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Abstract

This research explores the role of class in the development of a decolonized critical bioethics. Through data that were collected in the Philippines, this research posits that bioethics and bioethics education are rooted in people’s material conditions; central to this is the interplay of the dominant mode of production and superstructure in Filipino society. Using critical thematic analysis and a counterstory approach, data sets from four sources were collected and analyzed. These are: (1) Presidential addresses on the Philippine government’s COVID response, representing the ruling class; (2) volunteer teachers and (3) students representing the exploited class from a National Minorities school (Lumad Bakwit school); and (4) interviews with students from a Special Science High School who had taken a decolonized critical bioethics class. The different policies enacted to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic represent the violent ethics of the ruling elite against the exploited class. The responses of the research participants form a spectrum of positions and show their class positions. The volunteer teachers and students manifest an ethics of resistance in their responses, while the academic decolonized language of the Special Science High School students in many cases tend to revert to the ethical positions of the ruling class. The findings reveal the relevance of the material conditions of those who are subjected to an ethical transaction that revealed the ethical class positions of different groups. Thus, this research showed that bioethics can be analyzed through the lens of class analysis through the interplay of the environment and the ethics of the exploiter-exploited class dichotomy where a colonizing and decolonizing ethics are in dynamic contradiction. Furthermore, class consciousness can be revealed through a decolonized critical bioethics framework, conscious of the strengths and weaknesses of critical pedagogy and postcoloniality.
Impact statement

This research has the potential to enrich our understanding of bioethics as a discipline and how it is taught in terms of bioethics education through the decolonization of Western-dominated epistemology in the curriculum. Decolonization in this research does not only exist within the boundary of academia, where ethical debates are enough to address the ethical issues in our society. Rather, decolonization as this research shows is the direct confrontation of dominant colonizing epistemologies from imperialist countries that aim to subjugate those at the periphery or who are colonized. By maintaining and reverting to current tools and language from the current form of bioethics, those who become part of the discipline and engage in it are doomed to perpetuate its colonizing function – the colonizing ethics of the ruling class for the exploitation of the exploited class. The onus of directly confronting this violent ethics of the ruling class falls on who those would like to actively participate in enriching the language of bioethics to make it truly ethical.

I believe this research reveals the value of opening bioethics to other disciplines and addresses the gatekeeping by those who hold a position of power. Leaving bioethics to itself will only result in an academic exercise of ethical debates that does not benefit the most vulnerable in society. Furthermore, by not opening bioethics to other disciplines it will fail to understand the lived conditions of those who are historically oppressed, exploited, and marginalized, which the discipline should inherently consider. Ethical debates on such topics as surrogacy, abortion, medical technologies, GMOs, and other ethical dilemmas that exist within the boundaries of the current formulation of the discipline become solely an exercise on an individual’s intellectual capacity. In the end, this research aimed to show that those who dip their academic toes in bioethics are bound to take a position based on class; the language and lived realities of the oppressed guide us to take their side if we aim to develop a decolonized critical bioethics and bioethics education.
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CHAPTER 1 Introduction

This research was first borne from the realities I experienced and am experiencing as an individual with a rich history of the impact of colonization in the Philippines and as an individual who undertook a Master’s in Bioethics Studies in Australia in 2014-2015. Coming from a background in the Natural/Life Sciences, I entered this Master’s program in Australia without any background in ethics; thus, it seemed to me that the students and the lecturers in the courses I attended were using a foreign language compared to that used during my previous academic experience. Moral frameworks, ethical guidelines, principles, utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics, thought experiments and other such concepts were foreign to me. Also, during this time, I met an academic who introduced me to postcolonial theory, through the works of Said, Nandy, Bhabha, Spivak, and most importantly Fanon. The works of Fanon re-centered my appreciation of bioethics, on why the lectures did not sit well with me, as a colonized man studying the ethics of the colonizer which I would bring with me to my colonized home country.

Upon finishing my Master of Bioethics program, I returned to the Philippines and became more involved in activism, specifically, in working with the Lumad and their Lumad school curriculum. The Lumad school curriculum exposed me to a form of liberating education within the confines of a neoliberal education (Harvey, 2007) in a (neo)colonized country (San Juan, 2016). The stories shared by the Lumad students and teachers (Calsado, 2020) during our immersion in 2018 in different Lumad schools in Mindanao, Philippines, opened our consciousness to how a form of liberating education can capacitate marginalized communities. I was exposed to the application of critical pedagogy (Freire, 2012) by a community defending its right to its ancestral lands and self-determination. This liberating form of education is a form of resistance against the violence of colonization (Fanon, 1991) and the ruling class that maintain this system. This violence is not just found in academic discourse or in policies that tend to become abstract for those who are not affected by them, violence is experienced through the displacement of the Lumad, the closure of their schools, the redtagging of
students, teachers, and school administrators that lead to trumped-up charges and illegal arrests. This violence was further concretized when two Lumad volunteer teachers were martyred in 2022 and another Lumad teacher was martyred in 2023.

Further reflection on this reality made me realize that this is a product of dialectical relationships among the dominant politicoeconomic system of the world (i.e. capitalism/imperialism, neoliberalism) and the equivalent counter-resistance from the exploited class. The current order and arrangement of the societal structures of the world benefits the ruling exploiting class; at the receiving end of the opposite pole is the exploited class. In this case, in relating bioethics to this reality, as a discipline and imperialist tool, bioethics is no stranger in this social condition where the valuation of what is morally right or wrong, good or evil, and other moral valuations are normalized for the benefit of the exploiter class. Thus, to circle back to my experience, I am inclined to first ask the question “for whose benefit?” in evaluating a bioethical issue or dilemma as a conscious response to the reality that bioethics is normatively biased in favour of the interest of the ruling exploiting class.

In the context of global capitalism, or its current stage of imperialism (Guerrero, 1979; Lenin, 1970; Lumbera et al., 2007), where neoliberal policies impact and greatly influence, to the detriment of a country like the Philippines (National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017), this research situates the fundamental condition that the Philippines is a semifeudal and semicolonial society (Guerrero, 1979). Through a postcolonial lens (Césaire, 2000; Fanon, 1967, 1991) that decolonization is a form of class struggle where a decolonized critical bioethics should take its root. Thus, the definition of ethics in this research is extended, from the ought to dos, to include its interplay with the economic base structure that includes its dialectical relationship with class and capital. I will further develop the decolonizing position of this research in Chapter 2, together with the use of critical pedagogy, conscious of its weaknesses (Stańczyk, 2021), on how a form of liberating education fully aware of class struggle can lead to the decolonization of the discipline.
My experience working in solidarity with the struggles of the Lumad in the Philippines (Calsado, 2020) played a key role on the contextualization of idealist ethical dilemmas in bioethics classes to their material translation of the struggles of the exploited Other. The Lumad are marginalized indigenous groups / national minorities in the Philippines (Alamon, 2017), who in various ways were able to resist the violent attacks of the different forms of colonization throughout the past centuries and continue to resist these attacks through their own MMS (Makabayan, Makamasa, at Siyentipikong Edukasyon) or NSMOE (Nationalist, Scientific, and Mass-oriented Education) curriculum in the different Lumad schools (Alamon, 2017; Calsado, 2020; Caruncho, 2019; Montero-Ambray, n.d.; Sy, 2019). The Lumad schools are private boarding schools that are situated in different Lumad communities that exist in different forms, from a makeshift school in a banana plantation to the more developed schools like the Community Technical College of Southeastern Mindanao, Inc. (CTCSM) (Calsado, 2020) or the Alternative Learning Center for Agricultural and Livelihood Development, Inc. (ALCADEV) (Montero-Ambray, n.d.). The Lumad schools, through their MMS curriculum, directly confront the reality of the struggles of the Lumad and this made me more conscious of how the current normative acceptance of the present form and function of bioethics (Árnason, 2015; Hedgecoe, 2004; Parker, 1995; Rentmeester, 2012; Shahvisi, 2019) is actually violent to those who are perpetually oppressed because of the current class conditions. I will further elaborate the discussion on the Lumad and the Lumad schools in Chapter 2 of this research and discuss how their realities can be an anchor in the development of a decolonized critical bioethics education.

