small farms into larger production sites to congregation members and political constituents. In this way, she foregrounded the concerns of the farmers, and backgrounded the concerns of U.S. corporate interests in developing a definition of the causes and solutions to hunger and poverty.

Nancy also explained how an international perspective on issues of hunger and justice was essential to understanding how hunger is connected to national and global trade policies and foregrounded the role of grassroots development in response to these policies.

To look at it from an international perspective the root causes of hunger are often the policies in world trade. We wanted people to understand that there were currents in hunger trends. That the occasional famines that occurred might be short term or long term based on the particular circumstances and that this often meant contributing to organizations in the country where it took place. That this was to make sure that some grassroots development around agricultural issues or craft creation for income took place to meet people’s food needs.

Here she foregrounded her definition of both the causes and solutions to hunger and poverty issues as requiring discourse on world trade policies from an international perspective. She also foregrounded the importance of making
direct, real connections on the ground, at the grassroots level as critical in helping congregation members understand their connections to other countries. Overall, she uses the media description comparison to demonstrate how images of hunger and poverty can be deconstructed from having no discernable origin to real, understandable processes. From here, she foregrounded an alternative construction of the root causes of poverty and hunger by backgrounding dominant images to descriptions of how United States policies contributed to the problem of hunger combined with the perspective of the people working on self-development projects supported through congregation donations. In this way, she foregrounded her role within the organization as a facilitator who worked to connect local meanings about action around the issues of poverty and hunger to these broader issues. She stressed the local impact of global trade policies and the need to sustain local production as a solution to keeping people out of poverty implemented through grass roots organization and development around agricultural and sustainability issues to meet people’s food needs.

Bruce explained his organizational work as focused on issues of poverty and hunger in communities. He foregrounded the importance of cultivating local community
support and self-sustainability for the implementation of food aid projects at both national and international levels in explaining his perspective towards these issues. Consequently, as he discussed his work as a lobbyist on food policy issues, he backgrounded the relevance of most U.S. government and mainstream international aid programs towards resolving hunger in communities. He explained that they fail because of the tendency for project creators to not acknowledge these two issues as relevant in their program designs. In this way, he discussed how self-development and sustainability in development projects are backgrounded or omitted in the designs for larger aid programs.

Well, ideally our goal was to lessen the extent and the impact of hunger and poverty of people throughout the world. We believed that while aid was necessary, it was not a solution. And that rather there needed to be change in systems. So that people in poverty had a more equitable and just opportunity to achieve at least self-sustainability. Self, being defined as the family unit at that point. And to that extent, while there were great differences in degree, there were essentially the same needs and goals for self-sustainability domestically and internationally. That in both cases, the structures and systems that were then and still are in place so that it is extremely difficult for a lot of people to obtain sustainability.

Here, he foregrounded how these programs fail because they do not emphasize systematic inequities that are the root causes of poverty and hunger. He also stressed how the solutions background or omit self-sustainability practices
and the necessity of buy-in from the participants the aid is supposed to help the most in a community. Here, he made another type of local to global connection by foregrounding how cultural insensitivity to structural conditions of a global system shaped by neo-colonial powers and politics creates hunger as a consequence of systems. He discussed how these systems create a local environment in which it is extremely difficult for people to act in order to stop living in hunger and poverty. In further comments, he emphasized how the mainstream systems in place to provide food aid to people both domestically and internationally created barriers to poor peoples' abilities to access pathways out of poverty and sustain themselves. He described these barriers as developing from the implementation of program policies that did not consider the realities of people's lives and their abilities to sustain imported program initiatives without continued aid from outsiders. He discussed how,

Most of the government top-down, US government, USAID, but even frequently when the US government would fund governments of foreign countries for programs. And indeed even some, a large number of non-profits did, which creates structures that were not bought into by the people themselves or had not developed in light of, with, and by people who were actually going to be living it. And so when the aid stopped, when the organization left, the program collapsed. There was nothing there. It was being done in many ways to please the "doer" rather than to actually change the
circumstances of the people who were supposedly to be helped.

His solutions suggest that he worked to change the systematic nature of mainstream responses to hunger in terms of food aid by lobbying the national government from the perspective of local peoples. He also problematized the traditional relationship between funding sources from wealthy countries and recipients by making visible the contexts as representative of unequal power relations and solutions that reinforced these relations. That people in poverty were forced to embrace this relation for resources regardless of whether or not they had actually adopted the process as legitimate.

He foregrounded his role in advocating for the rights of local peoples to be heard when policies were developed that impacted the poor and hungry, both nationally and internationally. Specifically, he emphasized the need for policy makers to understand the critical importance of supporting local community decision-making to use the aid for the purposes they saw as necessary versus the general trend of the federal government that required they design the plan for action before distributing funds.

Trying to get governmental programs that would inform policy work with things other than from government down. Trying to make funds available to work with indigenous economic development programs that generally
had a better track record than the government or outside USAID in terms of sustainability.

Again, here he foregrounded self-sustainability, an understanding of which is developed by working with indigenous groups to implement a program as a root solution to the eradicating poverty and hunger in a community.

Donna foregrounded the relevance of people in local communities at the grass roots level having the ability to resolve the hunger and poverty they experienced as critical to effectively reduce or eliminate hunger due to the difference in power relationships as well. She described how the sponsoring organization was successful at organizing people in local communities around hunger and poverty issues by describing the different power relationships involved.

The focus [of the sponsoring organization] had always been in terms of working with what they call people's organizations, the grass roots as opposed to the more institutional structured organizations. Sometimes you have lay entities within churches but sometimes they become very institutionalized themselves. And so just the concept that the association is more of people coming together because they really want to come together to try to do something as opposed to an institution which is much more structured and has a different kind of focus. So even though it attempts to be involved with things that make an impact, a lot of its involvement is about maintaining the institution so it's a different kind of power relationship.

Therefore, she talked about how impediments to change sometimes develop from a tendency of people within
organizations to institutionalize their processes, therefore changing the nature by which people come together to analyze a common problem. Both Donna and Bruce therefore frame their work in contexts that enabled them to value local perspectives on development issues yet also backgrounded the relevance of their role as funding sources in impacting power relations with people being funded through their programs as well.

Another participant, Walden, who had worked for the sponsoring organization at the time, foregrounded how the sponsoring organization came to transfer its organizational goals throughout his time there. In response to my questions about his work on social justice issues and the goals of the organization, he described how the sponsoring organization transformed its organizational goals. He discussed their move from traditional approaches to hunger resolution, specifically through direct relief and large technology projects as put forth in the Green Revolution, to an alternative approach that emphasized local networks and self-sustainability efforts.

In 1970 the organization was at a crossroads. It used to be known as a technical organization focusing on services to farmers. In a sense, it was there when this whole optimism about the new technology in agriculture came out. You know, I mean the high yielding varieties: the miracle rice, the Green Revolution. And so [sponsor organization] was the
technical organization for the churches for that. And it used a lot of rural missionaries as they were called, to bring this technology all over the place. And you’d have churches for instance running farms based on this, demonstration farms, based on this technology. But, after awhile, they found out in their experiences that this was not really hitting the root of the problems in the rural areas in the Third World. And so they started asking questions and said, ‘Well, what do we need to do? What’s the new approach?’

Here Walden discussed the traditional role that churches and missionaries working internationally played in implementing agricultural technology and foregrounded their experiences in this process as critical in educating them about the failure of these methods in eliminating the root causes of hunger and poverty in sustainable ways within communities. As the literature review also suggested, an increase in agricultural technology and farming methods failed in many communities due to the reasons that Bruce suggested. The literature review documents how the technology required for these types of farming were many times too expensive for smaller, poorer, farmers to be able to maintain. As a consequence to this recognition, Walden discussed how members of the organization traveled to many parts of the world and came back with recommendations for a new organizational direction.

They decided that the main theme [surrounding hunger and poverty issues] was that there was a lot of people’s organizations, peasant’s organizations out there. Who were doing all they could in terms of
providing food, in terms of organizing themselves together. As a result, the recommendation they had was to come out in a program that will help support these different people's organizations, different peasants organizations, farmers organizations. And so they have that, just that insight. That vision. Supporting rural people's organizations. And then they were looking for people then with experience on that to help them operationalize that concept.

In this way, he also foregrounded the necessity of gathering knowledge from local communities most impacted by hunger and poverty in order to provide the organization with accurate, legitimate knowledge about their conditions and needs upon which their organization would be based. Regarding the Philippines, he noted that,

You have to study the situation right now in terms of the land. In places like the Philippines urbanization has caught up very much. Places where you used to plant rice and vegetables and all that sort of thing, are urban areas now. And the land commands infinitely higher prices than they used to. Also so the pressure to farmers of selling their land because of the price is very strong and in fact farmers have sold their land so that former farm lands are being turned into malls, mega-malls. So you have to take all of this into consideration. That metropolitan Manila has become, is not just Manila and its suburb cities, but has now gone to the countryside. It has expanded into what used to be farmlands.

From this perspective, by studying the specifics of a country, one can assess the structural inequalities existing between countries and peoples that reinforces the social positions of the poor and the wealthy. Essentially, he substantiated other interviewee accounts by emphasizing the
relationship of structural inequalities to loss of land, neo-colonial practices in operation. Its impact on people’s lives to which they had solutions were minimized by mainstream U.S. government perspectives, yet here shown to be critical in constructing and supporting effective solutions to these issues.

Nancy also foregrounded the relevance of preventative work in helping people keep their farmland by helping groups organize to protect themselves from becoming poverty-stricken and hungry. In this discussion, she noted that this type of organizational support for groups organizing to stay out of poverty by her denomination was outside of mainstream definitions of hunger and poverty solutions mandated for church programs focusing these issues. She discussed how,

Some of these are organizations that helped maintained organizations of small black farms in the rural south. And so there are all kinds of connections there but that was just a little too far removed for direct relief and development assistance for the other hunger programs. So yeah we did disagree. Yes they thought that Prairie Fire and some of these other organizations were doing good work but they couldn’t fund them. They just didn’t fit close enough to what they were mandated to do in their program.

Here she foregrounded the importance of her organization working with a definition of hunger and poverty causes that differed from mainstream definitions shaping the mandates of
different denominational programs working on hunger issues through traditional formats. She discussed how her organization, with this knowledge, was able to support groups that were advocating for small farmer's rights to maintain land and utilize small farming techniques in the face of the rising push for corporate agribusiness.

Essentially, by describing the policies as maintaining a community's state of dependence and situation of poverty on ineffective aid patterns that do not disrupt the global economy, these participants' descriptions discuss how their work experiences informed their understanding of and definitions of poverty and hunger.

The Role of the Church. Half of the participants described the importance they placed on the role of the church as an advocate for eliminating poverty and hunger both nationally and internationally. They foregrounded their use of its funds for projects supporting development practices utilizing local community members' knowledge and self-sustaining agricultural projects as well as community organizing that attempted to prevent people from falling into poverty and hunger through the loss of their land, farm, or home, or employment. In this way, the churches through which some participants worked or were affiliated,
were described as a space where congregations could learn about the role of the church and its members in actively supporting the self-development of people in poor communities as a step towards eradicating hunger and poverty.

Nancy, a participant who was working in a program that distributed grants to groups organizing around hunger and poverty issues, described how her work fit into the goals of her program to educate people about hunger. Her program emphasized constituency education (speaking from the pulpit as well as to different church groups) to speak to people about the connection between loss of self-sufficiency and the prevalence of poverty and hunger in communities. She spoke about the need for church dollars to fund programs that increased local capacities towards self sufficiency verses emphasizing the role of direct relief as the only solution.

Her work also entailed educating people on the impact of industrial trends on this pattern, and the importance of church monies being contributed to programs that developed a community to be self-sustaining rather than dependent on food donations. As she put it,

The primary goal of the [name of program] was to make sure that [denomination members] understood the root causes of hunger. It was so they had a way of
participating in eradicating the root causes as well as the symptoms, which are the way poverty is felt in communities around the country. And by participating it means that we took the dollars that were contributed for hunger relief and channeled them into organizations that applied to us around a variety of poverty and hunger related issues.

Here she introduced her work as a grant provider and foregrounded the relevance of framing the activities of passing the collection plate within a church as a way in which congregation members can participate in defining poverty and hunger related issues. In this way, she highlighted one way in which her work was able to directly connect people’s understandings of what participation in resolving social injustices such as poverty and hunger meant within the framework of Christian beliefs. She foregrounded the importance of donations as an act of participation by congregations to approach the issue of hunger in a way that was more than just a temporary improvement. In this way, her work defined collection plate donations as representing a chance for congregation members to get involved in these issues. Here she foregrounded the ways in which church members traditionally had participated in giving support to church causes with non-traditional use of funds to support non-traditional perspectives on acts to resolve hunger. These activities were non-traditional also in the sense that she provided congregations with opportunities to see the
relationship between lifestyles of United States citizens and hunger and poverty in international communities.

Although she prioritized the importance of obtaining continued funding and support from congregations and church administrators, she also emphasized how this process connected people's local lives and their understanding of their lives in relation to the global world using spirituality to make this connection.

More importantly, it was to help local churches understand what they could do and how they could do it. How they could be involved, how important it was. It was a way of globalizing the church in terms of understanding how it fit in the whole of creation.

In this way, Nancy's work reflected some of the goals described in the rise of the ecumenical movement and its response to social injustices. Specifically, she discussed how trying to connect local lives of middle class congregation members to their responsibilities to attend to the suffering in other countries which may be due to lifestyle choices made and take for granted in the United States. She continually emphasized the spiritual side of these activities in relation to how these understandings enabled her to reach publics using the space of the church that she otherwise would not have been able to reach.

That's a place where people went for help to understand their part of Creation and Faithfulness, response to Faithfulness. And in that context they're
more willing to listen and think it through and start to think of alternatives. And you don't get lifestyle change unless you start to understand why from a bigger level. It has to come from deeper within to make a real lifestyle change. It has to be something that touches you as a human being.

Here, she emphasized the relevance of educating congregations on their personal, spiritual connections to frame an understanding of acting on global social injustice and the unique role of the church in providing a space where people were more open to listening to ideas not promoted by mainstream, dominant discourse. Here we see how the discourse discussed as developing in the literature review is put into practice in negotiating definitions of hunger and poverty within the Christian community. At one point she foregrounds the contributions of her understanding of church member involvement on these issues directly in talking about how,

It's all integrated in what a way of making both the lives of the church whole and the lives of the individuals in the church whole as well, as the community outside the church understand that the church is part of the wholeness.

A second participant, Bruce, worked at the level of public policy lobbying in his role as an educator and church representative. He foregrounded the relevance of presenting as a strong constituency of religious denominations when advocating for policy changes in Washington regarding the
poor and hungry at the national and international levels. He spoke about how,

We worked we had an ecumenical body, in D.C., and when we first started out we had pretty good impact in fact. Probably more than we deserved. That is, we were perceived as being able to generate a lot of support from within the religious community because we would walk in saying we're representing the UCC, the Presbyterian, the Methodist and Lutheran, Episcopal, and the Roman Catholic, Jewish, Baptist, what have you, all in this coalition. The members of Congress really got thinking we could generate a lot of pressure and votes. We were welcomed and heard by the members of congress and by the members of committees and so forth.

Here, he demonstrates how an ecumenical movement that combined representatives from a diversity of Christian churches began to be perceived as having constituency power by politicians in Washington, which therefore legitimized their viewpoints as needing to be included when making policy recommendations. In this way, the symbol of the church was used to gain access into discursive and policy-making circles that the poor, the people impacted the most by these policies, were usually denied.

Another participant, Darwin, also emphasized the role of the church in being politically involved as a power and material resource for people living in poverty or suffering from hunger or other social injustices through the negotiation of change by people working on these issues.

Well with Christian outreach to the church as an organized entity to take it upon themselves to use its
influence and its relative affluence and prestige to make life better for other people. And so [sponsor organization] is an organization that does that.

Importantly, Darwin emphasized the connections between Christian purpose and the use of church resources to improve the quality of people’s lives whereas, from the literature review, we learned how people supporting dominant definitions of religious purpose in the United States do not take up these issues.

Another participant, Jean, discussed how her organization which organized African-American women in the rural south depended on the National Council of Churches for funding the work of the organization in which she was involved due to the emphasis of her group on activist activities. She talked about how her group attempted to facilitate change in her community around,

Issues in education, health care, and civil rights. We were quite activist oriented and we didn’t have any federal money, we didn’t have state money, we only used pretty much grass roots fund raising and through the National Council of Churches.

Here she foregrounds how work to improve the situation of the poor sometimes only had churches to depend on for support. Here she is recognizing that her activism on these issues was the focus, and as such, her group operated with very little funding as dominant structural
institutions, such as the state and federal government, were not part of the support they received for their work.

Additionally, Walden, an employee of the sponsor organization noted the relevance of educating congregation members as a goal of the sponsoring organization.

The core issue was the networking. ... But there was a second goal that, in a sense, was the culmination of the mandate of helping people's organizations. And that was that the church should involve itself through [sponsor organization]. The churches were being told to get involved in what we then called constituency education.

Overall, from this analysis we can see how these participants foregrounded the necessary role of the church in these matters. They described how the church as a space that could be utilized to educate congregation members about the social connection between the lives and decisions of middle class congregation members and the lives and of poor and hungry people at national and international levels. They also described their attempts at making this connection for people by emphasizing the relevance of using the standpoint of the church in these activities to make the connection between local activities and global activities utilizing a Christian perspective and considering the world as a whole community.

These participants foregrounded the role of the church as an institution that was utilized to promote institutional
change through its material resources as well as its strength as a lobbying power or special interest group at the federal level. They also emphasized the role of congregation members as a group that could get directly involved in resolving issues of hunger and justice through their financial contributions that were then applied to various hunger relief programs and lobbying efforts. Finally, they emphasized how the church supported grassroots organizations that, due to an activist stance, had difficulty finding dependable funding outside of the context of the church.

In this way, these members connected the local activities of their congregation members to the international efforts occurring around the world and through different mediums that served to eliminate hunger, poverty, and other social justice issues. From the information provided in the literature review, we can see how their voices express an alternative construction of the causes and solutions regarding hunger and poverty that contested the dominant meanings for people regarding these issues. They demonstrate how the church was a site from which these dominant definitions could be challenged, where people's movements could be supported, and congregations could be reached. In this way, the role of the church in promoting
these issues developed a foundation from which to reach people - both the people who could help through their funding and the people most directly suffering from hunger and poverty within and external to the United States.

The Interconnecting Discourses of Class, Race, and Gender in Defining Hunger and Injustice. Participants also framed the meaning of their experiences in their work by discussing the role of racism, classism, and sexism in supporting the unequal distribution of power and resources on communities to articulate the impact of world trade policies on levels of poverty and hunger in the world. For instance, Bruce discussed how,

There is in both cases [nationally and internationally] a wealthy minority who is pulling the strings if you will. Defining the realities. And overseas there is a smaller middle class who is either working in ignorance, sometimes a self-imposed ignorance, 'I don't want to know,' or they are so fearful about wanting to maintain what they have that they don't want to risk anything in terms of people who don't have. So the [role of the] middle class gets marginalized as far as the development of people who are in poverty.

Here, Bruce made connections between the powerful and the powerless in understanding the prevalence of poverty both in the United States and abroad as well as sending messages to middle class participants that they do not want to know what's happening because it will risk what they
already have. In such a way, he foregrounded the issue of class inequality within and external to the United States as implemented through U.S. policies as the culprit in defining the realities of world hunger. He also foregrounded the difficulties the middle class faces in their potential role as a force for changing the development of people living in poverty.

Additionally, Nancy also talked about how meeting with individuals organizing around the poverty they suffered from in their community enabled her to report back and deconstruct some of the myths about poverty supported by the mainstream, middle class United States public.

Well I can remember sitting in the homes of people in Mexico, for instance, with a group of people from another denomination who had never experienced from that level. And they kept saying, "Well why don’t people just get better houses, why do they live in shacks at the edge of such and such. And they didn’t understand that to get a really cheap apartment in a high rise building gave their children no access to the outdoors, gave them no opportunity to grow some food, gave them no ability to control their lives. And so they thought poor people’s lives would just be better if they lived them like rich people, without understanding that rich people have a lot of other things that make it doable. Without the resources, it isn’t as doable but we don’t see that from the outside. You have to hear it from people as to why they live in this way versus this way. And so you get a lot of learning from understanding why people have constructed their lives around such things and what the obstacles are to them getting beyond it, and what they see are their avenues of opportunity.
Here Nancy foregrounded experience as critical in working with the poor and supporting them in framing their needs. She based this importance by enabling them to define the type of support they need and therefore navigating around the myths of poverty enforced by many middle class, U.S. based programs that supported these myths in their definitions and responses to the perceived needs of the poor. She talked about how her overall approach to the trip emphasized American trip participants in the role of learner and the people they met in the role of experts on their situation.

