

Vigilantes and the philippine government essay

[Business](#), [Strategy](#)



The purpose of this paper is to persuade students and ordinary citizens that violence and vigilantism is not the answer to the Philippine archipelago's present problems in terms of corruption and injustice and also to make the administrators and the masses realize that change must come from within the government. In this paper, I use interviews, library research and research on the internet to alert the readers the seriousness of the problem which is the existence of vigilante groups and to commend a solution. I argue throughout the paper that vigilante activities are acts of terrorism and that these must be stopped with the Philippine government's help.

Marine D. Corp. When Love and Hatred Collide: Vigilantes and the Philippine Government moot shouldn't ask such questions openly. We have NAP members here, you know? " " They were good people then. But now? I don't know. " " They brought with the answers Vive got from talking to the citizens in Brandy Corona, Dave del Sure to the question: What do you think of the vigilante groups in Mindanao? The groups I'm liking about here are the armed forces in Mindanao that I will call as insurgency groups since they were rebelling against the Philippine government. The New People's Army [NAP] and the Dave Death Squad [ADS] are the two groups that I I I Nail call insurgency groups.

The following are the questions I intend to answer throughout the paper; What is vigilantism? Who are the vigilantes? Why are they called vigilante groups? What are the qualifications for a group to be called as such? What are their professed goals and what are their ways of achieving these goals? Is their existence a must in the society? How are they different from terrorist groups? What are their alarming similarities with terrorist groups? What is the

<https://assignbuster.com/vigilantes-and-the-philippine-government-essay/>

meaning of terrorism and its causes? What are the goals of terrorist groups, their beliefs and justification of their actions? How do their activities affect the people, our country, and our international relations? Are the causes of the existence of such groups as I Nail state in the next pages, whether vigilante groups or terrorist groups can be taken as it is or are there other causes? To be able to answer the questions Vive stated above, I feel the need to define the arms vigilante and vigilantism. Vigilante is of Spanish origin and means “ watchman” or “ guard” but its Latin root is vigil, which means “ awake” or “ observant”. When it is said that someone is taking the law into their own hands, this usually means that they are engaging in vigilante activity, or vigilantism, although sometimes the phrase ‘ taking the law into your own hands” is used to describe what some people call a ‘ secret police force”. If so then the New People’s Army (NAP) is a vigilante group. The phrase does not make for a good definition. Everyone seems to have an opinion bout what vigilantism is, but few people have taken the trouble to define it Nonstop 1996). Brown (1975) attempted to define vigilantism too, saying it represented ‘ morally sanctimonious” behavior aimed at rectifying or remedying a “ structural flaw” in society, with the flaw usually being some place where the law was ineffective or not enforced.

The existence of NAP started during the regime of the late President Ferdinand Marco’s. This same man declared Marshall Law all over the country making the whole archipelago a living hell for everyone except those on Marco’s’ side. NAP Nas then the people’s protectors. This definition implies that the phenomenon of dismantling will be short-lived since once a flaw is remedied, there is no reason to continue, and in any event, “

sanctimonious" morality which means, making an exaggerated show of holiness or moral superiority, is unlikely to be sustainable. So maybe, just maybe the existence of these groups (NAP) is needed then. They might have served their purpose.

Ferdinand Marco's is not the president anymore. This meaning also treats the vigilante the same as the criminal. Both are victims of the same social forces, the same " structural flaw," and vigilantes are the victim of a laded society in the same way a criminal can be considered a victim of society. The difference, of course, is that the criminal is an enemy of society while the vigilante acts as a friend of society. Do vigilante groups really act as the friend of the society? Aren't they the ones who causes chaos and disruptions? Political scientists serious disagreements over the definition of vigilantism. Political scientists are much more likely to categorize it as a subtype of political violence and would treat hate groups such as the UK Klux Klan as vigilantes. Psychologists, as well as some ornithologists Monsoons 1996), are much more likely to consider the vigilante's noble motive and premeditation toward curbing evil as important, making it the ultimate act of good citizenship.