These realities positioned me on how I understand bioethics and how this understanding is shaped by my history and current realities that are seldom understood through the lens of academics from the Global North. These realities do not discredit the progress that other academics have made in the Global North such as those in the
feminist movement, on critical race theory, and other such actions that directly confront
the dominant discourse coming from the core of the Global North and displace other
discourses to the periphery. Rather, this adds to that rich discourse that those in the
periphery are laying down in consciously confronting the dominating, subjugating and
dehumanizing discourse from the core. A common occurrence that I experienced the
past years is when academics from the Global North fail to wrap their mind around
ethical issues if discussed through the lens of the othered or exploited class.

I experienced this reality, when some of the academics and their works that were used
in the papers that I submitted for my courses, and ultimately in the Master’s thesis, were
deemed irrelevant if not unacceptable as they were viewed as social scientists and not
as philosophers from the discipline. This is one of the clearest manifestations of the
limitation of the discipline of bioethics as I saw it at that time, the qualification of who
can speak for or about bioethics and what academic language can be used in enriching
the discipline, issues which I think might be starting to be addressed during recent years
(Árnason, 2015) but which were actually explored earlier (Hedgecoe, 2004; Parker,
1995). This limitation, which sometimes is a function of gatekeeping by those in the
discipline, can be addressed if bioethics will open itself to other lenses anchored on the
material experience of those who are “othered” (Freire, 2012) that can respond to the
lived experiences of those who become the object of the ethical debates, or ethical
debates in general. The lens I am speaking here focuses on how we view the exploited,
othered, colonized, or those on the periphery which I started exploring in my Master’s
thesis, which looked into the gaps in bioethical guidelines through issues of colonization
(Calsado, 2016), and will try to explore further in this research.

For example, a common theme of these ethical discussions is on charity that for those
from the Global North in whatever its form is still charity, but they fail to address deeper
issues of exploitation, marginalization, false generosity, and otherness (Freire, 2012).
Thus, as Bhabha (2004) argues, Filipinos are like individuals inhabiting an
‘unhomeliness’ in our society. This is the reality of the Filipino people; they are all the
societies they interacted and interact with and they are also no one in particular as they live the Manichean lives of the colonizer and the colonized. Fanon also starkly captured this, as Young puts it:

The individuals in such a society are subject to the painfulness of what Fanon recognizes as a hybridized split existence, trying to live as two different, incompatible people at once. The negotiation between different identities, between the layers of different value systems … is part of the process of becoming white, changing your race and your class by assimilating the dominant culture. Except that, though you may assimilate white values, you never quite can become white enough. (Young, 2003, p. 23)

Rentmeester (2012) clearly described this attribute of the Filipinos, and maybe also of other previously-colonized societies and those who are still under (neo)colonization, where they live a dual existence – manifesting the worlds both of the colonized and the colonizer. Such existence forces them to create and follow the norms, traditions, and ethics created by the colonizer for them, and to create their own norms, traditions, and ethics in response to this reality. In essence, if viewed through an ethical lens, this represents the hybridity and mimicry that are deep-seated among colonized societies; their response is to become copycats of their colonizers, as such, hindering their liberation and emancipation as the colonizer is able to govern not only the physical structures and institutions but, more importantly, the belief systems and even the microbiota of the colonized (Anderson, 2006). In the work of Anderson, he outlined how the tool and process of colonization changed from the use of religion to control the colonized (Spanish colonization) to the colonization of the internal biology (microbiota) of the colonized through racialized use of the healthcare system (American colonization). The article of Rentmeester (2012) helped provide the language and contextualization I was searching for while I was struggling to find my voice and language in communicating the lived experiences of those in developing countries in bioethical debates, which sometimes, if not most of the time, becomes the object of the
debates. While the current bioethics discipline, with all its good intentions, tries to package itself as a discipline or as a tool that can address ethical issues in our world, it falls short if it is still not conscious of the inadequacy of its language.

This reality positioned me, as a researcher, to take a more active role in making our voice, those from the periphery, heard and realities visible in bioethical discussions. Where issues such as prostitution, surrogacy, poverty-alleviation, and others are seen through a rose-tinted lens of academics from the Global North, I see these issues not as an ahistorical reality but as ethics with the history and implication of colonization, imperialism, (neo)liberalization, and others. Being introduced to the works of Ashis Nandy, Frantz Fanon, Paulo Freire, bell hooks, and others as I was taking my Master of Bioethics program through other academics opened me to the possibilities that there are other ways to view and speak of bioethical dilemmas and it is through a decolonized critical bioethics anchored on postcoloniality (Césaire, 2000; Fanon, 1967, 1991; hooks, 1992; Nandy, 1988) and critical pedagogy (Freire, 2012) that this thesis situates its theoretical framework. Again, the work of Rentmeester (2012), through the lens of postcolonial discourse, not only opened me to the richer possibility of contributing to bioethics but more importantly helped provide some form of vindication that my lived experience can add to bioethics, rather than diminish it.

*Exploring bioethics education in a colonized society*

Current bioethics programs are still dominated by an inadequate language of the colonizer to enrich our understanding of what is ethical, as they fail to recognize issues specific or particular to colonized or previously-colonized societies (Jaycox, 2012; Liras & Arenas, 2010; Tosam, 2018; UNESCO, 2005; Wolinsky, 2006). Bioethics articles that touch on the curriculum still seldom address the language of the colonized; if they address the lived conditions of the colonized, the articles revert to the current dominant frameworks or guidelines of the discipline. For example, a quick search for articles that include ‘curriculum’ among the *Developing World Bioethics* publications from 2016-2021
revealed that 22 journal articles satisfied this broad criterion for bioethics and curriculum. Meanwhile, if the keywords ‘decolonization’ and ‘curriculum’ were used, and the search expanded to 2009-2021, even then only three articles satisfied the criteria, with two of them also found in the initial search (Jecker & Atuire, 2021; Ssebunnya, 2017). This shows that what this research aims to add in current bioethics education is not entirely absent; rather, it is not found in the dominant discourse especially in a publication that should address such issues. On the other side of the pole, the new work of Wong et al. (2021) on decolonizing the medical curriculum intersects with the aims of this research, specifically on the inclusion of critical consciousness through Freire’s critical pedagogy (Freire, 2012). This, together with the work of Rentmeester (2012) on postcoloniality as a lens for bioethics, shows that there is work already underway on decolonizing bioethics. As shown above, the current dominance of a homogenous treatment of ethical discourses, failing to take into account the realities of the colonizer-colonized dichotomy, are the gaps that this research aims to address. The implication(s) of thought experiments and/or bioethical dilemmas to the colonizer and colonized are different to those who take bioethics education as mere academic exchanges or those implicated by these moral dilemmas as mere commodities of the ethical discourse.