You go into those circumstances knowing that you are there to be the learner. You don’t go in with a proud sense of here I come with my resources to help you, the little guy on the totem pole. You don’t go in, you can’t go in with that kind of attitude because you’ll lose, you’ll get nothing out of it that’s useful. And you won’t be able to take it in. It won’t be part of you.

Here she recognized the pitfalls of coming from a wealthy country with funding for projects. How this entitlement could prove the purpose of the work to be worthless if people came in with preconceived notions of what needed to happen rather than understand their presence as learners about the self-development of people. She also noted that these experiences enabled these myths to be deconstructed as ethnocentric and classist, therefore ineffective in
eliminating the obstacles faced by the poor in their communities. Yet she also recognized these myths as existing based upon her interactions with middle class members of U.S. society.

Sometimes we try to create programs and we say, well if people just do it like we did in the middle classes they’d be like us in the middle class without realizing that there are several obstacles to getting there. And so therefore it’s important that we sit and listen to understand from their perspective why they’ve made the choices they have. Or what prevents them from making different choices. So it’s always important that you sit in those situations and let the poor inform you. Poor people aren’t poor because they want to be. They’re poor because of obstacles. And you need to understand the obstacles and you might see clearer that it’s their own fault afterwards but you also need to understand there are also structure obstacles. Therefore sometimes to eliminate hunger means changing those obstacles to make access easier for people to move up through the ranks to self-sufficiency. So whether it’s in the dump in Manila or whether it’s in villages of Mexico, there are obstacles for people to be able to have the kind of life you and I take for granted.

Here she explained to me how the poor must be in charge of identifying obstacles to their ability to escape poverty and that therefore these definitions are specifically impacted by class. In this way, she is taking a post-colonial position on the problem of poverty and hungry. Here she is defining the poor as in charge of defining of their obstacles through a process that enables outsiders to a country to help local communities organize against structural inequities which are created through trade
agreements, identified in the last section. She was also deconstructing the myths of the middle class on these issues through her belief that poor people have legitimate voices in discussing what changes will help them the best in defining hunger policy.

Jean discussed how the organization she represented foregrounded the role of racism in shaping definitions of sexism put forth by the women’s movement without including Black women’s voices or lives, particularly those living in rural areas. She discussed how the discourse that was publicly available from the women’s rights movements did not identify the factors faced by Black women in the rural south and her activism in response to meeting the needs of the everyday lives of rural women.

We had a women’s rural network in the south because the traditional women’s movement, like NOW and other women’s groups, just sort of did not include black women, and especially they did not include southern, rural, black women. And our issues weren’t there and so we formed a network which was a coming together in this region and on a state-wide basis at least we began to advocate for issues that affected the quality of our lives.

She added that this work was directly in response to the racism experienced within southern communities therefore directly connecting the impact of racism on the quality of people’s lives. She noted how her organization worked,
Just [to] confront and to be more sensitive to racism because we live in the mouth of it where it's overtly practiced. And so we suffer no illusions about race in this country because things have not changed all that much. [Laughs] And that was true in the 80’s and it remains true today. And people wonder why we love it, well we love it because it’s home and so we live here. So that was what it was about. Trying to improve the quality of our lives in many different ways.

She foregrounded the relevance of these local communities having the legitimate power to make these claims and protect their homes.

Jean also noted in her discussion of the activities of her group, that her work involved a nontraditional approach to assisting the poor, challenging the status quo positions and conditions of women using the discourse created around the civil rights movement. Yet she also recognized the way that sexism impacted the way that women were able to articulate their issues within that movement as well.

Challenging the status quo. Actively supporting women to become more vocal even in the movements that we are sort of naturally a part of, black women just don’t have that great a voice. And these are the black movements I’m referring to now. And so for the first time, rather than it being some sorority or some club that’s connected … or something, savings or something, it was women being agents for change.

For Jean then, connecting racism to the reality of women’s lives in the south integrated various threads of structural oppression. These experiences demonstrated for her how they were connected and worked together to reinforce
obstacles to these issues being defined by the rural people impacted the most by publicly acknowledged racist and sexist practices.

Nancy also noted the interconnectedness of racism and loss of family farms through globalization practices and the connection of these practices to hunger, facilitated by a racist culture in the United States. She discussed how,

Some of the organizations that we were funding that did things related to the family farm and people’s rights in small rural communities that were dealing with the violence associated with white supremacist groups. Now other ... programs didn’t see the connection to hunger the way we did.

Here she foregrounded how her program was using discourse on race in order to understand and respond to the systematic loss of farms in the south owned by African Americans through racist tactics of people in power in their communities. Through this quote she demonstrated how a direct link can be made between racist practices and loss of land, and how this happened in the United States, with her experiences organized around this occurring to African American farms.

Another individual, Donna, framed her work responsibilities in terms of educating congregations in the United States to understand the impact of gender inequality on dynamics of world hunger.
The primary responsibility was to help the churches in the US understand what the role of women was in the process of development. Particularly in developing countries but also in the United States as well.

Here, she articulated the role of women in development as a global effort in connecting the role of women in development in the United States to the role of women in developing countries. She foregrounded the similarities in the concerns and issues of women across countries, making connections between people that are invisible relations in the articles, who emphasize the differences between countries as organized around policies rather than people.

And part of it was working with women's organizations that were basically grassroots entities. Some of them were organizations connected to churches but many were not. And they would be involved in things, everything from providing daycare services to food production, literacy campaigns.

Here she is mentioning the relevance of her organization working with groups at the grass roots or local level - foregrounding the gender discourse that makes relevant women's need for self-sustainability in order to combat hunger and poverty, and how networking was crucial to this process.

Often women are on the lowest economic and social strata in most societies and so the question is how do we help women become on a more equal footing in terms of their own personhood. So the idea was just sort of looking at what very small organizations were able to do with very limited resources and if there was some way of strengthening their access to resources. The
idea was that they could intensify the type of work that they were doing and expand the number of women they were actually working with.

These descriptions demonstrate how people foregrounded the roles people in both the United States and in other countries in building up and strengthening access to resources that would reduce poverty in their local communities. They also foregrounded the connections between loss of land, home, or power through the connecting discourses and interpretive frames impacted by racism, classism and sexism. They defined these elements as involved in inhibiting action to confront poverty and hunger, including the loss of land in rural communities, as expressions of oppression and as reinforcing the dominant definitions of poverty as individually based, yet at the same time unable to be changed by individuals. In these ways, participants articulated structural conditions that they worked as individuals to change, and the myths that supported this oppression as multifaceted, and therefore difficult to resolve.

Building Networks. Participants also discussed the importance of building networks across people and organizations. Here, networking was defined as establishing relationships between two groups. First,
participants emphasized their work to build networks between the church denomination organizations from the United States sponsoring the peoples' organizations and movements and the groups being sponsored. Second, by establishing and strengthening the relationships between the grass roots organizations.

Nancy expressed the importance of networking to effective constituency education through her organization in discussing how she had worked with a network of people that brought these different issues into local churches during service and in different groups. She explained that,

We also maintained a network of people in the local churches whose job it was to both advertise the goals of the program in order to increase the revenues.

In this way, she was attempting to educate a section of the general population on issues of social justice, Christian faith, and congregation participation through their time or dollars.

Darwin identified how important international networks between organizations were in helping people organize to fight poverty and other social problems.

They have a network, of rural people's organizations from around the world. They try to do a little something for them they don't have a lot of money, whether it's technical assistance or whether it's a small grant to do something and also women's
organizations, that’s another emphasis. They help people make their lives a little bit better through their organization.

Here, he’s identified the networking of the sponsoring organization as essential to making changes occur in the quality of people’s lives. In this way, he, along with other participants, are building a case for understanding poverty and hunger as directly connected to people’s lived experiences through which networks can be established and change can take place at the local level.

Walden detailed how networking between rural organizing groups was a primary goal of the organization sponsoring the trip to the Philippines. He foregrounded the relevance of networking in its ability to strengthen organizations through the sharing of resources. He also added the international dynamic as essential to the networking between people’s organizations and the responsibilities of the church in this process. He noted that,

The core issue was the networking. That was the mandate at the time, the new mandate was how to support people’s organizations. In the sense especially of getting themselves together, in touch with each other. There are a lot of people’s organizations, peasant organizations out there who are doing all they can in terms of providing food and in terms of organizing themselves together. How they could get themselves in touch with each other in terms of self support. And so that became the mandate and we then started to help in each region. Latin America
had its own network on that principle, Africa has one, and Asia was the one I started. That was the principle goal.

Donna's comments substantiated this focus on connecting people's organizations. She described how this approach was considered to be nontraditional in its response to these issues, by emphasizing the necessity of organizing people to act without a lot of bureaucratic oversight, which changes the dynamics of power relationships organized by the project.

The focus had always been in terms of working with what they call people's organizations, the grass roots as opposed to the more institutional structured organizations. Sometimes you have lay entities within churches but sometimes they become very institutionalized themselves. And so just the concept that the association is more of people coming together because they really want to come together to try to do something as opposed to an institution which is much more structured and has a different kind of focus. So even though it attempts to be involved with things that make an impact, a lot of its involvement is about maintaining the institution so it's a different kind of power relationship.

This point is relevant because she foregrounded the importance of how informal networks can operate more effectively through people at the grass roots level versus larger institutional networking which are distanced from the lived realities of the group impacted by a problem in a community. She therefore highlights the importance of networking and how the nature of an institution in its
attempt to maintain itself, impacts the ways groups are able
to come together and create effective change.

Jean also noted how the relevance of working on
developing international connections in order to articulate
the relationship between women and development to foreign
policy, and how this initiative was an alternative approach
to discussing the issues that had not previously occurred.

For the first time black women were talking about
foreign policy and meeting with Nicaraguan women and we
were reporting that in our newsletter. On African
women, and Caribbean women.

Here Jean both discusses the importance of networking at a
grass roots level between women in poor countries and poor
women in the United States, emphasizing her role in
connecting women of color together to discuss their shared
needs and concerns.

Participant discussions used the discourses of race,
class, and gender, in addition to their understandings of
the goals of their work and the goals of their organization
to articulate the causes and solutions to the root issues of
hunger and poverty. In doing so, they revealed how the
myths about poverty and hunger operate in a society to
benefit powerful groups, both internal and external to the
United States.
Discussion. By defining hunger in terms of structural inequalities and the discourse that supports these inequalities, participants were able to transcend one-dimensional popular definitions for the causes of poverty and define these issues at the international level and worked to connect people at the local level to other international networks. This foregrounding of topics also provide insight into how people on the trip worked to connect local issues such as poverty and hunger, to poverty and hunger existing in other countries. This was represented by interviewees talking about their work to by emphasizing the similarities in needs and goals for people in poverty living in the United States and the Philippines. They did this by not only foregrounding the importance of creating networks between groups to confront these social injustices systematically, but also through educating constituencies within different churches to recognize the impacts of unfair global trade on poverty within the United States as well as in other countries.

In this way, interviewees contest dominant/mainstream definitions for the existence and eradication of hunger and poverty in communities. In doing this they foregrounded the relevance of their roles within their respective denominations to work to make connections between people’s
lives, social structural inequalities, and issues perpetuating poverty and hunger. Their descriptions of their work in relation to the sponsor organization show how they represented various levels of an ecumenical network emphasizing grassroots group and organizational development. This was development around hunger and poverty issues emphasizing self-sustainability and networking between groups and organizations as critical to their work and the role that the church could play in providing both material support and a space for reflection and education on these issues.

As such, we can see how they represented change agents in the U.S. as well as global political and economic culture regarding the definitions, causes, and solutions to issues of poverty and hunger in communities. This background would also provide them with alternative cultural resources to rely on in making sense of their trip to the Philippines, the relationship of the United States to the Philippines, and in interpreting the Mendiola massacre.

The Purpose of the Trip

I asked participants to discuss the purpose of the trip to better understand interviewee expectations for the trip in relation to their work and as related to the
purpose of the sponsoring organization. All participants framed the purpose of the trip in terms of learning - their role in the learning process, the role of the sponsoring organization, the role of the people they were meeting and the organizer’s role in facilitating the learning process. Through their examples, we see their understanding of what they were there to learn and how they were going to learn it. They described the purpose of the trip as an educational tour for their self-development and in order to perform the work they wanted to do within their respective organizations, including the sponsor organization.

Experiential Learning for Organizational Purposes.

Nancy foregrounded the relevance of her being able to witness local development in rural areas to be used as examples with other projects in other countries including organizing projects in the United States. She prioritized the knowledge that she hoped Filipino organizers would share with her about their development concerns and authorized this knowledge as significant and useful models for her to share with other organizing groups.

The project was specifically to go into the most rural areas of the Philippines out in the island areas and some of the mountainous areas and find out what kinds of local development had potential for being useful in other places. In other words, these were small family
farmers who had figured out ways to do things better with fewer resources or with greater output that we thought could be used as examples in other areas.

Here she foregrounded how seeing these projects in place within communities would enable her to gather information that she could share with other people organizing around similar issues who approached her organization for funding.

She also discussed how she participated in the trip in order to go back to her constituents in the United States and share her experiences with constituents organizing actively in local communities to engage hunger issues in rural areas as well as to share with congregation members within her denomination.

So it was an opportunity for people like myself to go in and see some of this. Experience it at the grassroots and meet with the people who had developed ways to respond to it to increase our understanding. And so that we were then resources to other organizations and getting it out as well as back into the congregations of helping them understand what could happen with dollars. So this was an educational trip for us to learn how people had taken very little and improved their own lives and how we could duplicate this or share the experience in such a way as to expand its impact. So it was an educational trip.

Nancy foregrounded her experiences traveling to other countries and meeting with local organizers as enabling her to take on their perspectives legitimately when returning to share her experiences with other groups of people, many of whom were not themselves living in poverty, but were in
charge of funding self-development projects. These experiences enabled her to report back to her constituents about the urgency of need in programs that were not some abstracted reality to people. She could do this through reporting on her observations in meeting with project organizers and seeing the projects in practice to the church administrators which were her constituents and source of funding.

They represented the development and we participated both financially and with people in there, learning, understanding, and participating in decision-making. Or as staff people we went back to organizations and said we recognize that this is what it says in your proposal but we found other organizations very similar to you who have done it this way and it’s increased their yield or made it better. Or can we work with you and put you in touch with others who can help you smooth out that part of your organization?

She foregrounded how what she saw and with whom she spoke could make the transfer of this information more direct and personal to constituents in the United States. This gave her perspective, in representing the needs of the people organizing, a legitimacy within the United States that inserted the concerns of the poor into the development of policies and programs attempting to resolve these issues.

Donna discussed the sponsoring organization’s goal as prioritizing the ability of people like Nancy to come away from the trip with knowledge to share. She discussed how,
The trip to the Philippines was an example of things we were trying to do in terms of educating our board and providing them with an opportunity to directly interact and hear from people directly about what we had been seeing as staff. To help provide that experience for them as well so they could ask the questions and see how significant their support would be for the work that was going on.

Donna’s description detailed how the educational impact of the tour was supposed to strengthen networks and understandings of development issues for United States Christian church representatives. She also noted specifically concerning the trip itinerary, that,

The trip to the Philippines was part of a global effort around looking at the, how women were participating in development, you know, economically, politically, socially, throughout the world, and at this particular time we were going to the Philippines to see that particular model.

Here she foregrounded the relevance of educating trip participants on the role of women in development as a model for local development initiatives that the churches should support.

Bruce noted that for him, the purpose of the trip was to teach him about the social movements currently existing in the Philippines.

The expectation was to put us into a better understanding of a lot of the people’s movements, a variety of the people’s movements, and we were going to accomplish this. And then we initially went and had some orientations and some overall presentations and discussions with the leaders of various people’s movements. Agricultural movements, women’s movements,
economic ... And we talked with people who were trying organize and what they were trying to put into place.

He discussed how these organized tours enabled him to understand the obstacles to people being able to organize around and resolve hunger and poverty issues in their community when most daily activities for poor people were already organized around the activities necessary in order for them to survive.

It was extremely difficult because the people were having to, unfortunately all their waking moments were spent surviving and so how do you organize people when they don’t have time to be organized.

Like Nancy, Bruce foregrounded for himself the importance of his previous experiences on trips similar to this and how interactions with people enabled him to bring back information that could be useful to people’s organizations and movements in the United States. Here he foregrounded his role as an information conduit of sorts.

That we could learn things techniques and endeavors from groups around the world and bring them, utilize them in situations here [United States]. Sometimes, some of our things would be able to be utilized there. But it was a two-way street.

He connected people and ideas around the globe to spread around methods of self-sustainability in poor, rural communities, and serviced people who might not have the same opportunities as he had, due to his position within the church structure, to see community organizing models at an
international level. By Bruce bringing back information about his experiences, they could draw on this information and use it as a resource to inform their activism.

Walden foregrounded the importance of educating trip members on common issues facing people living in rural poverty and the connections to structural development issues for rural communities in both the United States and abroad.

We had come out earlier with this study as part of the mandate of educating the churches on rural issues. And we had looked at several places where we could do this. One was here in the US with farm workers and the black farmers to look at how much land they have lost, black land lost over the years. So that was an area. The two other places outside of the US were the Philippines and Brazil on agrarian reform. So that was then the church in the Philippines in a sense then was part of this proposed study.

Here, he foregrounded the relevance of participants seeing the connections between Philippine and U.S. development practices creating loss of land and livelihood for farmers in both countries and attempts by people to organize around these issues.

Walden also noted how this networking between people from the U.S. churches and Philippine churches and religious organizations enabled people to experience the situation of the rural and urban poor which would enable the visitors to be better advocates regarding these issues in the United States. He spoke about how,
That knowledge, experience, that direct experience, not anyone saying well we were told, you know, seeing it first hand for instance was a very important part of it. And this is the whole underlying theme of the tour. Precisely for the church leaders, the church membership, to see the situation and to look at the situation first hand. That was I think the strong underlying reality for the study tour.

He also described why the sponsoring organization had considered the Philippines to be a good example of agrarian reform by relying on his knowledge of the politics of resistance that has historically occurred in the Philippines and which the literature review also supports in this research.

Because it's [land] an age-old issue. Agrarian reform is an age, from the time of the Spaniards, really. And we are probably one of the countries who could best articulate the land issue. Because of that age-old experience. The whole Huk rebellion in the 40's as a peasant rebellion and a lot of the revolts under Spain were all land-related. Not all, but a big majority were land-related.

Here, as in other instances as well, the marchers and protestors are being described as active agents in understanding and taking action to improve the quality of their lives. Moreover, Walden is putting this effort into a historical context and historically validating their position in emphasizing these Filipinos as being especially articulate about their experiences. He noted that this articulation is due to their historical protest against such a political and economic arrangement in their country which
denies a vast majority of the population the rights and benefits of owning land and having enough to eat.

Both Nancy and Jean supported the effectiveness of this type of experiential education. Additionally, in talking about her experiences in meeting Filipinos struggling for at least a subsistence survival, she noted how the people she met were very aware of their location in the world economy as compared to other countries and the relationship between corporate takeover of their lands and their poverty.

They're survivors. They recognize their circumstances. They see clearly what the obstacles are in their own society as well as the way they are connected to the global. It’s amazing how some of these people who you think are uneducated understand how they fit in globally.

When I asked her for an example of this she noted that, from her experiences in talking with people that,

Well they understand the way that factories come in and take over certain industries that keep them from being able to develop small little programs of their own. That some of the resources available to the community are often channeled into the bigger factories. On the surface it looks like a higher level of development than supporting people who have little stands and make the living at the edges without recognizing that those people go through stages onto higher stages of development and might eventually come out with a small employment-based opportunity. In other words they would employ other people, several people, small skill development. And as long as the resources of the community are going onto creating a tax free zone then their not fostering their own development of their own people, either industries in which most of the
resources that are developed go back out of the country.

When I asked her if it was the people organizing the trip or the poor people she was dialoguing with as a trip participant, she replied,

Both, they’re both. They sit around and talk about the fact. They have access to news and newspapers and things. But they also know from just talking that something can’t happen for them because it’s happening for some other level. And they understand the direct connection much better than some of our educated people do because we only take care of the transactions at this level and those micro-transactions never make it into our view.