That might be the case in the beginning but how about now, at present? Culbertson (1990) also points out the importance of distinguishing between domestic terrorism which seeks to harm the social order; and vigilantism which seeks to help the social order. How could these groups help to maintain the social order when they use force to get what they want? What are the characteristics of a vigilante? How does he do his work? These are

the next questions I set out to answer. The most common aspect behind all types of designate activity is that it may be a male or masculine phenomenon. It is significant that one of the first things that a vigilante does is stake out their target, stalks their dictum, and engages in a whole lot of thinking and planning. The planned intent to do harm is what makes vigilantism a criminal behavior since the vigilante's very reason for being is to do serious bodily harm or kill (which is conspiracy to commit aggravated assault, murder, or other serious crimes). This is what separates dismantling from self-defense. Vigilante behavior is planned beforehand, while self-defense is an action due to natural impulse.

The organization of vigilante activity occurs irregularly. Certainly, some organized training exercises are usually held, and despite the vigilante leadership's best efforts, membership always seems hard to maintain. A vigilante group frequently lacks support, and all that usually remain are 'hard-core' members. Vigilante groups are not hate groups.

Hatred is not what binds the membership together. What keeps them united is their common interest in the (sometimes) necessary use of force (or extreme measures) in the hands of private citizens. Some members are interested in joining the vigilante group only because they are interested in military or law enforcement work, and/or plan to become soldiers or law enforcement officers. When they do become soldiers or Officers, this is ideal for the vigilante group because such members are receiving training from the government. Most such members, however, withdraw or abandon their vigilante connection soon after the influence of government service presents

them with ethical and professional conflicts. Another typical pattern of vigilante group activity is the quest for recognition of legitimate status. Vigilantes will often try to incorporate themselves as a private security firm or a non-profit organization. They will try to be recognized a part of the state militia, or the militia movement nationwide.

Others will avoid any association Ninth the militia movement because they consider them domestic terrorists or ' terrorists next door. " In any event, an organized vigilante group will frequently have website, and it will eventually try to do fund-raising through that website. Established vigilante groups will usually be one of two kinds: crime control vigilantes; or social control vigilantes. This is a distinction made by Johnston (1996) based on by no means mutually exclusive. The crime control vigilante group seeks to punish those whom they believe are factually guilty of criminal wrongs (e. G. Thieves, outlaws, fugitives from Justice), and in this sense are simply playing the role of bounty hunter except that the bounty hunter is concerned for legal guilt, not factual guilt. The social control vigilante group seeks to repair some transgression in the social order hat threatens to affect the communal quality of life, values, or sense of honor (e.

. Illegal immigrants taking Jobs away from average workers, ethnic males who threaten to seduce wives and daughters away, anything that makes one's children run away). In Islamic societies, the practice of " honor killing" when a female member of the household shames the family name is a quite widely-tolerated vigilante activity. Vigilante groups that go after drug dealers would be an example of a mixed type, since they are probably equally

concerned about the crime of drug dealing as they are about their children getting hooked on drugs. The social control group is probably the most dangerous type because they might contemplate assassination of political leader in the name of social order. The crime control group is usually caught up in a retaliation cycle at the local level whenever they perceive an act of Injustice to occur.

Vigilantes regard the criminals and people they target as living outside the social bonds and communal ties that hold our society together. It's not so much that they euthanize their target, but that the target represents an alien enemy that must be defended against. The target must also be punished, and unwished outside the law. Any and all legal matters on the subject are seen as unnecessary intrusions on the basic freedom that all communities enjoy to protect themselves. Zinging (2004) says that the vigilante mindset is the opposite of the due process mindset. Vigilante thinking is precisely the opposite of any notion of fairness, fair play, or a chance for acquittal. Vigilantes do not care to wait for the police to finish their investigation, and they care less about any court's determination of proof. What they do care about is Justice quick, final, cost-effective Justice.

Too Gilligan, punishment should be inflicted upon those deserving of it at the first opportunity no waiting, and the more severe the punishment, the better. These are all romantic notions that feed an appetite for punishment more than an appetite for vengeance. Punishment is the foundational matter of Justice, and those who deserve punishment also deserve to pay (Alex silica) or receive some kind of harm equal to the harm they have done (Alex

Atlantis). Unfortunately, Alex Atlantis cannot be uniformly applied to every human harm committed. That is the reason we have a system of laws and courts to sort out the particulars and differences between a rimmer who deliberately commits a crime and one who accidentally commits a crime. Also, Alex Atlantis cannot possibly deal with extreme types of crime, such as the genocide of thousands of people. What would the vigilante do in this case? Kill the deserving party thousands of times over? Nor is vengeance satisfying. Almost anyone who's ever thought about it knows that vengeance is an UN-tempered emotion like fear, lust, and anger.