Given the reality of the Philippines as a previously-colonized country, which can, at least to a certain extent, exemplify the issues of other previously-colonized countries and societies, this opens the discourse on how to better understand bioethics education and also how to teach it. This study aims to capture these limitations, through a postcolonial perspective on bioethics curricula as it not only recognizes but more importantly opens up the discussion on issues associated with global capitalism and imperialism, dehumanization, power and knowledge hierarchies and the colonizing gaze to name a few (Fanon, 1991; Freire, 2012; hooks, 1992; Nandy, 1988), issues that are usually absent in current bioethics discourse or still absent in the dominant bioethics discourse, especially, in the context of its decolonization. Current bioethical programs seldom touch on these issues as individuals are separated from issues of politics, power...
relations, and economic paradigms; rather, the curriculum of such programs centers on the primacy given to normative philosophical discourse (Wong et al., 2021). In this research, decolonized critical bioethics education might be deemed ambitious, but such an education is seen to be more responsive not only to ethical dilemmas presented by current bioethics education but also to dilemmas lived by those made invisible by its current formulation. In view of this, this research aims to answer the following research questions:

*Research questions*

1. What is a decolonized critical bioethics that results from a class-based analysis?
2. What positions of individuals and groups belonging to the different classes in a colonized/neocolonized country are revealed through a class-based analysis of bioethics?
3. How do the lived experiences of learners in the Philippines influence their responses to bioethics thought experiments or to socioscientific issues that involve moral dilemmas?

Thus, given the contextual background discussed in this chapter, this research will address these aims through an examination in Chapter 2 of the interrelationship of the Philippines’ current politicoeconomic system, education and curriculum through examination of the Lumad schools and MMS curriculum, and the contextualization of a decolonized critical bioethics anchored on postcoloniality and critical pedagogy. Chapter 3 provides a stepwise discussion of the methodology and theoretical framework used in this research, designed to provide answers to the research questions. Thematic analysis, specifically critical thematic analysis (CTA), and counterstory telling were the methods used through a decolonized epistemology. The next four chapters explore what the data revealed through the methods and theoretical frameworks used. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the Duterte regime’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic, as a concrete bioethical issue, representing the position of the ruling class. Responses to
the use of thought experiments in interviews are examined for Lumad volunteer teachers (Chapter 5), Lumad students (Chapter 6), and former bioethics students (Chapter 7). Finally, Chapter 8 synthesizes the results of the findings in the thesis through a class-based analysis of bioethics, in the formulation of a decolonized critical bioethics education.
CHAPTER 2 Literature review

Society has a large role in the development of an individual (Freire, 2012; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996; Marx, 2010, p. 2; Vygotsky, 1962) and this role is vital in the analysis of this research on the current formulation of bioethics and the role of the language on its critique and further development as a discipline. At the center of this research is a postcolonial analysis of bioethics as a discipline because of the history and current colonial realities of Philippine society. To better grasp and use a postcolonial analysis there is a need to define it first, but this research is not focused on its different iterations (postcoloniality, postcolonialism, or postcolonial theory); rather, it will use postcoloniality to refer to its different derivatives. I settled on postcoloniality, not on postcolonial theory or decoloniality, as the broader theoretical scope of postcolonial theory may have proved to be too wide and might have brought more issues than answers to my theoretical objective; I also agree with the position of Tsang (2021) that between decoloniality and postcoloniality, there is no one superior theory in decolonizing work. This leads me to focus in particular on the work and contribution of Frantz Fanon, specifically his books *The Wretched of the Earth* and *Black Skin, White Mask* (Fanon, 1967, 1991), whose work centers on postcoloniality and is clear about its anti-imperialist position and class analysis. Additionally, my introduction to postcolonial theory also led me to the work of Paulo Freire on critical pedagogy, specifically through *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire, 2012), which became the other leg upon which my theoretical framework stands.

So, what is postcoloniality? Postcolonialism, according to Safak (2014), is a continuation of colonialism which gained momentum in late 19th century. He distinguished the two, through their analyses, as colonialism best exemplified through the exploitation of the Orient by the use of military force while postcolonialism used theoretical and cultural means in exposing “social degradation, political manipulation, and textual distortion” (Safak, 2014, p. 355). He further anchored the analytical framework of postcolonialism on the work of Edward Said (Said, 1979), on how the
West represents the East through “knowledge and discourse (that) are linked with power to define and name the Orient” (Safak, 2014, p. 355). In his Introduction to postcolonial theory, Young posits that ‘postcolonial theory’ involves a conceptual reorientation towards the perspectives of knowledges, as well as needs, developed outside the West (Young, 2020, p. 1). Elam (2019) also asserts that the ‘post’ in postcolonial theory does not intend to claim that colonialism has ended but as a theory it is concerned with the “fundamental claim: that the world we inhabit is impossible to understand except in relationship to the history of imperialism and colonial rule”. This understanding and conception of the world will later be addressed through concepts raised by Freire in his critical pedagogy. Shands (2008) asked why is there still need to interrogate this claim in the era of postcoloniality. She further added the following questions: have we not exorcised ourselves of the old orientalist cliches and stereotypes even under decades of migration, globalization and postcolonial theory? Is this a result of new imperialist pursuit in the formations of new “us” and “them” (Shands, 2008, p. 5)?

Has this definition and interrogation of postcolonialism/postcoloniality/postcolonial theory reached the Philippine archipelago and benefited the country? Reading the analysis of Veric (2019) on the history of the development of postcolonial thought and knowledge in the Philippines, he argued that it was greatly influenced by the Cold War colonial project of the US as a colonizing country, where some of the prominent academics of the Philippine Studies discipline trained under the Cornell University’s Southeast Asia Program used by the Americans for their counterinsurgency program in the region. Given this condition, Veric asks if “Philippine studies is perhaps nothing more than the capture of Filipino postcolonial thought, that what we have come to call Philippine studies is just the practice of American area studies by some other name” (Veric, 2019, p. 550). If this then holds true, then the question that he leaves for his reader of, “Whose Philippine studies, then, and for what purpose?” juxtaposed to this claim “The result … is a picture of how postcolonial knowledge production got entangled in the workings of American interests and the exigencies of local histories” (Veric,
2019). Thus, earlier and more contemporary works on Philippine studies, postcolonialism, postcoloniality, and postcolonial theory should be examined based on this fundamental context. The different literary works by Neil Garcia, Isagani R. Cruz, Cristina Pantoja Hidalgo, and Priscelina Patajo-Legasto from the analysis of Talaue-Arogo (2021), the colonial postcolonial analysis of Uytanlet (2013) in the Philippine Chinese context, Nagano's work on Postcolonial theory and Filipino intellectuals in the case of E. San Juan, Jr. (Nagano, 2008), to name a few, should be viewed through this lens of postcoloniality in the Philippines. The assertion of Veric on the influence of the US empire in the country, especially in the context of the Cold War project, adds value on how these works should be assessed; for whom are they writing their works?