Beyond just general viewpoints of how poverty in some countries created wealth in others, she also discussed how the issue of land comes into play in countries that had historically relied upon agriculture to sustain their people especially in the rural areas.

I think even at the Filipino level and in countries like the Philippines, many other poverty countries, Third World countries of whatever you call less developed countries, often you can’t get a bank loan until you have title to the property. You can’t get title to the property because it’s never been clarified who owned it to get the title from. If you don’t own title to it the business can be swept away the next time a government bulldozer decides he wants to make it available to somebody else. You know it’s just you know the property rights, if you can’t get title to something, you can’t do anything. We, we expect that kind of system to be in place because we’re used to it, but it isn’t in place all over.

In learning this from the people she talked to, Nancy was learning about hunger from her direct experiences.
Well, I think we went in asking them to tell us what it was all about, what their obstacles were to development. I think that’s an underlying question to all of this, what are the underlying obstacles to development? Because only through development do you get any sort of sustainable poverty relief, hunger relief. Handing out bread in soup kitchens doesn’t work. It might take care of the immediate pain just like grabbing a quick bite of bread but it doesn’t, it doesn’t do anything except put the Band aid on long enough for it to look at the larger picture.

Donna described a very similar interpretation of these events. She talked about how while on the trip,

In one of the areas that we went to see in Manila, was an area known as Smoky Mountain. And actually it’s a land fill, that and so as the debris deteriorates it smokes so you have mountains of garbage, so that’s the main concept but you actually had people that lived in that area, lived on top of that thing. And they would basically sort of go through the refuge in sort of trying to find metal and other kinds of things to sell. So that was a situation where people were very desperately poor in that situation but still in terms of talking to them, that they recognized what their situation was but there wasn’t a sense of necessary resignation to that. That this is where they were at this time and they were working, and they saw a better future for themselves, so that kind of experience is just really very incredible and just to see what the human capacity is to kind of see beyond where you currently are. We sometimes run into people here who are whining about this or that, and it’s like, [laughs] you really don’t know how fortunate you are. You may not have everything that you want but you are, compared to some other people, you really have a lot so get it together.

In this way, they backgrounded the relevance of foreign aid not being abstracted in concepts around agriculture and hunger. However, they foregrounded its relevance as spoken through people impacted the most by the policies that
prevented them from an improved quality of life who are assisted at the local and directly experienced level. Additionally, members of the study tour helped make the definitions of hunger and poverty and the programs that develop around these issues more direct and personal to their constituents in the United States. They described how this was actualized by their learning from the people they met about the different conditions in which people tried to survive, the obstacles to their development as people and as a community, and their knowledge of the reasons for their poverty being globalization practices. Participants discussed that overall, these lessons enabled them to not only personalize the groups they worked with to their constituents, but also enabled them to see what their resources were really capable of doing for people outside of the context of the United States.

Overall, participants were also being exposed to the role of the church in the Philippines as supporting people and projects that involved organizing around self-sufficiency and quality of life issues for people living in extremely poor conditions, specifically around agrarian reform and the rights of people in the rural areas.
Experiential Learning for Personal Purposes.

Participants also discussed the relevance of experiencing people on the trip at both individual and organizational levels. Jean discussed how for her, the trip meant that she could,

See first hand the people [sponsor organization] was working with. People working against hunger, people on strike, people involved in development, and we wanted to see the conditions because we wanted to see what people were experiencing.

For her, she foregrounded the relevance of the trip as enabling her to experience people organizing around issues related to civil rights and the importance of experiencing this organizing as relevant and legitimate knowledge to place into context in understanding what was happening in the Philippines.

Darwin foregrounded that he went to the Philippines in order to relate to the struggles of people in communities advocating for change and to generally see what was happening in the Philippines. He discussed how the trips in which he participated as a board member of the organization helped him to establish networks and remain informed, valuing the trips as responsible

...personally for my connection with people all around the world. That's the way that I find out what's going on and what to do and when to do it and to
connect spiritually with their struggle. So I went for that reason.

Here, he foregrounded this trip as enabling him to establish personal networks with people throughout the world and the spiritual significance of establishing these networks and of identifying with the struggle for civil rights by the people.

Both Darwin and Jean emphasized the need to know what was happening in the Philippines from the people themselves in order to be able to relate to their issues at a personal, significant level.

Nancy foregrounded the role of her experiences on this trip as critical to her being able to report back to people about direct experiences that helped her understand the urgency of people’s messages to her.

To see how these people, what they thought they needed to improve their lives. I sat down in their homes and had them tell me how they understood the situation. I mean you hear it from the lived level. When you hear it at the lived level you understand it at the gut level. Which means that you stop spinning your wheels around useless time-consuming things that get people nowhere.

Overall, as Nancy demonstrates as well, interviewees foregrounded the relevance of direct experience in helping them to understand an issue in a non-traditional way - in an experiential, lived, and “gut-level” way. Here, they prioritized experience and their ability to network with
people “on the ground” organizing as critical information to understanding how they could be involved and helped.

The Political Climate in the Philippines. Participants all discussed their desire to go to the Philippines because of the changes that were taking place within the country during the transfer of presidential authority from Ferdinand Marcos to Corazon Aquino. Nancy discussed how she remembered the Philippines as,

The Philippines at that particular time was filled with hope. They had just gotten rid of a dictator who had kept the country in just dire straits for so long, and there had been so much repression and misuse of funds that the country as a whole was in just a state of expectation and hope. Cory Aquino had been president for maybe nine or ten months. The big plebiscite, which is their national referendum to vote in a new constitution was just weeks away. There was a cease-fire in effect with the Communist insurgency that had been fighting against the dictatorship and trying to gain some control in the country. And any place where the system doesn’t work, people are interested in Communism because it seems like a more humane system when you look at just the structural aspects of it. And so the whole country was full of this hope and expectation.

Here she brought up the relationship of the Communists mentioned in the article, as well as the constitution, the cease-fire that was part of the peace talks between the government and the Communist negotiators (that we learned about from the newspaper articles). However, she foregrounded how the position of the Communist Party...
related to the historic oppression and suffering faced by poor, landless Filipinos occurring under Marcos and expressed through the persecution of people by the military and para-military groups protecting both the government and wealthy families. She therefore legitimized the views of the poor and their connections to Communist-oriented groups as justified in their concern for changes in the system that would protect human rights and advocate for land reform in order to relieve some of their suffering. She also described the atmosphere in the Philippines as hopeful in that people believed that a change would take place that would improve the political and economic lifestyles of the poor through the initiatives promised by Aquino.

Donna's reflections on the political climate of the Philippines followed this interpretation as well.

The time that we were there was shortly after Corazon Aquino had come into power after Marcos, who again was one of those leaders that the US government had supported for many, many years, who was basically kicked out. And so at that time there was a lot of excitement and enthusiasm as to the potential for change in the Philippines. So, we kind of went with an air of excitement and to see what was going to happen and to just kind of have that opportunity to be there on the ground and talk to people and experience that.

Again, direct experience in working with people, to be on the "ground level," is privileged as a way of knowing more important than others by group members.
Walden also foregrounded the importance of trip participants being educated through experience on issues people faced in attempting to confront issues of poverty and hunger in their communities and the structural circumstances of a country which enabled or hindered how people could act upon these issues in their community.

We were bringing members of [sponsor organization] as well as representatives from the denominations, wider denominations, to look at the issue of what was the agrarian situation in the Philippines in a political climate which has had the whole world really perked up because this was the time that Marcos had to go into exile. He was thrown out. There was a new president, a woman, Cory Aquino coming in. So it’s, after a year or so in power, are there changes in the Philippines in regards to the issue of land, which is an age-old problem in the Philippines. So a lot of expectation, mostly positive.

Walden supported her perspectives on the purpose of the trip as well. He foregrounded the relevance of both experience in the Philippines and the structural changes occurring at the time of their visit as important in framing issues of hunger and justice for tour participants to share with their constituencies once they returned to the United States. He noted that for him personally, having much past involvement with Philippine affairs and having come to the United States to work on such issues,

It was important to us, looking at this issue unfold. Trying to understand if somebody, a new president, would be able to change the situation in the Philippines so far as peasants and farmers are
concerned. Especially somebody who was coming from a land-owning family. The question therefore is, is that possible? And so this thing was sort of a test case and as it turned out, it was not possible in a sense, to move structurally. For a president to be able to say okay now sign this agrarian reform legislation giving so much to the landless peasants, you know, giving lands outright for instance. What turned out, you have still loopholes in the law, agrarian reform law with a land-owning congress, a land-owning president, so that was a very interesting test case for me personally.

Here, he foregrounded the potential for social change in the Philippines as a potentially historical moment that had been promised by he president but had not occurred due to the structure of power in place that had historically been dominated by the land-owning proportion of people.

Darwin also noted that the political climate is what interested him in participating in the trip, in order to experience what people were experiencing regarding their lives during this transfer of presidential authority.

I wanted to see what Filipino people were going through at the time. Marcos had just been thrown out and Corazon Aquino had just been elected and this was a great time to see what was going on in the Philippines.

Participants framed the Philippines as a time of hope that change would come with a new and seemingly unconventional president ad the end of martial law. In this way, the participants foregrounded their identification of the relationship between agrarian politics, social movements organizing, and their role as visitors to learn from people
who have suffered the most from the former and present policies. Their first goal in doing so was to learn enough about the current arrangements from the perspectives of people organizing against poverty and hunger in order to gather enough "real life" information through which they could cultivate support for change on these issues in the United States through the churches. Their second goal was to take back information that would help peoples' movements organizing in the United States around these same issues involving agrarian reform. In this way, they foregrounded the reasons for change and supported the activities of the people organizing for this change.

The Groups Involved in the Mendiola March. Based upon their experiences, people adopted the standpoint of the groups involved in the march to the Mendiola bridge in order to explain to me what they witnessed in relation to land reform and the structural impediments to the development of rural peoples. For example, Nancy talked about how,

I remember we were downtown and we were aware of the fact that these agricultural workers, farmers, had come to the capital and had surrounded, they had camped around the grounds of the Agricultural Ministry of the Government of the Philippines for four or five days. And they had repeatedly requested to meet with
the secretary, because the platform that Cory Aquino ran on was one of land reform.

Here, she foregrounded the activities of the groups involved in the march before they decided to march to the palace. These activities are omitted from the newspaper articles as well as the historically documented academic literature describing the event. This implies that the march and demonstration was the first and only type of attempt by these groups to get their voices heard. From interviewee and in some parts of the literature review, however, we can see that the rights of the poor to have their voices legitimized especially regarding agrarian reform, has been a historically contentious issue. She further explained how land reform was a critical issue to improving the lives of the rural population in the Philippines.

Nothing can happen in these countries until there’s land reform. It’s one of those big stumbling blocks and if you don’t get land reform, poverty’s always going to be a big aspect of their country. And the new constitution had been published, it hadn’t been voted on. These people had come in from all over the country to say you promised us land reform but it’s not in this new constitution. And nobody in the Ministry of Agriculture would meet with them.

Here she foregrounded the actions of the government and describing them as unresponsive to attempts people made to have their concerns heard. In doing so, she foregrounded and legitimated the marchers’ concerns as valid and
important and as articulating an understood history
connecting land reform to Aquino’s election platform,
 omitted from the articles but substantiated by the
 information I found for my literature review. Therefore,
 she adds to what the articles omitted. In her
 articulation, the concerns of the marchers are foregrounded
 as legitimate responses directly connecting a request for
 land reform to constitutional amendments and policies that
 had been promised but not implemented. This perspective on
 their actions provide further context regarding why the
 marchers chose to march and the issues involved in their
decision to march - both of which are minimized or omitted
 in the official account represented by the newspaper text,
 and partially minimized in the historical literature.

Walden noted that, within the political climate of the
Philippines, that the march to Mendiola was seen by its
participants as a sign of hope that change would occur to
benefit those suffering the most under government policy
through changes in land policy. He discussed how,

People were happy. The expectation was that we were
going to probably see a change, if not a radical
change, at least a change situation in the Philippines
with a new government and so this dialogue with the
president in Malacanang [the march to the palace] was
an important thing to see.
To Walden, a dialogue with the president meant that the new government was willing to listen to the needs and concerns of the groups that had historically been the most oppressed and ignored regarding governmental economic and political decision-making. These were the people who had suffered the most under unfair trade policies, military repression and human rights violations, and a government under martial law that, from the literature review, we found had supported habitually terrorizing rural people. Here what is backgrounded but came forward in the literature review is the role of the military in this terrorism against people in the countryside. A history of the Philippines demonstrated the power of the military increasing dramatically during Marcos' regime. This changes the context in which the marchers chose to march, the issues for which they were marching, and the choice by the military to prevent them from marching to the palace.

**Discussion.** Overall, people foregrounded the relevance of using their experiences in the Philippines to better understand hunger and poverty issues involving rural development. They went on the trip to be able to better inform constituencies in the United States about where and how church monies were being applied, and to reinforce
knowledge about the structural impediments to social development in the Philippines. In this way, the participants frame the relevance of participating on this trip in terms of how it taught them about the issues personally. They also described how that information could be shared with different public audiences in the United States so that constituents would continue their financial support of these operations in conjunction with local churches there.

Additionally, these perspectives authorized and legitimated the concerns of the marchers and depicted their march as an organized protest rather than an unruly crowd as depicted by newspaper articles. Their depiction of the Philippine political climate challenged the dominant definitions of the situation relayed to readers of the New York Times by taking on the political position of the marchers ad the poor people suffering under governmental policies. This provided them with insights into both land reform possibilities ad the historical context surrounding injustice perpetuated by the government to its people which are omitted entirely from the newspaper article accounts. In this way, participants authorize not only their own perspectives, but also the perspectives of the marchers to
challenging the depiction of the event made by the official sources in the newspaper accounts.

The issues faced by the marchers are further legitimated by interviewees as they used parts of their past experiences and personal histories to explain their understanding of the relationship between lack of control over land to the existence of hunger and poverty in communities. The Government’s attempt at peaceful negotiations, stressed within the newspaper articles is backgrounded and described as seeming indifferent to the concerns expressed by the farmers. Therefore, interviewees frame the reasons for the march as developing consequently from the failure of the government to acknowledge the concerns of the marchers - the social conditions existing that people wanted to change. In this way, interviewees foregrounded an interpretation of the event and the political climate of the Philippines emphasizing the conditions leading up to the march as problematic while the newspapers, using official sources, emphasized the social conditions (e.g. destabilization) that the march had created as a consequence of its occurrence.

The Purpose of the March

Interview participants who did not witness the march
still described the situation to me during interviews at my request. I wanted to know what resources people drew on from their backgrounds to understand the event. Interviewee participants primarily talked about the march and the violence regarding the role of the military as aggressors against the farmers, whom they described as farmers affiliated with various organizations, including the Communist Party.

Land Reform and Civil Unrest. Most participants responded that the march had taken place in order for farmers’ organizations to advocate for land reform, just as the newspaper articles stated. However, interviewee accounts foregrounded the specifics they understood to be important to the marchers concerning the changes that were occurring in the Philippines and what had already been acted upon.

Bruce’s descriptions of why the march happened are framed around the concerns of the marchers concerning the issue of land and Aquino’s new government. He describes how, at a rally before the march, from his interactions with marchers he found their position to be that,

They wanted to go and to present Corazon Aquino, with the very specifics that they wanted to achieve. This was to have land that she and her government had
appropriated from Marcos to be distributed amongst the poor farmers rather than just being held by the government. And because they were afraid that the land would eventually be taken over or taken up by members of the ruling elite. They were absolutely correct on that. On a bigger scale they were also wanting to present their desires to have additional property held by the government as well as most of them were not wanting to have land taken away from that was actively being cultivated. Most of them were wanting just even the some of the land that was being held by wealthy corporations and people, that had been lying foul for years to be turned over to the farmers. And recognize the rights of where they were squatting on such land. So those were kind of the three main things. The highest priority was this land that the Aquino government had taken over from Marcos.

By taking this perspective in order to understand why the march occurred, Bruce foregrounded the concerns of the poor farmers around the issue of land and detailed the specifics of how Aquino’s presidency could potentially have made real land redistribution a reality. Here, Bruce authorized the marchers’ voices as legitimate in discussing issues of land reform, and as having rights that deserved to be recognized by the new government.

Donna’s notions of the purpose of the march also foregrounded the issues of land reform. She discussed how, At that point, it was still an issue and I don’t think it was ever really addressed but it was the whole question of land reform, of what was the government going to do about land reform. Because that was part of what the demonstration was about. That the farmers were concerned about the issue of land reform, what was going to be the government’s policy on that, because you had few families and multinational companies that basically had control over the most
productive land throughout the country. And so the people had been, especially the small farmers, displaced from the land. So what was going to be the government’s policy to address that inequity? Because for the most part, the Philippines is an agricultural society, and so this was a way of people making their living and livelihood. And you had a similar situation now in terms of South Africa, the whole question of land, of redistribution in Zimbabwe.

Importantly, Donna linked her understanding of what was happening with lack of land reform alongside a transfer of power in agriculturally based societies in other countries as well, such as South Africa.

She also brought up the issue of how definitions prioritizing individual ownership of land run counter to the lifestyles of people with agricultural livelihoods.

Understanding the concept of the land and the importance of it. In the US the concept is more about individual ownership. That’s really the focus as opposed to more of a community focus. That the land in many societies doesn’t belong to any individual that it belongs to the community. And people sort of have responsibility to take care of it and they can use it for their own, but you know, people don’t generally have acres and acres and acres. But because of the whole agricultural industry, at this point you sort of have mega-farms that produce the food.

This comparison demonstrates how colonial or dominant discourse on land ownership enables corporations to buy land through Eurocentric land policies and purchasing agreements that did not need to consider the cultural impact of their actions on the community residing on the land. This is one way in which neo-colonialism operates. Owners have bought
the land for investment purposes, and to purchase and own large plots of land means that it can be used by the purchaser in any way they see fit, regardless of whether or not it had been depended upon by a community for survival. Donna's comparison of land ownership between two political and economic systems frames the importance of land in understanding the issue of land reform from a perspective of people who make their livelihood off it the most within an agrarian-based economy.

Here she discusses the connection between the role that individual ownership of land, land systems where food is not servicing a local population, and public understanding of how it can impact food supply. She concluded that,

The whole question about the land reform in terms of how it gets redistributed, I think, is something that's going to have to happen and the impact that that will have on the food supply. Well, the counter argument is that we can't really do too much because it's going to impact the food supply, but somehow before these mega-farms came along, people were able to produce enough food for people to eat.

Here she foregrounded the way that food systems are impacted by the accumulation and privatization of land that fosters economic dependency in a country as well as fosters situations of extreme poverty and hunger in the name of economic development.
The Marchers. Walden talked about how the march did represent pressure on the government and its connection to the politics between the government and Communist groups. As he had worked on these issues in the Philippines for over 20 years, he focused his discussion on issues of military power and its impact on leadership as well as emphasized the problem of instituting land reform in the country. He discussed how the meeting between the marchers and the government as well as the meeting between the Communist Party and the government negotiations of the peace talks represented a threat to the power of the military.

My understanding is that they were not in agreement with the president in the specifics of the agrarian reform. That’s a whole legislation and they were going to mandate different provisions in the law. But I think what aggravated it was the refusal of the president to meet with them. And here you already have to read the president who is anti-Communist in a sense, you know, meeting with a group who are mostly influenced in their perception by the communist party. And they know that. So there was this friction. And probably, I’m speculating now, they didn’t want to be embarrassed. With a confrontation, public, meaning dialogue. Or that maybe they were expecting very radical recommendations coming from the KMP [the farmer’s organization that led the march] that in their reading, would not really be they weren’t able to give in, you know, in terms of what they might call impossible demands. So whatever the reason there was this friction. The President didn’t want to meet with them. And therefore the decision for them to go and march to the palace for this demonstration in order to force the president to talk with them. It’s a social pressure.
Here Walden foregrounded the legitimacy of the marcher’s actions yet also foregrounded the political standpoint of the president as well who did not want to be seen as having an open door to communist-influenced people trying to get the government to seriously negotiate with them.

So, and here you’re getting into the whole politics of the thing. A military, a president, who was in a sense, did not have real power, because the power was in the military. A strong faction of the military who really wants to unseat her and a ... by the fact of the second day or third day of our stay there which finally led to our decision to abort the tour, that in the second or third day, there was the coup attack. And we were seeing TV stations being blockaded, being seized by the military. And the president being put in a very terrible situation with one part of the military rising against her and another part which is more loyal to her because of the general who she has allied with who then became later on the next president of the country, Fidel Ramos. So the president was not strong at all. She didn’t have the position of power. It was very complicated. And so to have the military on one hand on the right put pressure on her and then the left, the KMP, she was in a difficult situation.