Justice and punishment should NOT be guided by banal, primitive, UN-tempered emotions. Instead, we normally try to moderate or temper our feelings when thinking about how to punish somebody. The vigilante knows it is not vengeance they seek, nor even some lending of respectability to the punishment, or just deserts, and they want it swift and sure. The only problem is that vigilante justice is sometimes too swift and too sure. Vicious beatings and on-the-spot executions do not fit the crime.

The only purpose that vigilantism serves is to turn the tables on those criminals who make victims out of people. Vigilantes desperately want to avoid thinking of themselves as victims, so they become disclaimers themselves. It might even be said that vigilantes ultimately become Iranians, since they must rationalize what they know is improper behavior in the strongest terms possible self-defense, social defense, Alex Atlantis, natural law, patriotism, religion, honor all the time claiming that they are engaging in the most law-abiding behavior or duty there is the duty to preserve the

sacred right to protect one's self. It is a frontier ethic of survival and self-responsibility. If no one else will do anything, especially the legal system, then it is the red-blooded duty of any honest patriot to act, to kill-or-be-killed, to take a stand and do one's part. It takes a certain kind of over-zealousness to commit illegal acts in the name of do-it- {ourselves Justice, and until more ethnographic research is done (as many experts have called for), we will not know exactly how the vigilante mindset develops.

Vigilantism represents a serious threat to democracy and the rule of law.

Due to the lack of real research on the nature and dynamics of vigilantism in the Philippines, Filipinos often substitute it with the country-by-country comparisons on gun ownership and self- defense. This is a call for more research. Then are NAP and Dave Death Squad falls under this category? I would say yes. These vigilante groups might be heroes for the people then, but what about now? Since I'm one of the people of this country I would tell you my views on the matter. I think they've already served their purpose. People have associated vigilante activities with the word terrorism. But what really is terrorism? Terrorism is not new and even though it has been present since the beginning of recorded history it can be relatively hard to define.

Terrorism has been described variously as both a tactic and strategy; a crime and a holy duty; Justified reaction to oppression and inexcusable abomination. Then to better understand Nat terrorism really is. We should check out the terrorist's mindset. Terrorists clearly do not regard themselves as others do. ' Above all I'm a family man,' the arch- terrorist Carols, ' The Jackal', described himself to a French newspaper following his capture in

1994. Cast perpetually on the defensive and forced to take up arms to protect their selves. Terrorists perceive themselves as reluctant warriors, driven by desperation-and lacking any alternative.

This self-denial distinguishes the terrorists from other armed groups. A communist for example would admit that with pride he's unionism. The terrorist by contrast will never acknowledge that he is a terrorist and moreover will go to great lengths so that he wouldn't be labeled as such. Terry Anderson, the American Journalist who was held hostage for almost seven years by the Lebanese organization Hezbollah, relates a telling conversation he had with one of his guards. The guard had objected to a newspaper article that referred to Hezbollah as terrorists.

We are not terrorists. We are fighters. The terrorist will always argue that it is society or the government or the socio-economic system and s laws that are the real terrorists' and moreover that if it were not for this oppression, he would not have felt the need to defend either himself or the people fighter,' is a view the terrorists themselves would accept. What is called terrorism', Brian Jenkins has written, thus seems to depend on one's point of view.

' If one identifies himself with victim of the violence then the act is an act of terrorism. If one is sympathetic with the terrorists then the act is not of terrorism. I therefore conclude that NAP and ADS are terrorist groups based on the argument above. Why do these groups commit these acts? They commit these acts for the following reasons: They want to obtain worldwide, national or local recognition for their cause by attraction of the media, harass, weaken, or embarrass government security forces so that the

government overreacts and appears repressive, steal or extort money and equipment, especially weapons and ammunition vital to the operation of their group, satisfy vengeance and many more.

So now after all those points are presented can anyone answer this: Is vigilantism the way of the future? What will happen to our future if vigilantes turned into terrorists are the ones running our country? To prevent these things from happening again and again, the government should do their job. The people could say that, " No one could satisfy everyone". But at least they should at least try and let the people see that there's no need for these organizations to operate or even exist.