This question of ‘for whom and for what purpose?’ is central in this research, but more specifically with reference to the group of people that benefits from the current organization, re-organization, and arrangement of our society and those who are exploited because of this system. Said (1979) was clear in his intention in his writings; he argued that:

No one has ever devised a method for detaching the scholar from the circumstances of life, from the fact of his involvement (conscious or unconscious) with a class, a set of beliefs, a social position, or from the mere activity of being a member of a society. (p. 10)

In this case, if we will consider Orientalism as the foundational work on postcoloniality, then it is clear that class is part of the postcolonial analysis. But the inclusion of class in this snippet does not necessarily give primacy to it through a postcolonial analysis. As an academic from a (neo)colonized society, my perspectives are influenced by my history and current reality of colonization: from the purchasing power of my country’s currency which impacts my access to education, to the cultural products I consume, and to the ethics I hold for every transaction I participate in. Postcoloniality, both as a theory and method, allows us to dissect a concept, a material, or an issue through the colonial
gaze, subhumanization, dehumanization, the modern and primitive dichotomy, mimicry and hybridity, in naming the world, and other more ways in seeing the world through the lens of the colonized (Bhabha, 2004; Fanon, 1967; Freire, 2012; Nandy, 1988; Said, 1979). Given this abundance of lenses for a critical analysis of discourse, I am conscious of the postcolonial lens I wear for what it is and what it is not. Thus, there is a need for us to further explore other works that use postcolonial analysis that argues for the primacy of class, in relation to imperialism and colonialism, that will support the response to the question “for whom and what purpose?”. In this case, the early works of Césaire (2000) and Fanon (1967) as a function of the ongoing imperialist project at the time (Elam, 2019), assert that class is not in the periphery of postcolonial analysis; rather, it is at the center. For instance, as Césaire (2000) puts it:

Whether one likes it or not, the bourgeoisie, as a class, is condemned to take responsibility for all the barbarism of history, the tortures of the Middle Ages and the Inquisition, warmongering and the appeal to the raison d'Etat, racism and slavery, in short everything against which it protested in unforgettable terms at the time when, as the attacking class, it was the incarnation of human progress. (p. 67)

And in juxtaposing it to the analysis of Fanon (1967):

If there is an inferiority complex, it is the outcome of a double process: primarily, economic; subsequently, the internalization—or, better, the epidermalization—of this inferiority. (p. 4)

This then can be argued as a theoretical foundation for a postcolonial analysis that is centered on class analysis. This is vital in this research as identity becomes the central analysis of discourse in postcolonial writings and research, as shown by earlier works classified as postcolonial writing and more contemporary works in the discipline, as argued above. This then provides an important context on the work of Constantino
(1970) in the *Mis-Education of the Filipino* that critiques the US influence on the education system of the Philippines as an imperialist project that benefits the US and not the Filipino people. But then, this might subscribe to other postcolonial work that centers their response to the whom question to the colonizers but are blind to the local counterparts. Lumbera et al. (2007) further developed this work of Constantino, where they are clear as to the market-orientation of education in the Philippines, that its main objective is to benefit those in power: at one pole the imperialist countries and at the other pole, their local collaborators. Perhaps the most important of these works is that of Guerrero (1979) in distinguishing the class division in the country, between the exploiting class and their foreign counterparts and the exploited class in addressing the aforementioned for whom and for what purpose question of postcolonial analysis.

In re-centering class as the central analysis of postcoloniality, this will expose the central objective of colonization, moving surplus products from imperialist countries that are experiencing crisis of over accumulation (colonies as the site of new markets) and extraction of raw materials for the creation of these products. Through this lens, indigenous peoples like the Lumad are not discriminated against due to their identity alone; rather, their identity is tied to their class, where they inhabit the lower stratum of the class hierarchy due to historical exploitation of their rich ancestral lands by local ruling elites and their foreign collaborators. In relation to this, it is important in this analysis to situate the context of the Philippines in terms of its history and resources and their implications for bioethics in order to build on the foundational argument on the value of the language to the current formulation of bioethics and bioethics education. Finally, through the use of postcoloniality, we find the epistemological underpinning of the theoretical framework that this research will use in the analysis of the documents, speeches, policies, discourses, and others that are intertwined with power, especially, who holds power in a semifeudal and semicolonial society like the Philippines in relation to bioethics.
Circling back to the analysis of Elam (2019) on how postcoloniality exposes the world we inhabit as a world that is organized by the West for its imperialist and colonial pursuit, this adheres to the notion of naming of the world by the exploiting the class in the work of Freire (2012). I view Freire’s arguments (Carrillo, 2007; Freire, 1973, 2012; Freire et al., 2014; Heberle et al., 2020; Jemal, 2017; Shudak & Avoseh, 2015; Stańczyk, 2021) as a postcolonial work that addresses the issues of colonization through education, that education is a liberating tool if it is anchored on the struggles of the exploited. Central to this research is Freire’s work in *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in which concepts such as the banking approach vs critical pedagogy, the naming of the world of the exploiting class, limit-situation, and critical consciousness (naïve, magical, critical) are based. The central focus of this research is the analysis of bioethics through the lens of an exploited group as exhibited in the consciousness they hold (Assante & Momanu, 2020; Barrera et al., 2017; Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016; Freire, 1973, 2012) vis-à-vis the manifested naming of the world by the exploiting class through the speeches, documents, policies, and discourses analyzed through critical pedagogy. Thus, as a whole, the epistemological framework and method that this research uses is postcoloniality through class analysis and its intersection with education through critical pedagogy. This will be further discussed at the latter sections of this chapter in relating postcoloniality and its class analysis to bioethics and critical pedagogy to bioethics.

The different works on the relationship of language and ethics (Bai, 2006; Dörr Zegers, 1989; Stevenson, 1944; Super, 1910; T'Sjoen et al., 2020) show the importance of dissecting this relationship to further elaborate the aims of this research. Lastly, in situating the analysis of this research through the lens of postcoloniality and critical pedagogy, the work of O'Regan (2021) on language as a function of class analysis is vital in exposing the connection and dialectical relationship of language (in this case the language of ethics) and capital. As a result, this literature review will focus on the following topics: the Philippines’ history, society and education; language, bioethics and
thought experiments, bioethics and postcolonial theory; and bioethics and critical pedagogy.