From this description, we see that the military might have more at stake than just protecting the palace from “wild men.” That if negotiations had occurred, that this may have loosened the power of the military in the Philippines and as the literature review suggested, this might have seriously impacted the amount of military aid provided by Reagan funding their operations reinforcing their power in the Philippines. He also noted that the role of the military in
shooting the marchers has been well documented. He summed up his reflections on the march by noting that,

So the refusal even at the time, of the march, to meet with them led to this confrontation. Now you will of course there’s a lot of solid things that are written that the military provoked the shooting. In fact, in the testimony of some of our members, testified that the military started the shooting. So it was a real set-up.

Walden foregrounded the political nature of the meeting between the marchers and the government that is not mentioned as a contested position by the newspaper articles. Rather, Aquino is portrayed as having “no tolerance” for groups attempting to disrupt her government and the military is portrayed as the “peace keeping forces.”

Now we can see, provided by the information of participants, how alternative framings of the incident can be constructed as participants drew on a wide variety of resources to frame their understanding of what happened that day. From this perspectives, which takes on and authorizes the voices of those organizing around social justice issues in the Philippines, participants show how the Philippines at this time was considered by the marchers to be a time of hope. However, as Walden suggested, the ability of Aquino to maintain her presidency might have heavily depended on her alliance with a military general and she was also fearful that she would be overthrown by
members of the military loyal to Marcos. The argument that certain military members fired into the crowd to destabilize the government becomes increasingly a possible interpretation through these interviewee accounts. Here now, the role of the military in the shootings becomes more complicated than how it is portrayed by the collective accounting by authorized voices in the newspaper articles.

Additionally, Bruce revealed that, to some extent, the marchers were prepared to face the military. They were also informed of the possibility of the march being halted before it got to palace [Malacanang Palace where the President resided]. It was raised as a possibility. They thought there might be and if it did it would be at the Mendiola bridge. This statement corroborates Nancy's perception of the situation for why the marchers acted together.

Here, he foregrounded the marchers as knowledgeable, as having made decisions to take action, that describes them as critically thinking through the decision to march and in considering possible outcomes. The newspaper articles present them as an unorganized mass of people advocating for general, idealistic goals that had no backing or justification for occurring. The literature review resources acknowledged the concerns of the marchers but does not document the attempts by farmer's groups to negotiate with government officials before the march.
From participating in this pre-march rally, he also provided descriptions for the general emotive attitude of the marchers before the march took place.

My feeling was that they [the marchers] wanted to show solidarity. There were a couple of different farmers groups that were marching together to show Aquino that they were united. It was a show of force in that sense but I did not hear at any point before, during, or after, ‘we want to get Aquino.’ Most of them were so happy to see Marcos gone and they were hoping that Aquino would be responsive because of the reputation of her husband and new government.

Here he’s provided an explanation that is in contrast to the conclusions drawn by just about every authorized voice in the articles, including the journalist’s opinion, that the marchers represented a breakdown in talks and an attempt by “leftist groups” to destabilize the government. Interviewees distinguish between a breakdown between communists and the lack willingness by the government to negotiate with the farmers’ groups, which included the Communist Party but also represented a coalition of farmers, documented in all three accounts as existing. The breakdown in talks are attributed to the Community Party peace talks while the negotiations that the farmers had attempted to hold with the Ministry of Agriculture and the specifics of what they were asking for are entirely absent from the newspaper article descriptions. From these participant perspectives, the marchers wanted their issues to be heard,
not the government to be destabilized. The farmers issues and Communist Party issues are merged into one identity in the articles' cumulative picture to American audiences.

Participants also framed their discussion of the march around past personal experiences regarding the political conditions of the Philippines at the time in order to understand what had happened at the march. Participants authorized the voices and standpoints of the farmers participating in the march as resources to explain what happened. For example, Jean discussed her understanding of it in terms of civil rights.

There was unrest and disquiet among workers and against living conditions, and people were increasingly talking about the military and its effect upon their lives. It was just openness, more openness and more dialogue was happening. I thought of it as a civil rights demonstration, you know that kind of thing.

Here, she described possibilities in terms of an openness developing - a sense that something that had previously been closed, the dialogue, was open at the time. The reactions to the massacre as represented in the article discourses, by not presenting other possibilities for why the march took place except to destabilize the government, demonstrate how mainstream definitions were used to deny that this sense of “openness” around Philippine affairs even existed. This interpretation is absent in the
collective accounts that emphasize consequences on foreign
evestment, government control, and military interventions.

Discussion. Here we are able to get more detailed
information about the specific dynamics of land reform
being requested as well as some context concerning the
attitude of the marchers over their failed attempts to
voice their concerns publicly to the president. In this
way, the context of the event is framed around the
standpoints of the marchers. In this way, the tour
participants provide information about marcher perspectives
and activities, as well as important historical context,
which raises more possibilities to "what happened" than the
articles will account for. These activities, minimized and
omitted from official accounts of the event, frame the
event through alternative discourse made invisible in media
accounts. In this way, inclusion of these accounts
demonstrates the existence of more possibilities for
interpretation than from just the literature review or
newspaper articles.

Description of the March and Massacre

Two of the participants interviewed were direct
witnesses to the event, one of whom was among the two
participants who ended up getting injured at the march. I separated out these two participant descriptions of the event from other peoples’ depictions of its purpose in order to distinguish accounts of the event by witnesses from other peoples’ anecdotal interpretations.

I introduce and authorize their perspectives in this section in order to be able to have eyewitness accounts emphasized in the framing of this event in order to see how it compares to what was reported in the newspaper articles. Nancy and Bruce authorize important voices in their accounts of the event. Although they are the sole voices represented in this account, (for example, they don’t directly quote anyone else like the journalist can), they speak about what they saw and who they talked to, the purpose of the march as they understood it, and their experiences afterwards. In other words, I relied on participants as resources in constructing an understanding of what had happened and what relevant issues were involved in order for me to have a more robust understanding of what had happened that day. Overall, they authorize their own voices and standpoints as relevant eye-witnesses as well as authorize the standpoints of the farmer and of the marchers that were fired upon by the military in order to describe their understandings of the actions of all involved.
The Witness of the Conflict. Nancy began her description of the event by foregrounding how military personnel were established in ranks hours before the marchers arrived at the event.

We saw the assembling of all the equipment and the police, and the military officers. But we were told not to be concerned because there was a cease-fire in effect. When you see big trucks unloading men and equipment you start to wonder you know if you’re right in the middle of a war zone or not. Yet we were told repeatedly it’s okay. I’d gone and gotten some ice cream, which I do in almost every country of the world, and had just finished my ice cream when the crowd started to surge.

Here, Nancy revealed that the cease-fire, which the papers reveal as having occurred between the military and the communist groups composing the marchers, came across to Nancy as meaning there would be no violence that day coming from either side. This is what she was told. This framing confirms the newspaper account from official sources as well.

The Military. Bruce also provided some descriptions of the military activities that made him suspicious of something about to take place. He and his group watched the military set up their crowd control equipment.

One of the things we could see from the balcony was that on the other side, right over on the other side of the bridge, they had a water cannon. And they had military trucks and so forth down the road here as well.
as police were talking with the military people. One of the things that I noticed as well as several others did was that there were people in kind of Hawaiian shirts which was a normal fare, clearly with pistols in the small of their backs under the shirts, they were loose hanging shirts, not tucked in. And they were interacting with the police. As we were there, the word came that the marchers were coming. They were visible. When that happened these guys in the shirts with weapons left but they dispersed not by going back over the hill where the military was but by going out towards the marchers. And I firmly believe, although I cannot swear to it, that the first shot came from one of those police, the under cover Hawaiian shirt men. They're the only ones I know and saw that had weapons.

Bruce’s experience at the event portrays another possibility not considered by someone such as the journalist who had to rely on others to provide an accounting for what happened. He believed that what he saw represented infiltrators, undercover policemen, who had fired from within the crowd in order to make it appear like the marchers had initiated the violence.

**Witnessing the Event.** Both participants who witnessed the event described it as very unexpected and as an act of aggression by the military who chose lethal over no-lethal methods of dispersing the crowd. The marchers were described as many people coming in to negotiate with the military. Nancy described how,

The marchers were coming in just like a movement, a big wave of marchers, down this main street towards the bridge. Now it’s very traditional, and I know this
from after the fact, that it’s very traditional in Filipino society that instead of just shooting at each other and taking pot shots and things like that, the leadership of both sides come together. They send their leaders out, they talk, they go back to the troops, they make their decisions, they come back, and a lot of negotiations take place. It’s a style, it’s an orchestrated style of conflict. And we saw it more than once when we were there. It’s not like you see in many of our civil rights demonstrations where the police just unloaded and started pushing demonstrators and firing weapons and things like that. It wasn’t like that. It was very organized.

Her description of the marchers brings up a point on what she thought the negotiations would be like, based on what she had seen previously of government negotiations with protesting groups and what she had been told after the event took place. Here Nancy is letting me know that the way in which the police had opened up fire on the crowd was not what she had witnessed in other demonstrations. This led her to describe how she felt it was out of character from how she had already seen confrontations of this sort being managed by both sides. She described the shooting and her experiences.

They fired into the crowd. It was not expected, it was not anticipated. The crowd panicked. People got down on the ground to avoid the first volley of gunfire, and then as it stopped for a moment, people got up and started to run. I had been behind a cement column supporting part of a building right on the street. And as I got up to run, somebody behind me hadn’t gotten up yet and the crowd surging behind me started pushing and my feet were trapped so I went flat down on the pavement. And people fell on top of me because the whole crowd was fleeing, so because there was one
person down others started to fall. And at that point I lost consciousness and I don’t know what else happened. And all I can say is that when I came back to consciousness the crowd had dispersed and there were dead bodies lying around. And I have no idea how long I was out. It took me awhile to actually sit up and crawl over and prop myself up against the building. I was quite significantly injured at that point.

Here she portrayed the military as initiating the violence and described her waking up in the aftermath of the shooting. Although Bruce discusses how the marchers had been aware that there would be an attempt to stop the march at the bridge, Nancy noted that the existence of the cease-fire may have given people hope that the negotiations between the groups would not end up in violence. She labels the shooting as unexpected and her inability to disentangle herself from the crowd.

Bruce also discussed how in the immediate aftermath, the military continued to shoot at people with bullets and pellet guns, but never used the water cannon he had seen them set up out of the way of the marchers before the confrontation.

The immediate response of course was cries and panic. There was no attempt when the shooting started to rush the soldier’s line. They were fleeing. Well the shooting stopped and then the military parted and a couple of jeeps came up over the bridge. I mean they [the troops] parted and came through that and they had these pellet guns, riot guns that shoot semi-hard balls. Because I remember at one point where I was trying to see what happened, I stuck my head out and pulled it back quickly because a jeep was just going
by. I knew the jeep was coming because I saw one of those rubber balls bouncing down the road. Then the jeep went on tearing down that way, shoving people along, urging them, if anyone was gathering anyplace they were shooting.

Here, Bruce foregrounded the violence of the military upon the crowd and in doing so, provides context for the descriptions of military and marcher activities that are in direct contrast to the roles each group plays within the newspaper article accounts and he supports Nancy’s account as well. For him, he foregrounded how he was struck by the fact that he saw that the police had other standard, non-lethal methods in place (such as a water cannon) for dispersing a crowd that military members chose not to use, as the lethal method was chosen first.

The thing that got me was that the initial response was this deluge of fire and they never brought out the water cannon, which would have been a non-lethal way of containing a crowd or a riot. But they never even brought that in where it could be used because it had never come over the bridge. The response was immediate and with force and violence and after the initial barrage it was just, it really was in one broad sense kind of a going down to sporadic shots all coming from the military side of it. So everyone was running down the streets trying to get out of the way of the firing.

Now, the context that he provided here demonstrates more possibilities about the event. Had the military and police been surprised if they had been setting up equipment and getting into formation for hours before the marchers encountered them? Would this knowledge have changed the
journalists' story? It also raises the question of why the military chose to fire upon the crowd, who gave the orders, and why non-lethal containment methods were not tried first. In this way, Bruce is demonstrating that the military took actions to respond to the crowd within a different context than described in the newspaper articles. The articles frame the shooting by the military as unplanned and performed by unidentified soldiers. The articles also frame the military violence as lasting very briefly, as being a last response due to the violence initiated by the crowd, and as justified due to the behavior of the marchers. In this way, Bruce is legitimizing the protest and the definitions by the leftist groups quoted in the paper. However, these possible definitions of the situation from these angles then uncovers some hidden meaning - groups are denouncing the government but not the military. Yet it is the military who has been accused of shooting the people and have a history of performing atrocities against the Filipino people represented by the groups in that march. Clearly, from these descriptions, these witnesses feel it is the military to blame.

Discussion. Together, Bruce and Nancy foreground the marchers as a group and the issues they present as justified
and coherent in their issues and their actions as purposively related to specific land reform issues that were not defined in the papers. They are not described as violent, but as wanting to march to the palace and expecting to get stopped by the military. The citizens that rescued Nancy from the area where the shooting had taken place are portrayed as careful and vigilant in their reactions to the shooting. The military members are portrayed as the aggressors in both accounts and the Aquino government is presented as being viewed as good by the marchers. This is in direct contrast to the image of the marcher and military roles in the newspaper accounts. By foregrounding these issues, both Nancy and Bruce authorized and presented as legitimate the concerns of the farmers and marchers. Additionally, their perception of the people who rescued Nancy background the issues the military established as important in the newspaper articles - that the marchers were unruly, violent, "a swarming mass" and the like which minimize their standpoints as people. Together, Bruce and Nancy legitimated their concerns and their understanding of the violence that took place that day as being entirely organized and executed by military members. Both Bruce and Nancy offered a perspective that frames the actions of the
military as deliberate, considered choices to fire onto people in the crowd.

For many on the trip, the shock of the shooting and of trip participant involvement made them want to fly back immediately to the United States. Others were able and willing to stay on. Four participants stayed on with trip organizers after the other trip members had left. Two members of the group testified at the government commission established to investigate the incident and two traveled north to see more of the Philippines and having been invited to speak at a march on a northern island as well. One member going home believed a military instigator was put on the plane to harass her by shouting racist and sexist obscenities with no authority on the plan stopping him. Their stories were very rich, sometimes making me laugh along with me and a participant on the tape, other times making me pause and catch my breath, caught up in the resonance of people’s words. As special as these stories are to me, I want to save them for a future time and discussion. Instead, I want to prioritize how their stories explained their reasoning for understanding hunger and justice issues in the ways that they explained to me, and how was impacted by their working within the 1980’s and what they learned from these experiences.
Section I: Overall Analysis

In comparing and contrasting the two accounts, I found that there were great differences in interpretation between interviewee and press accounts. This develops primarily from the reliance on different authorized subjects as resources to explain the event in each account.

The newspaper articles represented the activities of people in authorized, institutional roles and were therefore an interpretation representing the standpoint of traditional, structured institutions (the media genre) and roles (such as "journalist"). As such, the articles focused on the actions of the marchers in that particular incident and then used this description to bring in official sources who described their response in terms of the consequences to the government, to the military, to international lending organizations (the World Banks) and U.S. lenders. In contrast, the interview participants authorized voices in traditional institutions (church) as well as non-traditional roles (such as the marchers, farmers, and people experiencing poverty) and used their roles in non-traditional ways in order to emphasize the issues that the marchers were attempting to present to the government. They framed marcher perspectives based upon
the people they met while on the trip as well as from their past work on hunger and social justice issues in other countries. In this way, the interviewees discuss the context in which the march took place based upon the needs and concerns of the people most directly suffering from the policies of land reform. Specifically, they discuss the socio-political conditions of the farmer's poverty due to corporate takeover of their land and a historically corrupt government and military controlled by business interests and foreign investment policies.

Solutions to the problems identified in each account, as a result of the authorized voices and context that each provides, also prioritize different issues to be resolved and different suggestions for reflection on both dominant and alternative definitions of what stabilization in the Philippines means. In article accounts, solutions are described as the Philippine renegotiation of its debt to foreign investors in order to encourage new negotiations with the World Bank, all of which is being coordinated by the United States. The military is described as being in the position to establish order while these decisions are taking place and as a necessary component in the ability for Aquino to maintain her power, for these negotiations to take place, and for the constitution to be voted upon.
Overall, these articles together create an explanation that is aimed at conclusions related to the consequences to the Philippine and United States governments and commercial investors rather than the people of the country. In contrast, interviewee accounts discussed the consequences of these activities on the people living in poverty within the country impacted by land reform policies the most. Interview participants framed their solutions to the political and economic tensions in the Philippines within discourse on the impact of neo-colonialist practice on a country concerning agrarian issues. Moreover, they frame this discussion using class, race, and gender discourses on inequalities, as well as what they have learned from their own experiences to describe how trade policies and hunger create situations of poverty. Therefore, their descriptions emphasize the relevance of land reform through the voices and experiences of people they met on the trip as well as from past experiences working on these issues.

In this way, interview participants foreground the standpoint of the marchers who have been delegitimized in article accounts, as the articles only use the perspective of the group to support military or government claims that all "leftist" groups were acting together in order to destabilize the government. By taking this standpoint,
interviewees discuss solutions that reflect the standpoints of the marchers and other rural poor in the Philippines and legitimize their ideas for improving their conditions. Interviewees also discussed solutions as coming from their organizations in being able to fund small agrarian projects or network groups so that they could share resources to implement development projects focusing on the hunger and poverty needs in a community. They also stressed the importance of developing networks between people and organizations as enabling people's movements to organize more effectively to meet their needs through a process emphasizing self-sustainability and local development. Finally, they framed their solutions as based upon how their work roles could facilitate this process for local communities by funding projects and assisting in the establishment of global networks between rural people, people's movements, and organizations supporting their goals.

These participants provide some of the context hidden by the newspaper articles that bring the marchers as valid, authorized agents into the discussion and construction of meaning around what happened the day of the march. In doing so, they emphasized the connections between United States policies and the perpetuation of hunger and poverty,
as well as the myths that support these practices. Through their experiences, they emphasize that the issues of poverty and hunger are not abstract. They discussed how these processes occur due to specific trends related to global, economic policies and discussed how the middle class power to change these dynamics is marginalized and minimized within the United States.

As a result, these two accounts frame causal significance of the event based upon resources primarily in opposition to each other. The public description emphasizes the consequences of the violence on the ability for Aquino to maintain a stable government and not hurt or destabilize investments in the country. In this way, the dominant, public definitions for the event and its surrounding issues prioritizes the abstract institutional processes of business and government over the lives of individuals. Article solutions emphasize concern over governmental loss of power and their solutions refer to changes in abstract policies, in development loans, and through further negotiations between countries in order to keep social institutions running. This framework thus represents the hegemony of ruling relations over the interpretation of the event as based upon what is publicly
available to know about its occurrence from newspaper articles.

Moreover, when participants talked about their organizational work in the 1980s, their comments about their lives and their work provided additional dimensions in understanding the cultural context of their interpretations. Participants tended to foreground what practices they considered to be the root causes of hunger and poverty existing across the globe. In this way, they brought up the suffering of people in hunger and poverty as paramount to their understanding of the social conditions of the Philippines. This social context regarding national policies, hunger, and poverty and the concerns of any group other than the military, banks, or governments, are completely absent from article descriptions of the issues explaining the march. Additionally, although they are referred to in abstract forms in the literature review, the participants’ experiences explain and made these issues localized. Therefore, they connected the abstract definitions of world hunger and poverty to concrete policies and practices that could be changed by individuals in the United States to help rectify these issues. They also foregrounded the opportunity for U.S. churches to take part in raising this awareness to congregation constituents.
as well as public policy makers and the changes that could occur to rectify these issues. Therefore, their reasons as United States citizens to visit the Philippines and the relationships and networks being established or strengthened was one very different than the relationship proposed by the newspaper articles which suggest that only government bureaucrats and banks do business in the Philippines. In such a way, using their own experiences as a legitimizing basis for the discourse they were attempting to get discussed in public spaces, they had to say, they foregrounded what is usually backgrounded or omitted in public discourse regarding these issues.

Additionally, participants expressed awareness that this approach was a non-normative one for analyzing and discussing hunger, social injustice, and globalization practices in U.S. culture. In their comments, they expressed their knowledge that connecting their Christian beliefs to actions that took the standpoint of the poor into political, economic, and religious arenas supported by dominant social arrangements. They also spoke with awareness that by their connecting these issues to the existence of racism, classism, and sexism, that what they were promoting meant stepping out of the traditional approach that churches had taken to assisting people out of
poverty. What they shared with me by discussing their work experiences and reflections began to introduce me to the values they hold as critical to the activities in which they participated. Their stories reflect inherent ethical standpoints valued by participants: human rights, dignity, the right to food, and the right to economic independence.

Overall, we can use this comparison of accounts to see how certain possibilities that these different perspectives provide are subsumed in the dominant media while others are prioritized in the constructing of accounts concerning the relationship of the United States to the Philippines. By providing contrasting, experiential account to that posed by the newspaper articles, I demonstrate the different possibilities for interpreting the nature of the event and the issues it involved. These alternative constructions, normally subsumed in history due to the everyday practices of the constructions of history, resurfaces to call into question the stream-lined version occurring in the newspaper articles as well as the short descriptions existing in the historical literature I found describing the incident. In these ways, the interviewee accounts and historical research offered additional perspectives that I used as resources for understanding the event and the surrounding issues from a standpoint located within the
United States. Analyzing experience in this way demonstrated how discourses and activities overlap to provide new possible interpretations to inform my understanding about this event as well as what had brought my mother to be on that trip as a church representative.

Section II: The Cultural Context of Ecumenical Work on Social Justice Issues in the United States

Along with the questions directly related to the event and its aftermath, I asked participants to describe the political climate and culture in the United States during the 1980's. Specifically, I asked participants to talk about the general political climate in the United States, the political climate of the U.S. churches, and how these climates impacted their ability to do their work. Additionally, I asked them to describe what it was like to be an American in the Philippines, what they experienced there that was most memorable, and finally, what they had learned from their experiences - how they felt now about the work that they had been doing during this time period. Overall, these perspectives show some of the resources and obstacles experienced in the cultural ideas and activities surrounding their work. Here I was looking for how their
experiences had been structurally organized based upon what
cultural resources they turned to in order to define their
work activities as well as those elements of culture that
created obstacles to their work.

Section II: Authorized Subjects/Voices

Interviewees authorized four voices in answering my
questions concerning the religious and political climate in
which they worked and their feelings about this work now.
First, they authorized their own voices in expressing their
personal experiences working on these issues in the public
domain. Second, they discussed the political context by
bringing in how perspectives critical of this work, coming
from the development of an organized religious right in the
United States and discussed how this impacted their work and
the response of the organizations they were networked with
in doing their work. Within this frame, participants also
discussed the responses of congregation members who were
impacted by their work in organizing people in the United
States against economic oppression. Third, they discussed
the perspective of government officials, and a general
culture growing more conservative in its approaches to
international relations as well as in providing for the
needs of the poor within the United States. Fourth, they
authorized the voices of the people they had worked with throughout the years in helping them to understand their role as Americans working to resolve these issues. Fifth, as they authorized in Section I, participants explained their positions taking the standpoint of the poor, of landless people, of people organizing in local communities around hunger and justice issues that they had met and for some, established deep relationships with, through their work on these issues.

In such a way, as with Section I, interviewees authorized and legitimated their voices within the context of the church as legitimate frames within which to discuss poverty and hunger, yet showed how these church sites were places in which these meanings were also contested. Through foregrounding and backgrounding techniques, they authorize the churches they worked for and the networks of which they were a part.

Section II: Identified Groups, Actions, and Issues through Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Omission Techniques

In this next section, participants discussed what it was like to do their work in the 1980s and how this work had impacted their outlook on life. They discussed the political and religious climate of the 1980s and how these
conditions impacted their ability to do their work, how it felt to be Americans doing this work, and how their work involved participation in experiential education on these issues.

They also discussed how their social locations and the standpoints they represented within them both helped and hindered their work. They also demonstrated how these activities went against the dominant cultural messages about the role of the church in these matters, and their role as Americans as well. These realizations enabled them to recognize and struggle with the meaning of their privilege and power and its impact on the work that they did while advocating for a more equitable distribution of power and resources across people and nations throughout the world.

The Political and Religious Landscape of the 1980s

When participants talked about their work in relation to the political climate in the 1980's most foregrounded how a conservative atmosphere had taken hold of the United States' approach to its own poor as well as its approach to recognizing and supporting the self-development needs of poor people abroad. They emphasized mainstream economic, political, and social conditions, mainstream government
perspectives, and debates within the church as cultural factors that impacted their work activities.

Participants discussed how government representatives and policies along with the development of the "religious moral majority" began to label the work of church representatives involved in organizing of the poor supported through church congregation collections, as communist and as inappropriate for church work. Therefore, in this section they authorized their position in reaction to these conservative trends in order to frame the criticism and their response to this criticism for their work with the poor both nationally and internationally.

Mainstream Economic, Political, and Social Conditions.

Nancy talked about how the United States was going through its own phase of structural adjustment and the politics involved in this adjustment during this time period. For instance, she noted that,

The 80s were a time in which the whole creation of the idea of the rust belt occurred. Big portions of the economy were falling apart which meant that there was a lot of economic struggle within the country as a whole and to start talking about the political issues involved in why people are hungry was extremely difficult.

Here, she foregrounded the importance of talking about poverty and connecting it to political issues as being more...
difficult when the economy was struggling. She implied that people did not want to hear about the struggles of the poor when they were struggling themselves. One possible interpretation of this comment is that people did not want to hear this connection because they did not want to see the connection between themselves and the poor either in their country or external to it. That this connection was normally made invisible, due to normative practices of people shaped by political and economic policies that usually kept the relationships between different groups abstracted and unconnected.

Jean discussed how she saw the impact of an increasingly conservative attitude emerging in legislation, government policies, and people’s general attitudes.

Well, it started to get pretty hairy. The government was increasingly conservative in those multiple terms [of Reagan’s presidency] there. And it even drew up young people I was teaching in college. And it was frightening that they were so conservative because they were right behind the civil rights movements, they were the next generation. These were black kids and it wasn’t that they were conservative by real standards but conservative by Southern black standards. So that was the beginning. When you noticed it there you knew how conservative the whole planet could become.

Here Jean foregrounded her experiences teaching to discuss the increasingly conservative climate of the United States, and associated it with President Reagan’s two presidential terms. She described the connection between presidencies
and conservative politics, as beginning to background the impact of the civil rights movement in national culture on the generation of people following its immediate occurrence. Walden discussed how the United States had both liberal and conservative movements being supported in mainstream culture. He talked about how,

It was a mixed sort of thing. There was this openness, liberalization in government and in Latin America and some places in Asia but at the same time, there was also a counter movement. I don’t know how to characterize it but there is also the beginning of the neo-conservative movement in the U.S. And this is fascinating also. For instance, the moral majority was founded at this time by Jerry Falwell. And this is now at the time of Reagan - President Reagan coming in. And the Cold War heating up.

Within this increasing conservative atmosphere, participants discussed the political nature of advocating for the poor at the local and national levels. Nancy again talked about how these discussions became politically contested. She noted that,

Well there’s always political problems around who you fund where, who’s the deserving poor, who is not the deserving poor. Any time you’re putting money into the whole notion of how our country was built, on the backs of pioneers and people pulling themselves up by their bootstraps, this has created a mentality in this country that there is a deserving poor and a non-deserving poor and that’s political. That’s very political in terms of who these people are.

Here she’s foregrounded the values that people place on how people become poor and how they end their poverty as
individualized, and the difficulties in explaining why people's money went to organizations that supported the belief that structural situations cause poverty, rather than individualize the problem, as dominant trends normalized. Jean also brought up the politics involved when discussing the root causes of and solutions to structural factors that create poverty and in advocating for the voices of the poor to be heard in culture.

Inevitably, you know, when poor people band together it inevitably becomes political. You can't avoid it. Because their whole condition and everything is attached to what's going on politically. And it's not rocket science for people to figure that out. So once they get together and have support you know from each other, many times the next move is something that is either political or has political connotations. Which is one of the reasons people fear people becoming organized. The establishment fears it.

Here, Jean tied in how poverty is a political issue that is feared by people supported by organized social institutions - the ruling relations. Here, she indicates why organizing people's movements were so threatening to the people supporting status quo conditions. By banding together, people can make change that disrupts current power relations.

Both participants discussed the impact of the conservative climate on branding their work to help the poor as anti-American. Nancy discussed how she tried to teach
congregations about their connection to these issues, within this political climate.

There were consistent famines in Africa and there were areas like Bangladesh that became suddenly extremely debt ridden and food deficient and needed to be dealt with. And people had never even heard of some of these places. So it was important that they understand why Bangladesh had been one of the larger food producing countries in that part of the world until much of the land was bought by corporations to be used for export agriculture rather than domestic production. And the local people suffered.

Here, Nancy brought up her role as an educator in the United States on the relationship between hunger and corporate practices. She foregrounded the necessity of being able to help people connect conceptually their local lifestyles to the global impact of these lifestyles on the poor. She added that for people in the United States this was critical to supporting the changes her organization promoted because it enabled people to see how these issues connected directly to hunger and poverty rates in both the United States and other countries. In this way, her work offered people concrete information about how these practices and issues are connected together, which she believed could make a difference to people's perceptions and therefore response to these issues.

And only by understanding that, if you do one the other happens, can people begin to understand that you maybe still have to do one but you do less of it. Or you do it in such a way that local people still have access to
their own domestic plot or that things are grown for the local market. It’s much easier for a farmer to produce something for the global market at five hundred dollars an acre than it is to produce beans or rice for the local market at ten dollars an acre. And as long as we pull farmers from some of these small countries, as long as we go in and collect them up and get them growing cut flowers for tables in Europe and the United States, they’re not growing rice and beans for their local communities and the whole country starts to suffer. But those are political issues. How much do we interfere with international business before we become the bad guys?

Here she identified the problems of doing this type of work that required her to advocate against corporate control over power and resources and the impact of cash crops or the structural impediments to the resolution of hunger in a country. She described how doing this work from a position within the church created tension because it challenged people’s definitions of what type of support they thought they should offer to capitalist ventures that were supposed to be good for the development of the United States. By foregrounding the role that U.S. companies played in perpetuating a system of poverty in other countries, she discussed how a debate developed around how the church should be involved in raising these issues before they started being viewed as not supportive of the United States government.

Jean also connected the work that she was doing with the work that had occurred at this level during the civil
rights and women’s movements, which was encouraging cross-cultural perspectives on economic inequality and poverty issues.

Let me just say this as a little bit of an aside, you know Dr. King got killed when he delved into foreign policy and was against the war. And that did not escape people’s notice. ... The subject was not broached as I recall until, at that level, of speaking out. I think Dr. King was the first or certainly one of the very first to be so vocal about it and certainly with no greater following. Nobody with any great movement or following like he had. To begin to speak out against the war and against other foreign policies. Economic policy – getting help for, on an economic basis, rather than just keep talking about black people, you know, poor whites, Indians, Latin, you know. He was concerned about that as was Fannie Lou Hamer. And she quickly saw the connection to the movement for example. And allied herself with the parts of the women’s movement that she felt like she could stand. Because she saw the connections, she kept trying to bring white women along.

Here Jean connected the role of two of the most prominent leaders in the civil rights movements connecting economic and foreign policy to civil rights for all people living in poverty. She discussed their concerns as representing alternative viewpoints in making these connections and the reactions of the traditional civil rights leadership. She foregrounded how these two examples of individuals backgrounded the differences between different types of social movements in order to establish the connections between race, class, and gender and the impact of economic and political policies at national and international levels.
She also foregrounded how this perspective, though critical to an understanding of intersections in inequality, was radical discourse to people using the already established discursive claims developed from within both the civil rights and women's movements. By connecting the issues in order to consider the position of the poor, she shows how these standpoints were unpopular to both mainstream public audiences as well as audiences involved in other types of social movements in the United States.

A lot of our people refused to deal with foreign policy, period. Because you know we were traditionally told that that was not our purview, the civil rights leadership, the traditional leadership, anytime they stepped outside of dealing with the "po' condition of black folk" they would be told to go back and deal with the old problems.

Nancy also foregrounded the impact of the civil rights movement on the political and social fabric of U.S. society. She talked about how,

The whole society was political. We had come through the civil rights movement but it was still being fought out in a lot of areas so there was a lot of contentiousness just in general in society.

Together, these participants foregrounded the political climate of the United States as having come from contentious ground and as moving into more conservative approaches to world issues involving hunger and poverty. They discussed how this factor was influenced by changes in
U.S. policy towards developing countries, and specifically foregrounded the relevance of how the United States attempted to sabotage the efforts while making its involvement as the saboteurs invisible. Therefore, these comments reveal some elements of the public climate that describe how participants struggled against cultural obstacles to make the efforts of poorer countries to be more sustainable, invisible to the public by making these connections visible.

Mainstream Government Perspectives. Participants also discussed the impact that mainstream government approaches, specifically identified as occurring during Ronald Reagan's presidential terms and as a result of the policies he promoted as president towards international relationships, which fed imperialist tendencies already existing in government officials.

For example, Bruce framed his discussion in terms of the attitudes he encountered in his public policy negotiations that represented this standpoint towards other countries less economically powerful than the United States and bound to U.S. interests due to their debt. Using the Philippines as his specific example, he explained the political climate in Washington as,
Well we were, although it was not as rabid/rampant as it now is in many instances, even 25, 30 years ago, there was a great deal of anti-American, ugly American sentiment abroad and a complete misunderstanding by Americans and members of Congress. I can remember one of the times before this that I was in the Philippines and there was a protest, the Filipinos against the U.S. And they were rock throwing and assembling outside the U.S. embassy. Well the U.S. Embassy had some concrete lions out in front like a library has these things, ornamentals. And one got broken in this protest. And some member of Congress said 'You know, these people don’t appreciate all that we’ve done for them. You know, in terms of all of the aid that we’ve given them and our military bases there to protect them and we ought to just take it all away and let them fend for themselves.' You know, that they were unappreciative, anti-American. It made big banner headlines.

Here Bruce foregrounded a generally imperialist-oriented attitude as being the popular standpoint of U.S. Congress members towards the Philippines in particular, but generally towards other countries with little economic power. He discussed how this attitude was misguided due to a lack of realization that the U.S. involvement in the Philippines was not benefiting the people of the country. He continued this discussion and stated that,

And of course, no realization that yeah, we have military bases there, they were also the biggest source of income for prostitutes and these were prostitutes I saw and spoke to [on the educational tour]. One prostitute that was 13 years of age and you know heard how, well, they like the American soldier better than the Japanese businessman. I mean all that kind of stuff. And there was all of the problems from our aid, well, a lot of it went to clearing land that Dole took over to grow their pineapples because they could no longer grow them in Hawaii. So here, we were greatly benefiting and, if you will, economically, and morally
raping the Philippines and this guy was all upset because they had broken up this concrete lion. I mean, it was that kind of atmosphere. And of course we were helping them out of our largess. And so there was a lot of this.

Here he discussed how abstractly government leaders framed issues of their control over the Philippines. Here, he's describing the operationalization of imperialism as reflected in people's attitudes and beliefs about the role of the U.S. government in the Philippines. In doing so, his alternative belief about what this role represents foregrounds the standpoints of the Filipinos he met and the experiences he had while in the Philippines.

Donna foregrounded the development of a new warfare policy undertaken by the United States as impacting the work that she did during that time. She discussed how government officials developed and implemented the concept of low intensity warfare. She described this as a time in which,

This was where the U.S. government was providing military and financial support to groups that many considered to be renegades but they were sort of held up as the freedom fighters. And so that was part of the debate and so in Nicaragua you had the Contras, that the U.S. supported against the Sandinistas who had emerged out of the popular rebellion against a very oppressive government, Samosas, which the U.S. had provided support for over the years. And so you had a lot of military disruption that was taking place. So they didn't declare war against any of these countries, you had Nicaragua, El Salvador, they had already invaded Grenada in 1984. You know so all the efforts in terms of trying to basically create an alternative
political and economic model in the Caribbean and in Latin America were under direct attack.

She foregrounded how this policy focused on specific countries that were advocating for alternative, more equitable distributions of power and resources within their countries. She suggested that this alternative economic goals of countries was their attempt to remove some of the economic and political obstacles to development that kept them with little economic power and under the control of foreign interests, specifically those of the United States.

Therefore, for her, it was important to foreground the relevance of the U.S. government's trends in war as connected to countries that were advocating for alternative systems than ones that fit directly into the traditional power relations of the capitalist, global economy.

She also discussed how church workers on these social justice issues advocating for structural changes had to justify, in a variety of public arenas, that they supported their government. She described how this defensive position developed as criticism by an opposition front portrayed by the media as well as the religious right began to brand the churches as communist sympathizers. She discussed how she took a critical approach to the arguments being advanced to
the public that her work was wrong after it had been placed under the label of communist.

To be able to make that kind of argument and sort of counter but not having the same kind of resources and access to the media that the government did in terms of painting this other picture. Demonizing what was being done, that it was almost bordering on communism, that we all know that communism is this horrible thing even if you don’t even really know what it is but people are told that it’s a terrible thing. That it’s so bad that you don’t even want to know what it is, just take our word for it. But when you look at the kinds of activities and who they support in the name of fighting communism, you really just have to ask the question, wait a minute, a lot of people are losing their lives so how is the alternative that you’re proposing better? And how does it really justify the kind of repression and brutality that you’re supporting in the name of fighting communism?

Here, Donna discussed how government leaders and the media supported anti-Communist rhetoric that foregrounded the concept of Communism and backgrounded the violence committed against people in the name of fighting Communism. That the violence occurring in the name of fighting Communism was no better than the system of Communism to which mainstream public opinion was opposed. She also described her understanding that people in the United States did not know any of the actual social conditions that Communism might represent when objectified yet they adopted it as a symbol when they could apply it to activities within the church of which they did not approve. Support of this mislabeling by government and through mass media aided the application of
this symbol and the rhetoric accompanying it, to church worker activities. She continued by talking about this element of her interactions with people.

So I think really it begged the question and rarely was there the opportunity to have that kind of discussion. Once they raise the flag of communism, people sort of shut down and do not want to be associated with it. Even though what they're talking about sort of makes sense - they're talking about universal healthcare, universal education. Well if that's communism, maybe it's not so bad after all. So when you look at it and begin to talk about the specifics of it as opposed to what's painted as the image.

Here, Donna discussed how critical examination of some of the tenants of a Communist system had common elements to some of the issues being debated within mainstream discourses already existing from people's concerns regarding these issues. Yet the label of Communism prevented people from making the connections between the activities already considered to be normative points to debate, and the activities of church workers stigmatized as Communist. Here, she also clarified and supported the perspective of Nancy who foregrounded the debate in the churches over their appropriate role in examining the causes of social injustices. Both participants discussed the frame by which that debate began to be taken into the public and political arenas for discussion, as they began to become publicly identified with people's movements considered to be
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subversive activities by the government. Their perspectives on these issues show how the symbol of Communism, as defined by the state, was distributed through the media, and began to impact their everyday work lives and interactions with other people.

Nancy also discussed how the National Council of Churches, an ecumenical coalition, faced much criticism during this time for its radical political perspective. It too was coming under heavy fire by both the media and government as being Communist sympathizers who were misrepresenting church people and misusing their monies. She mentioned that, as a partial sponsor of the trip to the Philippines, the director came to the Philippines after the violence had occurred to do “damage control.” In other words, to strategize how to handle the media depiction of the event and suppress information placing the tour members at the event. She discussed the Council’s fear that public knowledge of the existence of Americans at the event would further tarnish its image and impact as an ecumenical council in the United States. She explained this connection by discussing how,

Because these poor farmers in many countries have ties with the Communist party or are the Communist party or are understood to be Communist because of what they want, whether they are or not literally on the ground. But if they’re seen from Americans as communists, there
was a big concern about damage control to the reputation for the National Council of Churches.

Here, then, she explained how the National Council of Churches did not want to be implicated by the U.S. media as having been involved as a sponsor for a trip connected to learning from people in the Philippines associated with workers' movements, some of them Communist-affiliated at that time. This was explained as being due to the overall public tendencies to label these activities as anti-American and Communist.

Here we can see how a conservative agenda demonized any work towards any ideological framework that called for the redistribution of power and resources as a resolution to the suffering of people trapped by structural inequalities and prevented them from living healthy, hunger-free lives.