Philippine society: A semifeudal and semicolonial society that leads to a stunted Science and Technology sector

It is not the consciousness of men (sic) that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. (Marx, 2010, p. 92)

If one’s consciousness is influenced by one’s social existence, then it is important for us to delve into how Philippine society is stratified through the lens of class analysis in the context of postcoloniality. Is it a capitalist society as it enjoys the various advancements in technology which create a higher standard of life, compared to during its history of colonization? Or is it a semi-capitalist society where we can see the advancement in Filipinos’ ways of life but that these advances are still hampered by its feudal character through their relationship to land? Or is it a semifeudal and semicolonial society where the development of its people is hindered because of their relation to land and the policies that govern them are still greatly influenced by different imperialist countries? This research will argue that the Philippines is a semicolonial and semifeudal society due to its history and current impacts of colonization and struggles to free itself from the political, economic, social, and cultural influence of imperialist countries.

The class analysis that this research is taking is not solely a product of postcoloniality; rather, it is conscious of the Marxist influence on the different postcolonial works that this research is anchored on. Imperialism and colonialism are not distinct phenomena from our current social, economic, political, and cultural conditions. Rather, they are a continuation and a manifestation of the dominant mode of production in our society, a capitalist society (Marx, 2010; Marx & Engels, 2015). This mirrors the analysis that
postcolonialism is not inherently different from colonialism; rather, both are founded on a common theoretical framework, and postcolonialism is the continuing analysis used by colonialism but through a different lens. This has implications for how we view imperialism and colonialism, where the former is the highest stage of capitalism while the latter is part of its five basic features (Lenin, 1970). Thus, colonialism and its impacts on colonized countries is inherent to the current dominant mode of production, which is capitalism. Additionally, given this analysis, neoliberalism (Harvey, 2007) is regarded not as a unique and separate condition from capitalism, but, like imperialism and colonialism, a contributing element of capitalism for the dominance of the exploiting class over the exploited class. Later, I will discuss the significance of neoliberalism as a contributing condition to the exploitation of the exploited class in a colonized or neocolonized country such as the Philippines as a semifeudal and semicolonial society.

So, what is a semifeudal and semicolonial society, why not just qualify the Philippines as a colonized country? Lenin (1970) in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* defined semicolonialism as a product of pressure of finance capitalism exerted by imperialist countries to semi-dependent/semi-independent countries. Even with their “fullest political independence”, finance capital (from imperialist countries) derives the “greatest profit from, a form of subjection which involves the loss of the political independence of the subjected countries and peoples” (p. 71). Sison (1987) on the other hand contextualized this in the Philippines in his analysis that the imposition of “direct colonial rule from the beginning of the century, the United States granted only nominal independence to the country in 1946 but continued to exercise indirect colonial rule through unequal treaties, agreement and arrangements” (p. 313).

One can argue that these analyses might already be outdated due to subsequent changes and development in the past decades in the country. So, in relation to this, in its latest study, the National Anti-Poverty Commission of the Philippines showed that this is still the reality of the Philippines as reflected by “its chronic reliance on imported consumption, intermediate, and producer goods” (National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017, p. 30) as a result of political and economic policies dictated by other
countries. Additionally, it is the dependency on an export-oriented economy, as a product of the liberalization of the market, that resulted “in a limited ability to get maximum benefits from the country’s rich natural and human resources” (p. 3). Liberalization as a direct influence of imperialist countries on Philippine political and economic policies negatively impacted the ability of the country to ‘meet national development goals’ because of reduced government revenues from ‘tariff cuts and excessive fiscal incentives’ that lowered the national budget allocation for social services such as in education, health, housing, and other infrastructure (National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017). There is an emphasis on education as will be seen later on how these policies directly impact the form and function of the education system in a semifeudal and semicolonized country like the Philippines.

A country that is rich in natural and human resources should not be poor but as in the case of any (neo)colonized country, these resources do not benefit the broad population of the country. Furthermore, proof of this is the economic and physical displacement of rural poor Filipinos due to policies that fail to protect their interests (rice liberalization, unequal power relationship with International Monetary Fund-Word Bank (IMF-WB) and World Trade Organization (WTO), etc) (Baracol, 2005). Agricultural land-use conversion that benefits only a few oligarchs and members of the elite, such as land conversion for real estate developments, tourism, renewable power, mining, and other uses, have become commonplace and in many instances exist under the control of foreign interests (National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017, p. 17). There is a clear manifestation of bureaucrat capitalism (Guerrero, 1979) in the Philippines, which serves the “special role of linking up the interests of the foreign and domestic exploiters” (p. 63), as shown through the control exerted by the elite, the oligarchs who have taken the mantle of class interest of their foreign counterparts. This leads to the analysis that Philippine society is semifeudal, in that “since the beginning of its domination of the Philippines, the US has imposed monopoly capitalism on domestic feudalism and transformed the feudal society of the 19th century into the semifeudal society of the 20th century” (Sison, 1987, p. 313). The policy brief coming from the National Anti-Poverty
Commission indicates that the analysis of Sison (1987) still holds true to this day; the interests of foreign (imperialist) countries that lead to semicolonialism becomes the interests of the local bourgeoisie (semifeudalism) in the control of land and the benefits derived from it.

Reverting to the analysis of Marx to a society’s overall relations of production (economic structure) as the anchor that dialectically interacts with the superstructure (social, political, intellectual life), it becomes clear why there is a need for this contextualization (Marx, 2010). Bioethics and bioethics education are part of the superstructure that maintains and perpetuates the kind of mode of production in our society as they influence our valuation of our ethical positions. Policies and laws are crafted for the benefit of a few oligarchs or foreign capital at “the expense of the poor majority, domestic capital and smaller enterprises, and national development” (National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017, p. 4). This reflects Fanon’s statement that in a colonized country, the national bourgeoisie, a pseudo-bourgeoisie in fact, imitate or make their own the class interest of their colonizing masters (Fanon, 1991). If an argument is to be made that the Philippines in the past decades has already decolonized due to the absence of a colonizing country, this should be viewed as a product of a compromise having been made (Fanon, 1991). For this compromise “involves the colonial system and the young nationalist bourgeoisie at one and the same time” (Fanon, 1991, p. 62) that is reflected by the analysis of the NAPC on the role of the few oligarchs in ensuring the crafting of policies and laws which maintain favorable conditions for the interest of their colonial counterparts, as their interests are shared.