Walden foregrounded some of the avenues in the public arena that encouraged people in the United States to emphasize human rights. He explained how this emphasis on human rights facilitated dialogue about the situation of the poor in other countries as initiated by the foreign policy approach of President Jimmy Carter. He discussed how this perspective shaped the nature of aid going to countries with highly documented human rights abuses and how, as a result, many government leaders listened and began to restructure
their governments from dictatorships, to, at least what it looked like on paper, democracies. He explained that,

Well in a sense, of course, the 80's you can't understand that without the 70's. And the mid-70's there was this openness I think in the political climate in the US because of Carter becoming the president and his emphasis on human rights as part of foreign policy. So that dictators all over the place could no longer say, hey, leave us alone when the United States said in terms of policy that they are going to look after human rights that was very, very important. I mean this was new. So that was Carter's opening. And then you get into the early 80's. And the trend in the 80's then, I don't know to what extent the Carter policy was instrumental in doing this but in the 80's then the dictatorship governments, in Latin America especially but in other parts as well, started to change. There was a process of liberalization. Almost every government started to become a democratic government. I think the trend is, it's the people, really, this network of people in the rural areas, that were very, they were very happy in terms of getting into a democratic framework. And I think that's a very strong part of it.

Here, he identified the impact of the United States on the restructuring of other governments and the ideals of democracy appealing to people networked throughout the rural areas desiring to become democratic rather than live in a dictatorship. Here Walden may be indicating the possibilities of how people define democracy as a government system without including the detrimental impacts of globalization in the process of democratizing. That there is the possibility that democracy is introduced to people without the information of the impact this will have on
local economies. Here, then, is another colonizing tool at work, as it is the corporations involved in development processes that champion trade liberalization as they buy up land for investment purposes. In the United States, democracy is normalized to be associated with economic development, carrying with it a role for private investment and business to be the arm through which this occurs. He also backs up what Donna expressed by looking at how the implementation of human rights into foreign policy approaches of the U.S. government impacted the approach that countries led by dictators used in negotiating with the United States. He followed by noting that,

Carter, I think, was a very important opening - human rights. Because most of the things then that came out later were in the name of human rights. An investigation in Nicaragua, an investigation in El Salvador. The killings in Argentina. That was all in the name of human rights. And they were able to be articulated in the US and there was growing receptivity about that. And if you look in the period, films around the issue of political prisoners, of massacres, and all that sort of thing were coming out. And so that openness was there.

Here he talked about the emerging articulations of human rights in U.S. culture, even while there was a growing conservative political and economic climate and a growing U.S. public receptivity towards this reflected in the popular culture. Here again we can see hegemony at work. While discourse on human rights is being amplified,
investigations are occurring, yet countries trying to attain economic independence being engaged in low-intensity warfare sponsored by the United States.

Participants also discussed how this standpoint by the government created a backlash against activists who felt they were now being labeled as subversives as a result of their international networks. Jean discussed how people working on issues started to be watched and felt intimidated by the government.

And what was happening was that we were hearing news about organizations who were on certain lists, of people who were being targeted because their name may have turned up at some travel agency that books people to Central America. So you were always hearing some kind of rumor like that. You were hearing about strategies to defang the left and the various methods, you know, just lists of methods of how it could be done.

Here we can see how structurally, people were marginalized by popular opinion for the work that they did as radical enough to cause them to become targets for government surveillance although they had committed no crime. These comments reflect how these activities violated social norms and understandings about the relationship people should have to the politics of their nation’s involvement in other countries, and the ways that the people supporting this dominant paradigm were able to sanction individuals for
contesting the normative definitions of these relationships.

**Religious Debates.** Participants also discussed the impact of a debate within the churches at this time about the role of the church in social reforms and how this impacted their work using the church as an institutional support. Donna foregrounded the liberal versus conservative debates within churches at both the national and international levels, as impacting perceptions of the work in which she was involved.

I think nationally, there was sort of a whole debate or discussion about the role of the church. And so particularly outside of the US, during the 80s you had what they called, in Latin America, the emergence of the theology of liberation. And that was an effort of many poor people basically sort of reinterpreting the scriptures and identifying with Jesus the Christ as being a defender of those who were less fortunate than others as opposed to being in favor of the rich. So there was a lot of tension around those issues and discussions and there was a lot of activity around what is the correct role of the church around these social issues.

Additionally, participants mentioned the rise in the role of the right wing “moral majority” in criticizing their perspective on hunger and poverty within a church framework by connecting their work and the idea of liberation theology to communism. In doing so, this work was labeled as inappropriate for a Christian focus which impacted the
images of their work held by the public and by congregational audiences as well as policy makers in Congress. As Donna noted,

Then you also had the moral majority at the time, led by Jerry Falwell, who were advocating the opposite [of liberation theology]. I mean, one, there was no evidence that they really were the majority, that they represented the majority points of view. But they were just very vocal and very well funded and it really was a political argument that they were advancing under quote religion. That it was improper for the church to be involved in what they were calling "subversives." And so working with those who were advocating the theology of liberation was the equivalent of working with subversives.

Here Donna foregrounded the role of groups critical of her work, criticizing them as advancing a political argument using the conceptual framework people associated with religion yet had previously identified that liberation theology was relevant to the role of the churches in working on social justice issues. She also discussed how the religious right defined church work helping the poor to organize for their rights as the church enabling, in other words, as anti-American behavior. This conservative definition of work with the poor ignores the nationalist roots that can come from working to improve the lives of people within your community or nation. In this way, the debate discussed in my literature review concerning the
“ecumenical movement” is reflected in the political and religious climate of the 1980s here.

Donna also foregrounded how liberation theology promoted internationally through the consecutive social movements in Latin America became a point of contention within U.S. churches and impacted her work as,

Well, it was primarily being advocated internationally but it was local to the extent that you know churches were providing financial support for some of those efforts. So that was the national impact of it that this was an improper use of money that should be going to other types of work or causes.

She talked about how the public image of the groups and organizations funded through the sponsor program and in other programs began to be impacted and the reaction of the sponsor organization.

And so that impacted the work in terms of trying to help explain to people that you had these groups and organizations and that this was the kind of work that they were doing. That some of them were involved with the government but not necessarily. But for the most part, they supported the policies of their particular government and everyone was really talking about how do you improve quality of life for children and women and the elderly which tend to be the segments of the community that have the most challenges. So how do you do something that’s different to improve their quality of life?

People also foregrounded what it was like to do their work during this time by foregrounding how these elements of culture impacted their relationships with their local churches. They discussed how these images of their work
created backlash from parts of their respective religious denominations and from the religious right overall. Nancy gave examples as to how the struggle over this alternative role she encouraged in speaking to congregations caused her to faced backlash from congregation members in the business community.

Well the basic thing was that is was extremely political. There were huge portions of the denomination, local churches who didn't understand why we had any business in meddling in things like public policy around hunger relief whether it was national or international.

She explained her point further in noting the role of funding and giving as exacerbating this issue.

They didn’t understand why the dollars they put on the collection plate should be going to support their opposition. I mean, it’s as blunt as that. They gave dollars for hunger relief and they saw the church giving it back to groups that were the bad guys in their communities. And it didn’t make sense to them and they wanted it stopped.

In other words, taking on the standpoint of the poor in social circles that many did not have access to, such as middle class churches, negatively impacted the image of her work by congregation members whose livelihood benefited from taking advantage of the poor in everyday business arrangements. She noted the alternative role that the church played at this time in helping to resolve these
locally generated political issues in a way that she supported.

And they needed to be helped. So they understood that it was a committee that made the decision, not staff people. It was looked at from a larger perspective. That it wasn’t going over the desires but that the monies that were going into these organizations were actually being used to create cooperative buying clubs and to make sure that people were paid for the kind of staff work that they were doing.

She noted that her challenge as an educator was linking definitions of poverty to lifestyle choices of people living within the United States as well as based upon U.S. foreign policy and foreign lending organizations and the tension this created within the congregations with which she worked.

If we start giving funds to help organize farmers of the grassroots in Bangladesh, how much are we going to know interfere with international business processes that think they can go anywhere and do anything as long as they buy up the land and control situations. It’s very political when you start bringing to the U.S. Congress the fact that they shouldn’t be doing X, Y, and Z because X, Y, and Z will create bigger pockets of poverty. Because the return to us as a country might be that we all benefit at the local level. You and I might have better coffee or cheaper coffee.

Here she is framing all of the purposes of her work around the connections between lifestyles and quality of life as impacted by the everyday activities of individuals in a wealthy country which promotes poverty in another. By connecting these issues, she was showing how the beliefs of the church in aiding the hungry had to take an international
stance on social justice issues. This was a move not supported by the leaders of the dominant institutions, both dependent on the structure for support as well as distanced from the people facing the poverty caused by these activities.

Jean added on to Nancy's description of the debate within the churches over the relationship between the church and politics through her experiences establishing networks between different groups of rural women in the United States with rural women in other countries.

Not many churches were doing that kind of work on the Black side, but the left was doing that kind of work, the traditional left was doing that kind of work. We were going to Nicaragua, and people like the International League of Women, the National League for Peace and Freedom, marched to it, taking us to the border in Honduras and praying there and being involved in a lot of things that were mind expanding.

She also noted the split in her relationships between more conservative church approaches to these issues and the philanthropic institutions that the sponsor organization tended to deal with for funded projects (both nationally and internationally). She talked about how,

Many times, local churches would be a little more conservative than the agencies we were a part of. And they weren't really that close. Local churches from the U.S. situated in another country would sometimes be more conservative than the people that [sponsor organization] would have hosting us.
Here she described how the split in religious purpose occurred in churches supported by the U.S. internationally and the alternative networks that existed that were less conservative, paralleling the relationships between churches in the United States in debate about their role in these issues. Here is how we see hegemony creeping in to the successes of the initial development of this perspective.

The churches supporting alternative development and hunger response activities engaging the structure for change had to respond back to the criticisms of mainstream culture, mainstream religious culture and its extreme right component, and spend its time justifying its causes, fighting delegitimation while the conservative viewpoints were allowed to flourish.

Bruce talked about the impact of the development of the religious right’s activities on his ability to be an effective lobbyist on hunger and justice issues. He discussed how,

A couple things came to happen. One was the evangelical, the religious right woke up to this fact [church involvement in political lobbying] and so they began to create lobbying. At the same time, it began to dawn on the members of Congress that we really couldn’t deliver the votes that they thought we could. Even though we didn’t claim we could. ... But we lost a lot of ground when Reagan came to power and did not have as much, and the religious right began to give much more influence, Barry Graham and Pat Robertson... And they started doing the same kind of organizing of people and
they began visiting the same members of Congress and so all of a sudden, they said whoa, you Christians were in one position here. And then what happened is we both became irrelevant.

Bruce then, foregrounded the impact that the religious right had on his work in public policy, in that they negated the strength of the coalition in which Bruce was working. Although Bruce felt that these groups themselves did not have enough strength to impact specific policy concerns, he felt they had enough impact in conjunction with the mainstream media and government perspectives regarding these issues to reduce the power of constituencies advocating for the poor with Congressional members.

Donna also noticed the impact of a conservative outlook on policies targeting the poor and hungry by discussing how churches began to be stigmatized as sympathizing with communists. She noted how this public reaction sparked fear in church administrations over loss of congregation funding.

During the first term I think that people were much more active and then during the second term there seemed to be some more resignation to these types of policies. I think part of it was that there was some concern that financially the churches were going to sort of take a hit and maybe that the membership might be listening to the strong rhetoric that was being advanced by the right wing at that point. Because some of the denominations started to have more internal discussions about well maybe we need to be focussing more on you know strengthening our work here at home in the U.S. ... So we saw towards the end a more conservative trend setting in. Several denominations kind of relocated out of New York to the sort of the
bible belt area, the Midwest, talking more about doing home missionary kind of work and evangelism. I think there was an underlying theme that was about the money except it was couched in terms of 'well this is probably where we need to focus.'

Walden foregrounded the sponsor organizations' non-alignment to any one particular denomination for support in being able to respond to this criticism. He discussed how organizational representatives were prepared to challenge this criticism by emphasizing that they were working to organize poor people in order to enable them to sustain their livelihoods, rather than supporting any one particular politicized group of people based around a communist ideology. He discussed how their organization constantly differentiated their support of people's organizations and people's movements from the larger idea of communism or what an insurgency represented to the public in the United States and the constituencies in the churches.

Well in a sense you have denominations then who started asking okay where is our money going? Is it going to insurgency or what? So there was a tendency for instance, for churches, denominations, to ask you, to say we want straight answers, we want to know where our money's going. That was the immediate result of that issue. And because we were open at the very beginning we had involvement to show that this is what we are doing. We're helping people to get themselves organized. We are not involved in any insurgency work or anything. I think we were very lucky. Lucky in the sense that the insight of people's organizations was very important. That meant it had no political
aligning in a sense. We were not necessarily allied to any, there might be some connections at certain points with people, but our program is not to help the Communist efforts or that sort of thing, no. What we were saying is let’s help the people at the grassroots to get themselves organized in terms of their issues, in terms of their problems. So in hindsight that is a very important thing for us. [Author: Looking at how you needed to distinguish between people’s organizations and this larger idea of Communism or an insurgency?] Yes!

This is an interesting detail regarding the position of the sponsoring organization. In networking with the constituencies represented by their board, they were able to work on joint missions. However, their non-alignment to any particular denomination enabled the organizations to defend themselves and the projects funded by making all denominations jointly accountable for the work of the organization. Therefore, no single denomination could be singled out for criticism for their efforts in the political arena. They could not singly be targeted by their local congregations, or by members of the religious right and the sponsoring organization itself could continue to function based upon a jointly approved agenda approved by its board, which contained the representatives from these various denominations.

Nancy explained a similar situation regarding how her denomination’s program was prepared to act in defense of its funded programs by having a similar arrangement in its
decision-making process regarding the funded programs. She talked about how at one point,

"We were trying to help people who were being ousted from their homes and lands by large companies. And often in, it’s generally well known that [her denomination] are usually upper middle class, it’s one of the most prosperous denominations, and therefore we were often going up against people who owned the coal mines or high management in the steel mill. And by supporting the poor, supporting the people on the ground organizing, we got ourselves involved on the ground, in the fights that were taking place between management and employees.

She notes the role of national offices in mediating the dispute and the ways in which the national committee of her denomination made the decisions, therefore taking away the blame placed on the local church staff by more powerful members of the community.

We worked through this process of helping both sides understand why they were in conflict and how the church needed to be a mediating influence in conflicts that affected both sides’ livelihood. The owners of course saw their livelihoods being distressed by the organizing that was going on. They didn’t understand why the dollars they put on the collection plate should be going to support their opposition. ... It did get resolved. And only by all of the groups coming together to talk about the issues.

Here she foregrounded the important mediating role the church was taking by getting involved in local disputes over business negotiations that were impacting the livelihoods of both rich and poor. Their ability to effectively manage this role provided a voice for the poor in an arena that the
wealthy usually controlled. In this way, the church's work was criticized as radical and as supporting initiatives that hurt members of the congregation. These stories also show us how their emphasis on enabling people have a stronger voice in advocating for their needs caused a reaction by the public in favor of defining these activities as Communist and therefore anti-American, and therefore wrong. Overall, these comments demonstrate how hegemony occurred in the articulations of individuals debating this meaning for the purpose of the church by demonstrating the symbols in language used to stigmatize the work of these individuals. By enabling the poor to advocate for their needs, individuals were defined as going against business, which implied going against democracy and towards Communism. Here then, these individuals expressed how the will of the powerful in shaping public definitions through the spread of mass communication impacted their understanding of their work and their everyday life activities.

Discussion. Overall, participants describe how they worked in a politically and socially contentious environment, due to the general conservative attitude of the government and public, which influenced the ways in which congregations requested that their donations go towards.
They relied on their international connections and the collaborative nature of their organizations to protect themselves by structurally providing their critics no one organization or individual to target. Yet they still struggled to distinguish their activities from being defined as communist and rather to be defined as helping the poor improve their lives.

Participants discussed the tension in the churches over the role of the church in political affairs. They described this tension as exacerbated by groups informed by the religious right and by a mainstream media perception that this type of activity, such as that the networking or funding of small agricultural projects, was enabling Communism to flourish. Overall, they foregrounded how the 1980s conservative climate impacted their public image by describing how their activities devoted to issues confronting the poor both nationally and internationally were described as un-American and as an inappropriate use of church funds. Therefore, helping poor people organize and helping them network with other groups, became communist activities in the United States and due to this negative stigma, their activities were curtailed by religious institutions under pressure from their congregations.
These discussions provide us with information about how issues of development in the Philippines were connected to a committed transgression by participants from institutionally organized procedures and beliefs in order to side with the oppressed groups with whom they worked. As a result, they were stigmatized by mainstream culture through symbols that portrayed their work as anti-American as well as anti-Christian. However, by siding with the poor, participants articulated critical discourse on politics and economics and their impact on people's lives - both the poor and also the privileged, some of whom even played the role as mediators between these two groups. In doing so, their communities (local and national) sanctioned them for violating the unspoken norm that only economists and politicians can correctly talk about politics and the economy with knowledge about what is best for people. Rather, these participants were saying that people experiencing the problem the most, as suffering the greatest, are the experts in what needs to be changed to rectify the situation and that the church needs to be involved in helping to rectify this situation as a part of their worship. Their being labeled as Communist enabled them to be stigmatized not only by the church community but by the wider community as well. This label was symbolic enough in U.S. culture to shut down all
alternative discourse on the role of the church in intervening in political affairs that create poverty and hunger. This was due, at least in part as mentioned by some of these interviewees, to fear of recrimination by the public leading to loss of church donations and other purposes of the church (such as to evangelize). Hegemony in discourse enabled the public, media, churches, and government to use already existing negative discourse on communism to criticize participant activities and goals.

On Being an American

I asked participants if they felt that being an American in the Philippines had impacted their trip in any way. Some responded by discussing how they managed to advocate for oppressed people while coming from, to varying degrees, positions of greater economic and political privileges and power. Others discussed their work as finding a common ground, through common concern or religious practice, from which to talk with people so that nationality did not appear to be an issue. Still others relied upon their past experiences in social movements in order to identify emotionally with the struggles being fought by Filipino social movements, and mentioned the civil rights movement as an example. Overall, their reflections
demonstrate their work to create or reinforce networks that would enable people to advocate for their needs across class levels by using the discourse of social injustice and form of poverty and hunger in communities.

Reflections on Privilege. Some participants discussed that being an American had an impact on their experiences both in their work roles as well as specifically regarding the trip to the Philippines. Participants discussed how being an American gave them privileges in doing the work they did by teaching them to never take their position of privilege economically and lifestyle-wise, for granted.

Bruce discussed his awareness of this notion of privilege and how it had been played out in his life experiences. He drew upon his memories working with African American groups and as a missionary working with different cultural communities throughout the world. Specifically, he foregrounded how as being white, middle-class by U.S. standards and American, he was constantly taught by others to be aware of privileges which, for him, were beyond his perceptions sometimes, as they were usually rendered invisible in his everyday life.

That is to say, I’ve spent a lot of time arguing against the powers that be in our country though all of the efforts seem to always be positioned to choosing
the lesser of two evils between candidates and policies and this sort of thing. And so me against them. I get overseas and I realize I’m still seen as the ugly American. Try as you may, you still are American and you are still reflective of the mores and the culture. Inadvertently, that’s what it is. I had that brought to me once in terms of your perception. When I was in [Country], we had an occasion where we went to the US Embassy, I went with the head of the Bible society, who was black, so were my colleagues at the seminary, were black. And we were coming in to meet the new USAID information service not U.S.A.I.D., U.S.I., U.S. Information services, who was black. He was American, he was black. And we went and had a presentation, of course, [Country] being very gracious. But I’m going home in the car, and we were talking about, well, what did you think of this and all that. One of them finally turned to me and says you know, he sure looks like us but he thinks like you. [Laughs] And so it was very good to be reminded [in the Philippines] that I was American for good or for ill, that I was not poor, I was not Filipino, so it’s one of those things that you learn.

Here, Bruce foregrounded the relevance of reminding himself in his experiences that his being an American impacted the way he could think about the problems of other countries in ways that he took for granted and in ways that stereotyped Americans. In this way, Bruce was battling the discursive labels placed upon him by his culture while recognizing the importance of other people teaching him about the biases inherent to his position as an American in shaping his perceptions of the world.