Drawing further on the analysis of Fanon (1967) on colonization as characteristic of imperialism, he views the impacts of the control of one country over another, where the “disalienation of the black” or of the colonized (in the case of the Philippines) is a product of social and economic realities. For Fanon (1967, p. 4), this inferiority complex is a double process that is primarily economic and secondly its internalization (culture) touches on its implication on the superstructure (Marx & Engels, 2015), reflecting his
Marxist epistemology. This relationship between the few national elite oligarchs and their foreign counterparts is summed up below:

Finance capital is such a great, such a decisive, you might say, force in all economic and in all international relations, that it is capable of subjecting, and actually does subject, to itself even states enjoying the fullest political independence. (Lenin, 1970)

This relationship is a ‘form of subjection which involves the loss of the political independence of the subjected countries and peoples’, not a relationship between two countries on equal terms. Additionally, on the scale of foreign relationships, Freire’s conception of false charity and false generosity (Freire, 2012) captures this relationship as the national policies of the colonized/neocolonized country are influenced by the interest of its colonizing Imperialist country. And in the latter half of the 20th century, Imperialist countries, especially the US, employed a powerful tool in reshaping and re-organizing the world for their own benefit – neoliberalism. As finance capital is one of the five basic characteristics of Imperialism (Lenin, 1970), I will argue that neoliberalism is just another instrument of finance capital for “financialization of everything” (Harvey, 2007, p. 33) in the context of imperialism. As Harvey adds:

The extraction of tribute via financial mechanisms is an old imperial practice … This tendency on the part of the core states like the US to protect financial interests and to stand by as they suck in surpluses from elsewhere both promotes and reflects the consolidation of upper-class power within those states around processes of financialization. (Harvey, 2007, p. 74)

To further explore this line, in its USAID website (Foreignassistance.gov, 2021), US Foreign Aid to the Philippines is above average aid in the region. In 2019, 51% of the aid was military and 49% economic; in 2022, 5% was military and 95% economic; in the first few months of 2021, 100% of it was economic. One possible reason for the changes in the allocation of aid from the US is the threat of Duterte to end the Visiting
Forces Agreement and other military agreements between the Philippines and the US (Lema et al., 2020) and also the impact of the COVID pandemic upon the country. Even with the changes in the allocation, the nature and objective of this aid has not changed; it is intended to ensure that a country like the USA can maintain its control, direct or indirect, in a country like the Philippines through political and economic influence as part of aid-giving. Figure 2.1 captures the interest of the US in influencing specific key sectors in the Philippines and in the context of this research we see the prioritization on health and education.

![Figure 2.1. Graphic showing the budget allocation of US aid to specific sectors in the Philippines (Foreignassistance.gov, 2021).](image)

Lastly, where the World Bank sees investment as a benevolent act to help in the development of the Philippines, Guerrero (1979) argues that these investments are solely used to further the (neo)colonial and imperialist rule of the US in the Philippines, a sort of false generosity by the exploiting class (Freire, 2012). This is supported by the data of USAID, which shows that the majority of their ‘investments’ are in governance, education, and in regional security. China also showed similar interest in the Philippines, especially with the pro-China stance of the Duterte regime, through various
loans that amounted to almost $1B (de Vera, 2020) but some critics fear these to have been left unfulfilled (Lopez, 2020a).

The above data show that the absence of physical presence of a colonizing country in a colonized country does not hinder it from influencing its semicoloncy, as is the case in the Philippines. Such influence is present in unequal political and economic agreements that also lead to influence of cultural tools such as a country’s education system. Given this, we can now highlight the value and impact of investments of Imperialist countries like US and Australia and other Imperialist institutions like the World Bank in the Philippine Education system in influencing the development, formulation, implementation, and goals of the K-12 Basic Education System (San Juan, 2016). San Juan’s (2016) research argues that the import-dependent and export-oriented character of the Philippine economy is not unique to its economic policies but is also present in its education policy. While we can observe the importation of the education curriculum through the K-12 Basic Education System, exportation is manifested in the export of Philippine talents now (Banyan, 2010; Ofreneo, 2017) and in the past (Pernia, 1976), that shows the direct impact in the Philippines of these kinds of policies, namely brain drain out of the Philippines. This is characteristic of a neoliberal form of education that is market-oriented, elite, and colonial (Lumbera et al., 2007).

Neoliberalism in education results in “financial, economic, and psychological toll on both students and academics” (Desiertoa & de Maio, 2020, p. 148) that is in perpetual cycle that aims to address a capitalist appetite for casualization of workforce and loss of employment. In more specific terms, the influence of neoliberalism on science education has resulted in a backward and stunted science education program in the country on one hand and a science education that prioritizes the interest of local ruling class and their foreign counterparts on the other hand (AGHAM Advocates of Science and Technology for the People, 2005). This leads to a science education that is lagging in the world, last placed among participating countries in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2018, where “over 80% of students in the Philippines did
not reach a minimum level of reading” and ranked at the bottom in Mathematics and Science (OECD, 2019). As (Pernia, 1976) argued, those who were privileged in STEM are then pushed out of the country that leads to the country’s brain drain. In short, there is a need for a critical lens (Rogers et al., 2009) in analyzing the influence of neoliberalism in education, and science literacy in more specific terms, as our analysis on the value of the different visions of science literacy (Sjöström, 2017) should be within the context of how it can be used as an exploitative tool under capitalism.

Viewing this reality through the lens of bioethics, this reliance on an import-export policy has implications regarding the possibility of a wholesale acceptance of a bioethics education dominated by teachings from the Global North as an example of an import-dependence in education. This importation of education has resulted in an education that is colonial, elite, and market-oriented and has led to the miseducation of the Filipino population (Constantino, 1970; Lumbera et al., 2007). As the Filipino people soak in this form of imported education, they can now go out of the country and can speak the language of the West with its colonial, elite, and neoliberal education. In terms of bioethics, this touches on what Levitt and Zwart asked in relation to the export of bioethics to other countries, “How will activities to promote and ‘export’ declarations work in practice, notably under circumstances where bioethical professionalism is still sparse?” (Levitt & Zwart, 2009, p. 376). Bioethics and bioethics education in the Philippines becomes a space for colonization as it is also characterized by an import-export orientation in these kinds of discipline.

*Imperialism and neoliberalism: The formation of class in a semicolonial and semifeudal society*

Imperialist countries, that structure the world based on their class interest, keep on reformulating how they go about their program such as through neoliberalism when capital accumulation has occurred and created another crisis of capitalism (Harvey, 2007). Harvey carefully teased out how neoliberalism came to be a major driving force
in seizing the little power and capital that an emancipated and liberated working class has achieved and returning it to the exploiting class. As a theory:

Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. The state has to guarantee, for example, the quality and integrity of money. It must also set up those military, defence, police, and legal structures and functions required to secure private property rights and to guarantee, by force if need be, the proper functioning of markets. Furthermore, if markets do not exist (in areas such as land, water, education, health care, social security, or environmental pollution) then they must be created, by state action if necessary. (Harvey, 2007, p. 2)