Bruce also foregrounded the material privileges that came with his position. He foregrounded the relevance of
the ability to fund organizations, contradicted with the relationships he was trying to build with people that were impacted by the financial power that he carried. He discussed how to rectify this aspect of his work by mentioning how,

One of the first things I would do is I would associate myself with someone who was not even necessarily in the church circles. Because they had also been tempted by our aid, our church aid, going through so that they kind of tended to try to say to us what they thought we wanted to hear. I didn’t always trust what I heard. One of the things is that too many people were too easily jumping to conclusions about what they saw and believed.

Here he discusses how this power prevented him from being able to talk with people about their programs with more honesty.

He also discussed how this power was something that enabled him to have choices in lifestyle that others did not. Specifically, he paralleled his privilege in lifestyle choices with being white at a primarily black college and through a colleagues’ experience living as a missionary in Zimbabwe.

I know we had a family who was working with us in what was then Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe, back in the early 70’s, and they refused to live in missionary housing. In quote unquote Western style housing. They went out and lived in the villages and so forth. And finally one of the African leaders went to him and said, “You know the problem is John, you know we really didn’t invite you out here to be like us. We want to become like you. That is, we want to have the economic
abilities as you have. And you have the economic ability to say I don’t want to live that way I want to come and live here. But we do not have that ability to say we don’t want to live here. We want to live like you. We haven’t got a choice. We’ve got to live like this.” The same things are true here. I mean I went to a black university but I never became black. And the fact is while I was there one of the things they were saying to me was “The difference is that you can always go back. We don’t have any alternative. You can pretend like you’re black or you can go back to being white. We can’t except for those who pass.

Here Bruce discussed how he, as an American, working on social justice issues in other countries had to always recognize the privileges that they bring into any situation in working with a group oppressed in terms of race, gender, or class. The ability for him to “go back” to being an American who was not poor, whose children would not die from hunger, and to a house and land that he owned was a privilege he acknowledged as part of his identity. He stated he always tried to be conscious of this reality and how it potentially impacted his interaction with others. He summed this up very eloquently in stating that,

The thing that all this traveling and these experiences and things, I came back realizing that all of the terrible things were being perpetuated by us Americans. On the other hand, strange enough, also being very thankful that I was an American. I could sympathize with their circumstances but I didn’t, truly I did not want to live that way. And I was grateful that I was living in a system where even the vast majority of the people who were poor did not have to live on Smokey Mountain [a garbage dump]. So it’s an interesting tension that you have but it did make me appreciate more what privileges and opportunities we do have.
Even as I chagrin about the way we exercise it sometimes.

Here, Bruce’s reflections represent a feeling that while he was comfortable and happy with the economic privileges from which he benefited by living in the United States, he was also angry and frustrated at realizing how these privileges had come to be in place both historically and presently. Here he recognized how this privilege is related to the exploitation and oppression of others.

Walden foregrounded how the act of Americans visiting the Philippines to view social concerns and the impact of poverty on the areas’ peoples would better connect the United States government and churches to the social concerns of the Philippine people. Therefore, if this connection was established, their voices had a better chance of being heard and acknowledged by the Philippine government through denominational pressure on the U.S. government to take action.

We knew that the United States had a very strong influence in terms of the Philippines, the Philippines being a former colony of the United States. And there was that unstated part [of being an American in the Philippines], that there was that clout. We knew that the churches here, once they saw the situation in the Philippines, could advocate for what the people actually in the Philippines really wanted. That advocacy from them [Filipinos] would have a strong hearing here in the U.S. So I think that was the positive aspect of that [power]. A very strong aspect of that. That knowledge that we have strong people
contacts. Americans, United States citizens, would have a strong voice in advocating for the real needs and problems of the people.

Here is the dynamic of how the power of the United States could be used to advocate for an oppressed group that was primarily oppressed historically and in their present situation by the imperialist policies of the United States. This dynamic shows how people used the resources available to them as Americans to help advocate for oppressed groups at an international level. From a systems perspective, this group of Americans represented organizationally, a potentially strong lobbying force in the United States for the social justice issues important to the people in the Philippines with whom they were meeting. Here, the symbol of American involvement was expected to be helpful in carrying the perspectives of the poor to constituents who had the power to support their issues in a greater public realm, the international level through a country with great economic and political power in Philippine affairs.

Darwin brought up how being an American increased his chances of staying safe while touring in the rural areas.

Well we probably were a lot safer than the Filipinos. Because we had American passports. That was one of the calculated risks in going. But because we were Americans going into it we had a much better chance of negotiating some of the dangers.
He foregrounded the elevated feeling of safety of being an American which implied that he had contacts and that as such, he would have a better chance of negotiating any troubles. He also noted that it was his being an American that enabled him to contact the television media after the event.

That was one of the main things I was able to do as an American. I had to be an American and an American with contacts. Because I knew people at CBS.

Here he demonstrated how his contacts worked following a crisis. Because he had media contacts and specifically American media contacts, he was able to bring international attention to the event as a reporter interviewed group participants about their experiences although there is no mention of this tape ever being aired. He described how,

I knew people high up on CBS so I called one of my friends who was a producer. I called her because I wanted her to send out the TV’s, the cameras, for coverage, for protection of the people. And so she didn’t believe me at first. Then she went to talk to somebody high up above her and they said get the information. So I got them the information. So in 45 minutes a truck from CBS is coming up to our hotel and interviews the people who had been through whatever had happened to them. Which is what I wanted them to do. Because then it becomes an American problem and not a Filipino problem. Because I figured that if the Americans were involved then the politicians would take a look at it and maybe some questions would be coming from Washington about what was going on there to these Filipinos.
So here we see an example of how media contact was established in the attempt to get a description of American involvement which would turn U.S. government attention on the issue and for this person, protect the people through their coverage of the events. These actions were instigated in the hopes that U.S. media attention would help keep other atrocities from occurring against the people by the military during this time.

He also explained how he participated in the second march that was held by different groups to protest the killings. He stated he went because,

I figured that because the cameras were going to be there, that the risk might be a little more safe and the military would have a little more restraint because people would be watching it. And I was right. They wanted to do the same thing. You could see it on their face but they didn’t.

Again, the public attention that media could provide to document occurrences to international audiences was perceived as an increase in safety for those people marching.

Bruce also discussed the role of American media in framing the issue but talked about how mass media spun events and how the groups marching in the event were extremely concerned about this occurring in regards to the
incident and their attempt to impede that dominant framing process. Specifically, he noted that,

It was the either first day or the second day after the incident that the Council of Churches put on this forum which brought in the farmers and others, of which I was one person, because they were wanting to get the story out before it got changed while it was fresh in people's minds. I told them what I had seen and that's what I'm doing here [points to the picture].

Here, we can see how participants were actively involved in preparing statements of the event that would contest dominant definitions, as they anticipated a biased report coming from mass media. Here, the organizers of the march worked with church members, all aware that the mainstream media would not depict the event in terms that favored the standpoint of the marchers. Therefore, these activities show the process of constructing a counter approach to mainstream media, as well as people constructing this frame with awareness of how the media might spin a description of what happened. We also see descriptions of the organizations involved in response to this event become active agents in this process of interpretation as well as in responding to the crisis, none of which is reported in any of the New York Times articles.

Finding Common Ground. Other participants discussed how they found commonalties with the groups they were
meeting through their own personal and lived experiences of oppression, through the sharing of concerns for the rights of people, or as having participated in social movements in the United States advocating for people’s rights. Participants foregrounded these elements as enabling them to cross race, class, gender, national, and colonial boundaries to discuss organizing for change. For example, Donna noted how,

Well I found that people were receptive to my presence and I guess the Philippines sort of has a history of U.S. missionaries going there and as a military base. So there was some familiarity with America, I think there was some curiosity about me as an African American in the sense that certain images get projected so they sort of see a Hollywood or single, you know, an entertainer is usually the image that’s projected of African Americans. But as we talked about the kind of work that I was doing and the issues I was concerned about they could see that there was a connection that was there in terms of being concerned about people’s rights.

Nancy also foregrounded that upon meeting people, she recognized the stereotypes existing of Americans, but also the importance of dialoguing around common concerns as critical in moving conversations beyond these issues to talk about changing the existence of hunger and poverty in a community.

I don’t [think it had a impact], other than them knowing that we were Americans, and what that means in terms of the world. People see Americans as very wealthy and very domineering. Once you got down to the
personal conversations, you're really one on one in understanding people.

Therefore, both Nancy and Donna highlighted how they were able to find common ground in which to talk with people so that differences in lifestyles were backgrounded while common interests in working on social justice issues were foregrounded.

Darwin connected with people based upon his previous experiences in the civil rights movement. Because of this past experience, he had a similar connection and understanding of his relationship to the people and the political situation they were in. He discussed how he was reminded of this by a Filipino farmer who he encountered as a participant in the second march to meet the president occurring two days after the murders had taken place.

This one guy came up and started talking in Tagalog [taGAlug], a little farmer, and one of the people with him spoke English so we asked him what was he saying. He said 'you are black people and you belong with us.' Then we all shook hands and he went on marching and we went on marching. I never saw him again. It was like a spiritual proclamation on his end and it was very moving. Just two sentences. You’re black people. You belong with us. No, you’re American black people. You belong with us. That’s what he said. Like we knew, you know? He knew the history. He knew the commonalties. He knew what had happened in history to black people in America. He knew what was happening to him. You know, he’d never seen the correlation, he’d probably never been off the land, but somehow he knew. And that was the important thing. That he wanted us to know that he felt comfortable with us being there with him. A very spiritually connecting moment.
He also noted that these experiences in the Philippines reminded him of similar experiences in working for civil rights in the United States. He talked about how unexpected it was that,

How close the situation was to experiences I had already experienced in the movement. I didn’t expect to have that experience. Um and also just how close we could feel to the plight of the people who were there. We felt emotionally close and spiritually close. We managed to give back some of the things that I was seeing there.

I asked him what things about being in the movement had helped him understand what was occurring in the Philippines. He replied that,

Just in an openness to start with. Just being sensitive enough that you want to help people be a part of a piece of a movement who are trying to get the same things. They were trying to get what we had been trying to get, that distance, because we had already been through the 60’s so we were still I guess trying to get the same place that they wanted to go they hadn’t gotten anywhere.

Here, the marching Filipinos that he met made it clear to him the connections they have with him in facing oppressing institutional structures in the historical struggle for civil rights to be actualized for politically and economically oppressed people. He made this connection by drawing on his experiences in the civil rights movement and its still foregrounded relevance in understanding that they were working for the same goals from different social
locations. He also used that discourse in order to make sense out of what he saw he had in common with people oppressed in a social system benefiting the powerful.

Jean also made a strong connection to the oppression she saw in the United States with the oppression she witnessed in other countries in stating that,

You wanted to help. You knew that somehow the same people who were oppressing them had something to do with your own oppression. We were moved by the people’s stories, by the cardboard houses, that we saw. It was very difficult for me. To see that people actually lived there.

Overall, we can see how participants identified with the people they met in the Philippines based upon conditions of their own life experiences, or framed through concern about the connections between the problems each faced within their respective country regarding social justice issues.

Relative and Absolute Resources. Others discussed how these experiences as an American made them appreciate the resources they had available to them in order to support programs and have the opportunity to work with people who developed effective programs or the organizing of people with very little resources. Donna talked about how,

Finding out about some other organizations and just to see how people with very limited resources that were against incredible odds were able to continue to do what they believed in and so that was very inspiring to
see that. And so when I would go to Columbia, or meet with groups in Brazil, and see the kinds of conditions people were operating under and then come back here, we would have nothing to complain about. You know, in comparison, we really didn’t have much to complain about in terms of the access to resources. And so even though we thought there wasn’t everything we needed but it was so much more that we would tend to take for granted that other people didn’t.

Here, Donna foregrounded her experiences doing social justice work in other countries and described how she used this information to revitalize her own awareness of the resources she had available to her that others didn’t. How the trips reminded her to not take her lifestyle and the programs she was funding for granted.

Nancy also discusses this issue of understanding the issue of resources a little differently in noting that,

I felt humbled by them. To begin to understand the almost insurmountable obstacles to every day life and to recognize that my life is so easy and I have so many resources that they don’t even begin to understand. It’s really very humbling to come face to face with somebody you know that you’re no more human or better than just because of your education or your better clothes. And it’s an amazingly humbling experience to realize that they understand it better than you do, and they suffer from it. When you benefit. That’s hard.

Here Nancy discussed the difficult understanding of knowing how the culture of her country was oppressing others and how a genuine awareness and knowledge of the processes that made this happen by the United States was humbling to her. She discussed how in the process of her experiences, she
rejected the dominant definitions about what the poor could understand or not, as she discovered that they were more knowledgeable about the connections than the people in the U.S. This juxtaposition of the role of "expert" and "expertise" as involving experience rather than formal education and wealth helped her to recognize the ways that power works to construct a reality prioritizing the rights and opinions of the privileged. This is an area that the articles reinforce through the structuring of the account in the news.

Darwin also noted the significance of the social movements in the Philippines as in response to the need to reduce the level of absolute poverty in the country as compared to the poverty in the United States.

The poverty factor however was more [in the Philippines than in the United States]. I think that's another angle to it. ... You know we have the richest poor people in the world over here. There the poor from the Third World so called are poor, poor, poor. Their need was different.

Bruce foregrounded the difference between absolute and relative wealth in negotiations with people and his realization of this difference in perception, coming from the United States, in his work as an advocate for the poor.

While I didn't consider myself wealthy here, in many places around the world I was very wealthy. So wealth is a matter or degree and don't get thinking that it's easy to identify yourself with the poor. You get
overseas and you say, I’m not poor at all. It’s a correcting stance. While I’m trying to advocate, understand some of the things that they’re needing and seeking, I’m trying to advocate for them, trying to facilitate things. So I’m not necessarily, saying that I am poor, but I’m oriented in that direction more than towards trying to do things for the wealthy. My primary experiences were working with people who were or people who were working with people in poverty circumstances, agricultural, industrial, whatever. And sometimes you get thinking that’s our orientation and then you get into something overseas and all of a sudden you realize they’re seeing you as one of the wealthy and you realize well, that’s also probably true in the states. And you’ve got to be very careful that you don’t start talking about “we”. It’s a corrective. And that happens politically.

Here, Bruce foregrounded his struggles to never take his position of privilege for granted or believe that he could fully identify with the people he worked with because of his social location. That this was something he recognized could never be left behind, and how this helped him understand the roles he played, in both dominant and alternative interpretations, in interacting with the people around him.

Discussion. In this section, participants describe how they were able to identify with the people they met by drawing on different cultural resources. These perspectives also describe how people saw themselves as Americans in these situations and how it impacted their conscious activities ad perceptions of their roles as Americans in
other countries. Here participants can be seen as finding usefulness in their being American to be able to advocate for the needs of the poor in other countries even while they came from a country whose consumption patterns impacted the lives of poor people the most. As such, they were creating a network from within the United States that was perceived to be effective in advocating for the rights of people, in legitimizing and foregrounding their voices from a sounding block located in the United States regarding their suffering under discriminatory development policies.

Here, they were demonstrating how connections between people with a wide difference in lifestyle are able to come together to dialogue about change through finding commonalties - a concept that the newspapers omit in order to foreground the differences between countries and how much help they need from the United States. Although participants came from the United States, they were not depending on their status as such in order to provide people with assistance. Rather, participants were explaining how they made connections based upon, to some degree, faith relationships but also as humans with the same concerns about the existence of hunger and poverty in the world.

As a result of their social location and discursive location, they were able to work with a variety of both
mainstream and alternative constituency groups. Through their work to establish networks of support for people's movements, they were able to challenge some of the dominant power structure and status quo conditions represented as a norm of social structure within the United States.

**Education Through Experience**

This last section reports general participant reflections on their work and any general thoughts they wanted to share with me about their feelings towards these experiences in these roles and how it had impacted their outlook on life. I asked participants to reflect on their experiences to better understand their sense of self regarding the work they had done and asked them to articulate the issues and feelings that were important to them still - 20 years later. I felt this was important overall as we have seen so far how everything we can know about this topic through participant descriptions of their experiences involved them stepping outside of the traditional approaches of the institutionally organized dominant U.S. cultural responses to hunger and social justice issues. These questions enabled me compare what influences through experience helped them shape and advocate an alternative dialogue than the dialogue organized by
institutions and people working in institutional processes, in this instance, specifically the news media description of what had happened and of the issues informing the march and massacre.

Cross Cultural Education. All participants stressed the importance of experience in other countries that enabled them to express their messages to their constituencies in the United States. For instance, Bruce noted that,

I had the opportunity to see things around the world, a lot of different programs and agencies which they [different groups in the states] did not have, they perhaps could read about, but that’s different than speaking to someone who had been there and seen it.

This type of cross-cultural education seemed to facilitate the connections that people were trying to make with rural people’s organizations at all levels of religious institutions. Additionally, this type of cross-cultural experience enabled people to be able to share important ideas around issues of hunger and development that otherwise may not have been shared. Bruce described this point in stating that,

One of the things we believe that we do not, we meaning the Americans, US, didn’t have all of the answers and that we could learn things techniques and endeavors from groups around the world and bring them, utilize them in situations here. Sometimes, some of our things
would be able to be utilized there. But it was a two-way street.

This type of cross-cultural education therefore reinforced their beliefs in how to expose social injustices and their beliefs that Americans could learn from others about how problems in their own country might be resolved. This type of relationship is radically different than dominant discourse on the role of the United States as necessary help with all of the answers because of its power. Here, Bruce was saying that this was not the nature of his relationship with the people he worked. Instead, he foregrounded how these cross-cultural connections enabled him to explore and explain issues and problems around hunger and justice in his own country through this shared discourse on these issues.

Walden also noted the relevance of this type of education in helping him grow. He noted the value in his life of,

Being able to see this world wide now as part of [sponsor organization] and getting a global view and being able to share that experience.

Here the international perspective is foregrounded as important to his reflections on his work now - having the opportunity to gain a "global view."

Jean also foregrounded the significance of attaining a cross-cultural education in order to better understand the
work that she was doing and motivated her personally as well.

I was exposed to a whole world, Third World of people, other activists similarly situated and they were usually people of color in the Islands, in Central America, in, you know, in Africa, wherever. They were people working to try to get themselves out of poverty or some dastardly situation. And so it was a milieu that fed my soul. And so because [sponsor organization’s] board is comprised of people throughout the National Council, from the various denominations, I got to know people and their work throughout there. And I was organizing rural women so, and it was just the best thing that could have happened to an organizer to be able to connect with women and other people from around the world. And many of those connections, in fact most of them, remain today.

She added that she had made deep and lasting friendships with people and how these friendships allowed her to surpass dominant definitions of these relationships through dominant discourse that generalized people because they were from different countries. She paralleled the significance of these meetings to obtaining a formal education on the matter. She foregrounded how these experiences were an important part of her education on these issues.

We got to meet each other and to know and love people through that work and as people, not as the Indian woman, to affirm each other you know and to become best friends, passionate best friends with people of other cultures and races. And that was wonderful because I mean there are more people who have done it now, but there are just a handful of people who have, when you consider the culture. I consider it a real blessing to be able to have that insight at that age, that was 20
years ago and it was like another degree you know, education wise. Yeah.

In this way, Jean foregrounded the value of her having cross-cultural experiences which educated her to a certain perspective about the world and enabled her to be able to know other people from other cultures and connect on issues.

People's experiences in working with this organization and as representatives of activist groups enabled them to challenge the legitimacy of certain institutionalized practices in response to what they knew based upon their experiences in other countries. This is why cross-cultural experiential education was so critical to participants being able to challenge the legitimacy of dominant interpretations for the causes and solutions for hunger and poverty.

**Personal Growth.** People also discussed how this work had enabled them to personally know that their feelings about the connections between countries and people that they were facilitating were valid, in the face of the constant criticism from different groups. As Jean stated,

>You see, I only do this work because I truly believe in it. So seeing the conditions of other people in the world and what they experience and to see how the policies in this country affect other people and talking to those women it was all very affirming and it helped you to know that your feelings were valid.
Donna foregrounded how she had learned to interpret traumatic events in her life from not only that trip but from her previous experiences working with and being friends with the leadership in Grenada who were subsequently murdered. She noted that these experiences in her lifetime gave her the strength to keep working on the issues in the face of unexplainable loss.