Kotz (2002) agrees with this definition of neoliberalism – that it is both an economic theory and a policy stance. Neoliberalism claims that an unregulated capitalist system can achieve “optimum economic performance with respect to efficiency, economic growth, technical progress, and distributional justice” (Kotz, 2002, p. 64), which has been sold by western ideas as common sense, although this is debatable, as its “fundamental assumptions are patently absurd” (Clarke, 2005). This absurdity lies in the perceived impact of neoliberalism in different countries, such as forced regime change, political and economic influence, re-orientation of education systems, an ethics of the market, and other changes for the benefit of the exploiting class in a capitalist system (Harvey, 2007; Limon, 2019). This was achieved through the ‘neoliberal turn’ (Harvey, 2007), in which political consent was constructed through the collusion of different institutions (corporations, media, universities, churches, professional associations) to create a “climate of opinion in support of neoliberalism as the exclusive guarantor of freedom” (Harvey, 2007, p. 40).
Masquerading as the guarantor of freedom in a climate of political and economic uncertainty ensured the restoration of economic power from the working class to a small group of the elite in Philippine society. This is important as there is a need for the consent of the public on the acceptance of capitalist tools for the further accumulation of class power to a few powerful elites. Considering the study of Camba (2015) on his critical reflections through the historization (colonialism to neoliberalism) of the Philippine mining industry, he failed to address its impact to mining communities such as on indigenous peoples. Even with the expansive language at the disposal of academics, entrenched in neoliberal speak, in discussing what neoliberalism is and how it impacts a developing country, they still fail to grasp the political and economic condition of the Philippines as a semifeudal and semicolonial society. With his attempts to academically tease out this condition, even touching at a surface level on the impacts of the use of paramilitary by the State in protecting their and foreign mining interest in the area, his point of analysis is an acceptance of existing political economic relations, anchoring it on the appropriation of ‘cheap nature’ or of basic capitalist inputs. But this cheap nature is possible due to the unequal relationship borne from a semifeudal and semicolonial society whose political and economic structures are arranged to benefit the ruling elite- local collaborators and foreign neocolonial investors. When juxtaposed to material devoid of the influence of neoliberal lens, such as the work of Alamon (2017) with the Lumad and mining activities in their ancestral lands, exploitation is not just a footnote in the analysis; rather, it is the central focus of the analysis that situates those who benefit from an extractive industry like mining as an exploiting class and those at the other end – the exploited class.

On the other hand, if only viewed through the lens of academia, the same reality exists as argued by Harvey (2007), that academics play a role, through their academic positions and opinions, in influencing our understanding of the impacts of neoliberalism in our society. We see this difference when comparing the works of Oona Paredes (Paredes, 2018, 2022a, 2022b), a Filipino academic specializing in Lumad scholarship,
teaching in UCLA, and Jose Monfred Sy (Sy, 2022a, 2022b, 2023; Sy, 2019), a Filipino academic specializing in Lumad scholarship, teaching in the University of the Philippines Diliman. Both are academics from prestigious institutions and specialize in Lumad scholarship, but given the argument raised by Harvey (2007) on the role of expert specialists, there is an argument that can be made that the work of Paredes has a wider reach and influence than the work of Sy. In this regard, Paredes, in centering her scholarship on the indigenuity of the Lumad, where their struggle is not the central analysis, this then paints the struggle of the Lumad more as an ideological struggle of their place in Philippine society. On the other hand, through the lens of Sy’s scholarship, the Lumad’s struggle is concretized through their struggle for their right to their ancestral lands and to education. This is the other leg of neoliberalism: monopolization of control was also done through academic experts who become influencers, who might be directly espousing the neoliberal political and economic stance but were able to distract the mass base from the real crisis of capitalism through their scholarship that veers away from the capitalist struggle of their object of research. Additionally, reverting back to the argument raised in the previous section, Paredes represents the product of neoliberal education in the Philippines; those who gain from it are pushed out of the country to benefit the elite’s class interest, in this case on how the Lumad’s being is packaged through neoliberal scholarship.

What were mentioned above were the direct implications of neoliberalism as a tool for exploitation through imperialism in a capitalist society. Another important inherent characteristic of neoliberalism is that it "creates conditions for class formation" (Harvey, 2007, p. 72). It is important to understand who occupies the different social strata as it will determine the exploiting class compared to the exploited class in our society. If neoliberalism created conditions for class formation, then who are those who occupied the status of the elite in our society as opposed to those are exploited by this group? Harvey (2007) identified the CEOs, as a substantial core of rising class power, but also added other individuals who amassed capital through their use of finance capital as maximized by neoliberalism. He also included wealthy families that became local elites
in their own countries (Indonesia and Mexico, as examples) but only elaborated on their rise to power through their investment interest. This is where the semifeudal and semicolonial analysis of the Philippines becomes important, as the class formation becomes distinct and contextually unique compared to the class formation in imperialist countries. It is true that the financial interest of elites in a developed and developing countries do not greatly differ but somewhat differ as to who occupy that status.

The works of Simbulan (1965/2005) and (McCoy, 1993), though they might differ in their socioeconomic analysis of the Philippines, further validate the influence of a semifeudal and semicolonial society in the concentration of capital and power in the hands of the elite. Simbulan (1965/2005) shared this analysis on the influence of a semifeudal and semicolonial society in the formation of the elites from the Spanish to the American period and from 1946-1963:

… in a country characterized by a marked degree of social stratification, with wide gaps dividing social classes, there will likely be a high level of inequality in the sharing and distribution of key values such as wealth, education, power, prestige, and skill among the various social classes. (p. 5)

Simbulan further added that to be part of the elite, not only based on individual membership but also through an individual’s family, entails having a high level of influence. So, who are the elite in a country like the Philippines? For Simbulan (1965/2005), the elite belong to a particular socioeconomic (merging the concepts of class and elite) and political group. Given the high degree of stratification in the Philippines (IBON Foundation, 2018) where, for example, the hidden, ill-gotten wealth of the Marcoses places them at the top of this hierarchy (IBON Foundation, 2021), we can now identify the members of the elite to be those who have more control of wealth, education, power, prestige, and skill. This argument is observed in the same book where Simbulan (1965/2005) showed how the Philippine elite manipulated the concentration of power not only nationally but also through local offices where younger
members of influential families are elected and which become a place of their internship in the maintenance of power. Simbulan (1965/2005) further added this analysis of the Philippines from 1946-1960s:

Looking at the various positions of the members of these ‘political dynasties’, it will be noted that they can be generally categorized into two: on the higher level are the top public positions which have been previously considered as of elite-category and, on the lower level, those that fall mostly under the ‘pre-elite’ … The implication of this is that the younger members of the family are now in precisely the same posts occupied by their elders before reaching top public positions and that under ‘normal conditions’ and, in due time, they should be able to follow their footsteps, thereby ensuring the continuity of the family’s political dominance. (p. 209)

He further added this analysis, which is as true today if not worse:

The Philippine political elite, we also noted, are not only political decision-makers. From their ranks are found landowners, bankers, shipping and land transportation magnates, owners of newspapers, TV and radio stations, owner-operators of private universities, colleges and other educational institutions, industrialists, directors of private corporations, importer-exporters, timber concessionaires, owner-operators of public utilities, government franchise-holders, lawyers and big corporations (both Filipino and foreign), and other high-income professionals. Socially, they belong to the most prestigious and exclusive organizations. Membership in ‘service’ and ‘public policy’ associations provides them with further avenues for social leadership.