What I learned about myself was actually the ability to live through trauma, to recognize it, and be able to mourn but still continue on with what needs to be done. But I just felt that I wasn't able to just stop and break down [after the massacre]. I guess part of that was because I was very close with the leadership in Grenada. And so in 1983, when the Prime Minister and several members of the government were massacred, that was a situation that was really very traumatic. Because I felt like they were my brothers and sisters. So I guess that was really my first experience in having dealt with the loss of people that I was really close to that was unexplainable. It’s like, how could this happen, you know, why? It wasn’t a car accident or anything like that, it was a political situation that went awry. I also learned that as a group, not everyone can handle trauma the same way and that it’s important to look at ways of having support for people who are impacted by it. How to help them move on, because it’s not the kind of thing that you just forget. You just don’t say, well, Grenada happened 20 years ago. I mean I still have these vivid images, as if it was just a few weeks or years ago.

Here Donna foregrounded how experiencing this trauma made it impossible for her to abstract political relationships and occurrences of violence as painfully real. As involving the loss of friends or family, and the trauma of its occurrence as well as the trauma of its political basis. For her, the
ability to move forward in the face of this trauma, to gain the strength to keep going, taught her the power of her own strength and the strength of others to continually move forward in the face of adversities with strength as a group.

I learned the importance of people. That people determined can make a difference and so the second demonstration [occurring a few days after the Mendiola shootings] that they had there, the numbers just swelled, although people did not know whether the same thing might happen again. But nonetheless there was a determination that this is a statement that we have to make. A very strong and powerful determination, you know, people walking arm and arm and saying that we will not be deterred from what we believe is right.

Here, Donna described her reaction to being among the people protesting the shootings in a second march in the Philippines. This march was very briefly mentioned in the newspaper articles as a peaceful meeting between groups and the government, in which the articles attributed Aquino with the ability of her charisma and unique rise to power, was able to make peace with the people angry over the violence. Here, Donna foregrounded the relevance of the people standing together determined to rectify the situation and advocate for justice while the newspaper foregrounds the relevance of the government participation and leadership in meeting with the marchers. Again, this demonstrates the voices authorized in each account as very different in perspective and scope.
Participants discussed how these experiences changed their sense of self and purpose in a lifetime and the issues that were still important to them. Specifically, Nancy and Bruce sum up the personal changes that occurred for them as a result of this work. She noted that,

> Anytime you reflect on a job that has so many high goals and ideals, you just wonder if you did enough. You always think that there was more that you could have done or you could have gone further with things but your time got absorbed by meaningless meetings and more meetings and travel to meetings, who got to do what and what body got to prove what. I was meetinged to death.

Here she foregrounded the disjunction between knowing what else needed to be done but being slowed down due to the organizational framework and bureaucracy inherent to the process of making organizational change from within the structure. Therefore, she talked about how the bureaucracy involved in her work was part of what prevented her from accomplishing her work goals. Yet, she discusses how the work itself changed the way she approached her own life.

> I just know that I am not the person that I grew up to be when it started. I grew up in a very conservative, Republican household in which everything was done decently and ordered and properly. And when I, I think that maybe one of the first breaks in all of this was I heard that Cuba had become a model for development. And all my life I’d heard about what a horrible place Cuba was and how bad they were because they were Communist and I had no way of interpreting those two perspectives in the same brain. So I went to Cuba to find out for myself. And it, it’s one of those unexpected twists and turns inside of you that changes
your whole life. And it became a continuous changing of my whole life, I mean, how can you change that many times and it still be the same life? But it’s that kind of light-years away. But you can’t maybe specifically maybe see it in the way I live but it’s inside of me. It’s just, I can never see it the same way. I don’t know how to describe it. I really don’t.

Here she foregrounded as important the process by which the experiences in her life and work taught her to problem-solve in order to identify and mediate the contradictions in meaning she was encountering in her everyday world around these issues. She emphasized the importance of encountering the issues first hand by describing how they led her to a new understanding of the issues and how they were connected to her ability to know oneself as a person.

Bruce also reflected on how his experiences had transformed his notion of himself and his ethics in approaching work against social inequalities and social injustices. He talked about how,

I guess I would say that when I started my career and going through this experience, the experiences I had in Zimbabwe, Ghana, and other places around the world, I started out being very optimistic. I went to Rhodesia as a pacifist, believing it. But they’ve certainly moved me out of my pacifist regime when I confronted the government in Zimbabwe and Rhodesia. I felt, as sinful as it is, that there are times when evil is so present you have to resist it with force. When I think of the atrocities I saw, witnessed, saw the aftermath. People being dragged by their testicles behind cars and being shocked with cattle prods and live electric wires, and all being done in the name of justice, civilization, and Christianity. I became a little more cynical and I stopped being a pacifist. I became a
situational ethicist, which is a little more difficult because it means you can’t go and plug in a code but you’ve got to look into every incident on its own and make a judgement.

Therefore, he foregrounded that these experiences impacted his sense of how change is possible. He also talked about the necessity of cross-cultural experience on these issues as a requirement to accurately target instances and expressions of racism, sexism, and classism in this type of work in order to be able to minimize their impact when working across national and cultural boundaries. He’s described how that social location still impacts the work that you do, because it occurs at an unconscious level as they are institutionalized cultural rules. Yet he’s also talking about how these experiences helped him realize how to try not to exert this power covertly, to navigate around it, and use his position as a point at which his awareness could be used to challenge dominant power relationships.

It provided me with learning experiences throughout my life that probably would not have been available, which even made it possible for me to be perhaps a little more susceptible to what they [people his organization was funding] had to say. Just the various experiences I had. To have that kind of cross-cultural experience. To look two or three times at what I thought I was hearing. And try to think about what I’m saying and to help me in my continuing education and the continuing efforts to be more humble about the station from which I came.
Therefore, he also foregrounded how cross-cultural experiences were crucial in his realization of these issues and his change in understanding how to resolve structural inequalities.

Here Bruce is talking about how these experiences enabled him to be a better listener as well as speaker about the needs of people for which he was advocating.

Darwin noted that these experiences, for him, enabled him to apply what he knew to his classroom teaching. He noted that he felt what kept him strong and engaged in these issues is that,

Knowing that what I'm doing here is helpful overall because I'm training more people to open their eyes and see what's going on. That by looking at their situation here in America they also get a birds-eye view of what's going on in other people's lives. And sometimes people make that connection like in my classes that I teach here.

Here he foregrounded a cross-cultural experiences as important in helping him connect what happens in the United States and the local or national level, to what happens in the rest of the world to the students he teaches.

Donna discussed how this work had prepared her for her current role as an advocate for groups organizing around development issues in her community. She noted that,

I would say that the accumulation of those experiences, I think that they were all part of the training that I needed to get to be where I am at this particular point
and time. ... A lot of it has to do with just working with community groups and being able to relate on that level, to assist them, to be able to navigate through the legal and power structure. I find that as an attorney, that I have entry to certain kinds of areas because I’m an attorney. When I say something, certain other people will listen to it and respond differently than if just a community person was saying it. And so I think it’s the combination of the two efforts because I think the community can really best speak for itself in terms of what its issues are and what its needs are. And so then my role is there to provide technical assistance to enable them to do that.

Essentially, these participants discussed the meaningfulness of their work that enabled them to obtain a global view of hunger and social justice issues. They expressed the relevance of these experiences in forming their perspectives on current social issues as well as described how they wondered if they had done enough, or that they felt the responsibility to do more. Overall, these responses show how these experiences created life-long learning opportunities for individuals and that it had personal impacts on their lives.

Reflections on Experiences and Current Social Relations. Participants also discussed how these past experiences had reinforced their approach to addressing current issues in their lives. Darwin noted that his experiences helped him pass on information about the necessity of local knowledge to the groups with which he
works. He spoke about how these types of cross-cultural educational experiences enabled him to keep,

A continued awareness of people and the issues in this world economy. An awareness that there needs to be something done but that it has to be done by the people themselves and that they need as much help as we can give them in whatever form.

Bruce reflected on how these experiences had reoriented his understanding of when peace and violence changed the approach he took towards understanding how change around these issues could occur. He noted that,

I’d like to believe that my life was committed to seeking justice in a variety of ways but particularly in terms of race and poverty. At the end of the day, what can you say? I think some things have moved not by me there’s still so much that needs to be done and I’m not really able to do much anymore. But it doesn’t change my perspective and I’ve become even more convinced, certainly more than when I first started in my career that the systems have to change. We have to change the whole system. I don’t mean necessarily globally but even that you’ve got to look at the city and say what is really needed in this community, this area? What are the problems, how can we fix it and how can we go about doing that. You’ve got to change it in big chunks or else you’re never really going to get caught up. So I started out thinking you could do things on a small level, you may be helping a person or a family, but now I’ve become more and more convinced that you have to change the structures. You’ve got to change the structures of racism and those of us who are men who are in my age group we were brought up in ways we don’t even know of being chauvinist. I’m white. I was brought up with ways of being a racist that I don’t know until someone shows it to me.

Here Bruce is providing us with some insight into what it means to have a foot in both worlds when studying
globalization issues coming from a powerful country. He also provides insight on how his experiences were impacted by this type of privilege as it is something for him that he carries with them in their ideas of problems, causes, and solutions of social injustices.

Donna noted that for her, the issues surrounding her understanding of how poverty could be eradicated are still a very strong part of her belief system.

There may always be poor people or some people have less, poor compared to having less than others, but I believe that there are enough resources that everyone’s basic needs can be met. I believe that. And so that’s still a very important issue that I am concerned about and looking to work on it at this point through my community and economic development work. So working with specific communities to try to develop a model, to try and find this model, of how do you have communities that are self-sustaining and economically viable. If we had that I believe that that would help address the question of poverty you know, in terms of people who don’t have anything at all or very little.

Here we see past experiences helping Donna embrace a position of a community advocate and enabling her to understand her role as providing technical assistance and creating a space for people’s needs to be voiced in traditional power structures that do not enable people without power to voice their needs.

Jean foregrounded how being in this role and the experiences taught her personally how to believe in her own strength and that,
I feel a tremendous responsibility to address them. And to say what I, exactly what I feel. Not to sugarcoat my speech for anybody anymore. Not to make it, not to look or wait for somebody else. To decide that these are issues that need to be brought to the fore. I feel a tremendous responsibility to begin to address especially the healthcare issue myself. There's something very wrong in a country this rich where people have to be sick and live sick.

Finally, Walden discussed how the issues of land reform are still very much relevant to his work today but that changes in the world economy has had its impact. He noted that for him, his experiences had reinforced his commitment to working on issues of land reform and organizing for social justice. He noted that currently,

We really have to deal with the issue of globalization. That is very important. Churches have to deal with the issue of globalization and in that context, how best to help people. And my answer to that is without forsaking the political aspect of that, it's a strong component, to have much more of a focus on how people can live. So to have more of an economic approach in terms of micro-credit, and organizing people in terms of cooperatives so that they have power in their hands. And even as they demonstrate, as they go to picket lines, they are sure that they have something to eat when they get back.

Here, Walden discussed the responsibilities of the churches today towards these issues, framing them as still relevant in understanding issues of power, land reform, and religious activism in contemporary times.
Discussion. Overall, these descriptions of participant life experiences demonstrate how their experiences changed them as individuals and enabled them to understand and work towards social justice issues today, either programmatically or in understanding their everyday life experiences and how these experiences are caught up in structural events. In these ways, participants described how they worked with awareness on these issues, the struggles they faced in doing so. They also discussed how they coped with the knowledge of their limits and abilities in aiding people around issues of food and justice, through their awareness of how these issues ties into racism, sexism, classism, and colonialism and impact the well-being of people overall. Through these depictions, we see the transforming effect of experience on people’s lives and the value in investigating how what they know can inform activities for the future concerning these issues. It is the relationships between people and the activities and transformations that result when people from the colonizing and colonized countries are able to work together with respect for each other’s differences. It is this historical relationship that I argue is ultimately erased from mainstream histories concerning the power of food and its relation to social justice in the world and
therefore not represented in the historical consciousness of U.S. culture.

Section II: Overall Analysis

These testimonies represent a standpoint in the United States in which people are in a sense, messengers between countries establishing and reinforcing networks of people working to change the structural relationships that reinforce neo-colonial thought and practice. As these participants participated in their dominant culture and dominant structure as Americans, they also created new ways in which these issues could be talked about and therefore acted upon in the United States. They also discuss the emotional and political problems they faced in advocating their particular standpoints and talk about how they coped with these issues as well.

They discussed how their social locations and the standpoints they represented within them both helped and hindered their work. They discussed how privilege and to not take it for granted, as it provided them with lifestyle choices and security that the groups they worked with were still trying to attain. They also discussed the ways in which they found common ground with people in the Philippines as well as people’s organizations they worked
with in other countries over agreement and concern regarding common issues that helped people identify with one another across boundaries of race, class, and nation. These realizations enabled them to make sense of their work in understanding the role they could play in responding to the needs identified by the communities they were supporting.

They also demonstrated how these activities went against the dominant cultural messages about the role of the church in these matters, and their role as Americans as well. That Americans shouldn’t be involved in economic and political policies and that the poor do not have the capabilities to know how to work to change their communities. These realizations enabled them to recognize and struggle with the meaning of their privilege and power and its impact on the work that they did while advocating for a more equitable distribution of power and resources across people and nations throughout the world.

Therefore, in this chapter I have discussed the various experiences and interpretations of events and issues surrounding the Mendiola march and massacre. Additionally, I have shown how interviewees, located and organized by U.S.-based groups, struggled with dominant religious and political culture in order to get their work done, ad the impact of this work on interviewee outlooks on their lives.
and these issues. The next chapter will discuss how interview participants drew upon very different cultural and personal resources than the authors of the press articles in helping them to understand the context in which the Mendiola march took place and the relationship between the United States and the Philippines.
CHAPTER VII

OVERALL ANALYSIS AND REPORT CONCLUSION

Overall Project Analysis

Interview participants drew upon very different cultural and personal resources than the authors of the press articles in helping them to understand the context in which the Mendiola march took place, as well as the relationship between the United States and the Philippines based upon their experiences. The articles substantiated their claims using its power as a form negotiating definitions and perspective in public, mainstream knowledge - mass communication guided by principles emphasizing the stability of status quo conditions.

Participants substantiated their claims by foregrounding similarities in the experiences of people living in poverty within the United States due to trade policies. They discussed how structural readjustment occurred in the United States through a decline in industrial production (creating the "rust belt"), and the loss of family farms in the United States, in particular the loss of southern African-American-owned farmland to larger
corporations and the transference of the agricultural industry into agribusiness.

Participants also framed the causes of world hunger as structural impediments interpreted using past discourse on race, class, and gender inequalities formed in the United States from previous civil rights movements. Therefore, as interviewees participated in the dominant culture and dominant structure as Americans, they also created new ways in which these issues could be talked about by emphasizing how racism, classism, and sexism reinforce and reproduce this power structure for the United States as well as abroad. They also used religious discourse regarding a church's responsibility to expose social injustices to demonstrate to people how global capitalism impacts people at the everyday level. Guided by these viewpoints as resources, participants were able to articulate a politics of resistance by relying on these experiences and past social discourses of resistance already embedded in their culture as examples of how this type of economic subordination could be resisted.

Their stories also reflect how churches at this time were providing a site for the negotiation of meanings regarding the causes of and solutions to world hunger which challenged the status quo definitions and legitimacy of
United States corporations and government aid program perspectives. In this way, they demonstrated how they could use the resources available to a dominant institution, the church, to support alternative movements for community development both within and external to national boundaries. Additionally, they were also able to make the connections between U.S. foreign policies and individual lifestyles visible to congregation members and other constituents.

Their reflections on their experiences detail how these actions were perceived as threat to some of the core values of American society by negotiating the relationship between religious beliefs and political action against structural injustices that produce poverty and hunger in communities. They described how their work came under criticism for supporting people's movements both nationally and internationally that went against U.S. corporate interests. These activities violated certain norms in the United States because their assistance to the poor, hungry, or landless groups was political rather than just emphasizing charitable direct relief efforts. Reaction to this violation in social norms from within the United States, which was growing increasingly more conservative in its foreign policy activities, caused interviewees stigmatization in certain areas in their life.
Participants discussed how individuals and organizations were stigmatized in the United States as Communists and anti-American, and as misrepresenting the church's position as framed by the religious right, the media, and the government.

Therefore, while the church was a site in which these interviewees faced criticism, it was also a space, both discursively and literally, that people were able to participate in activities which resulted in the development of cultural, political communities that connected local actions to the world political economy. This connection enabled participants to define themselves in relation to this structure through experiences that emphasized how this power could be recognized and subverted through public participation in the United States.

Cultural activities and beliefs are commonly studied to investigate the role they play in supporting status quo conditions. This research describes the process by which these belief systems move in a process from comprehension in the private, or experiential form, to a negotiated public space, resulting in a contested period of time in history. During this time, stakeholders debated the definition in meaning around these activities and the result of the debate became embedded as a publicly available resource from which
people can now draw upon, in its form of mainstream textual history.

Implications of this process in public policy is that this process, in effect, shapes understanding of what potential actions people know and understand as resources in response to the relationship of ruling structural relations of globalization to food and hunger in the world today. Therefore, this research reveals how what people can publicly know has been socially organized. Therefore, what we can know about the relationship of the United States to other countries like the Philippines is negotiated in cultural practice so that the mainstream or hegemonic account is what gets recorded through public methods and therefore historicized. With this process, and through this research, I revealed the consequences of hiding histories through mainstream discourse so that the public commonly does not get to the point where alternative perspectives exist and are available to them in order to guide their response to these issues through policy.

Thus, we know that formal institutional structures, such as religion, social science practices, or development practices and policies, inform all levels of culture and prioritize hegemonic interpretations over others. This research adds to the literature regarding ways that people
have navigated their meaning around these structures, with various degrees of awareness, and the role of certain experiences that enabled them to be resilient in supporting new perspectives on traditional structural arrangements. It is in understanding how this occurs and then becomes erased in public history, which leaves traditional theoretical approaches to the issue of experience incomplete.

Report Conclusion

By comparing these sources of information, I uncovered how the structuring of public discourse emphasizes conformity to ruling social relations regarding U.S. policy practices, neo-colonialism, and conceptions of hunger and poverty. Through this comparison of accounts, I demonstrated the possibilities that develop in investigating different types of resources informing the competing social discourse responding to this issue framed and expressed through the institution of the church and its network of affiliated organizations. In this story, participants described how they navigated a social structure that encouraged them to reproduce power relations as they were tied to traditional religious and economic structures that both supported and sanctioned their work. However, it is
through their lived experiences that we can see how they used these work sites as opportunities to challenge these power relations.

Future steps for this project involve further interviews with the six participants as well as with new participants from the trip. Additionally, I will look at more newspapers in order to have a better comparison between accounts, as this project represents only the beginning of a larger investigation.

This project therefore, represents not only contrasting definitions of what happened at the event and the issues and groups involved, but also describes the contrast that existed between dominant discourse and interpretive frames that enabled United States citizens to confront these issues as part of their identity. As public discourse on imperialism and colonialism is drawn from past movements, future hopes, and present conditions, this research enables us to remember the Mendiola march as an example of how a public problem is negotiated, debated and then made invisible as a potential cultural resource. This limits then what people in the United States can rely on and know about the possibilities for interpreting and then acting upon historic social conditions as it is the hegemonic
interpretation that goes down in permanently recorded history.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

What did you go to the Philippines for?  [What was the purpose of your trip?  What were the reasons for organizing the trip?]

What organization were you representing at the time?

What did you see as the most important goals of the organization you were representing at that time?

What, for you, were core issues that your work emphasized?

How did your organization's goals fit into some of the overall work of churches/ecumenical organizations on these [core] social injustice issues?

What was the political climate in the United States towards your work, and work like yours in the 1980's?  [How did it influence your ability to do your work?]

What did you expect to accomplish while you were in the Philippines?  [What did you expect to get from the trip?]

What did you do while you were in the Philippines?  [What are your impressions of what you saw?]

What were some of your impressions of the people you talked to, of the activities and events you witnessed?  [Did you feel yourself in solidarity with the people you were meeting and talking with?]

What do you remember most about your experiences there?

How did your sense of the issues raised by the groups/individuals you met relate to your work in the United States?

What happened the day of the demonstration?  [What were the groups involved?  What were people saying about the march?  What was your understanding of why it was happening/occurring?]

What happened afterwards?  [What did you do?]
What, for you, were root issues that led to the march?

What are some of the things that you learned from being on that trip? [What did you learn that was expected/unexpected?]

What were some of the depictions of this event that you saw in the media? [How did you feel about these depictions?]

Looking back, what are your feelings about the work you did? [What of these issues we discussed are still relevant for you today? What has changed about your responses to these issues?]

How have these experiences influenced your outlook on your life? [What have these experiences meant for you (then and now)? [About human life? Society?]
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