(Simbulan, 1965/2005, p. 211)

McCoy (1993) updated this analysis of Simbulan’s (1965/2005) work in his book An Anarchy of Families: State and Family in the Philippines, where he shared the same sentiment that the “economic and political behavior of the most powerful families” (p. xi)
influences the economic growth of the country. McCoy (1993) agrees with Simbulan on how the elite used the current bourgeois democratic tools, like the election, for legitimizing their position in Philippine society. This analysis still rings true, based on the results of the 2022 elections (Marasigan, 2022):

... a protracted experience of formal elections that has provided some political legitimacy for elites at the cost of heightening elite rivalries, reducing the cycle for development planning, and breaching any insulation that might allow government to impose some market discipline upon elite corporations. (p. xiii)

Simbulan (1965/2005) provided a very similar analysis some 40-60 years earlier:

Although these ‘family dynasties’ may be said to have been produced by formal procedures sanctioned by the democratic political formulas [i.e. elections, appointments of relatives, etc.] the hereditary nature of these 'successions' are the telling symptoms of the existence of an oligarchical system. (pp. 210-211)

Also, outside the timeline of the analysis of Simbulan, McCoy added how crony capitalism during the time of Ferdinand Marcos Sr. further entrenched those in the upper echelons of the social hierarchy together with the use of the “three G’s” (guns, goons, and gold) (p. xvii) and the use of the “four Cs” (p. xvii) (continuity, criminality, Chinese, and celebrity) in the post-Marcos era. Zoning in on one of the four Cs, ‘Chinese’ is intended to refer to Chinese businessmen, who are mostly naturalized as Filipino citizens; this has created a new context, as shown in Chapter 4, where China, as an Imperialist country, has taken the position of one of the four Cs, influencing Philippine politics and economy.

Vis-à-vis the analysis of McCoy (1993), perhaps as a function of his colonizing gaze, where he contends that the current social order in the Philippines, the existence of the modern principalia (elite), results from the failure of Spain and the US to control these families, Villegas (2009) contradicts this position:
This *principalia* emerged from the economic class nurtured by the Spanish colonizers to serve the latter’s interests and further endowed with political power by the Americans to cow the restive masses after the Filipino-American war. (p. 124)

So how does the analysis of class, the reality of a semifeudal and semicolonial society, and bioethics come together? John O’Regan’s (2021) *Global English and Political Economy* is very helpful in this regard, especially in dissecting their dialectics which can help us to locate the relationship between bioethics and capital. In Chapter 1 of his book, he discusses how Marx explained how in the circulation of commodities money (M) becomes capital (C) through the capital transformation of M-C-M (O’Regan, 2021).

This transformation may then be translated into M-C-M’, where \( M' = M + \Delta M \) shows how the money (M) invested at the start of the process has by the end of the process gained value through an incremental enhancement (M’) of the original investment. For O’Regan, there is a need to focus on the capital formulation M-C-M’ instead of on the simple exchange of products in the formulation C-M-C, as the former – unlike the latter – describes a situation wherein “the circulation of money capital and commodity capital has no end, but is constantly renewed – value leads to more value, which in turn leads to yet more value” (O’Regan, 2021, p. 14). C-M-C, for its part, only “has as [its] outcome the generation of *use values* which meet their conclusion in the satisfaction of human needs” (O’Regan, 2021, p. 13) whereas the former, M-C-M’, generates exchange values which by making exchange appear equal conceal relations of exploitation. The limitless circulation captured in the M-C-M’ transformation is vital to our understanding of how the ethics of the elite was brought to the colonies through capital, since, with the formulation M-C-M’:

Marx may be said to cross from the limitless circulation of capital as money and commodities *within* a geographical area to the potentially limitless circulation of capital for accumulation globally. (O’Regan, 2021, p. 14)
The key words here are ‘limitless’, ‘circulation’, ‘capital’, ‘accumulation’, and ‘globally’, where, from its initial position (from the colonizing countries), capital travelled to other destinations (colonies) to satisfy its limitless circulation. At this point, O'Regan (2021) points out that the English language has acted as a ‘free rider’ upon capital through its circulation as $M-C-M'$. In order to show this, O'Regan revises Marx formula to $ME-CE-M'E$ (for commodity capital circulation) and $ME-M'E$ (for financial capital circulation), where the superscript $E$ represents the free riding of English upon these different forms of capital. With this reformulation, O'Regan suggests that the English language has been integrated in “investment, trade, and in the processing of profits from trade” (O'Regan, 2021, pp. 14-15) since the 1600s. As the English language attached itself to capital under the auspices of the British rise to capitalist world hegemony, the English language then took root in the colonies, and in the world-economy at large, to be later superseded by the rise to global hegemony of the United States. The combined cumulative effect has seen English become the dominant lingua franca of the capitalist world-system. Today, according to O'Regan,

This can be seen in the language policies of national governments and in the discourse of international institutions, global financial networks, English-medium academic journals and TNCs. (O'Regan, 2021, p. 36)

Of particular importance in the context of this research is how class and other dominating identities play a role in the domination of the imported language in the colonies as:

Class- and ethnically-based elites also operate as agents of the core in ensuring that local political, legal, economic and educational – including language policy – arrangements work in their interests. They do this by dominating politics, the judiciary and business, and by monopolizing to themselves select [i.e. private] education provision. (O'Regan, 2021, p. 26)
This reflects, as in the previous section, that those who concentrate power and capital use the language that benefits their interest, in this case the language of the colonizer which becomes a “largely class-based normative standard” (O'Regan, 2021, p. 41). At this point, as the colonizing language, in this case the English language, was shown to free ride upon capital, I will make the argument that ethics also either acted as a free rider upon capital through the colonizing language or acted as a free rider upon capital on its own. This free riding of language (ethics) on capital is an application of the dialectical relationship between the base economic structure (capital) and superstructure (in this case, ethics and language).

We can reinterpret this transformation $M^E - C^E - M^E$ (in commodity circulation) and $M^E - M'^E$ (in financial circulation), where English, $E$, can be equated to $L^E$, the free-riding of ethics ($e$), in the context of this research colonizing ethics, through the colonizing language ($L$), where the relevant formulations become $M^L - C^L - M'^L$ (in commodity circulation) and $M^L - M'^L$ (in financial dealing) or, in the case of ethics, these can be represented as $M^e - C^e - M'^e$ and $M^e - M'^e$. The inherent characteristic of capital below ensures the expansion of the ethics of the colonizer as it free rides on language and capital:

Capital cannot stand still; it is always in search of new spaces in which to accumulate. If capital cannot move, a crisis of accumulation can occur because more capital has been accumulated than can readily be re-absorbed … Another alternative is to export the ‘surplus capital’ to new geographical locations overseas. (O'Regan, 2021, p. 12)

The arguments above show that through the ongoing domination of capitalism, especially through more effective means of monopolizing power and capital in the hands of the ruling class, the colonizing ethics of the ruling class becomes the dominant ethics in our society. Again, through a decolonizing lens, especially in the context of power, it is important to position the analysis in the context of the Philippines as a
semifeudal and semicolonial society in order to provide a more nuanced analysis. Such an analysis is able to expose the role of previous and current (neo)colonizers in the existence of the oppressor-oppressed dichotomy in a (neo)colonized country, that they are not just mere indirect participants but conscious power players in the current social order. In this case, I agree with the notion that neoliberalism creates conditions for class formation, but who the members of each class are might differ between a country that is a capitalist society vis-à-vis a country that is semifeudal and semicolonial society. This subscribes to the postcolonial framework of this research that a postcolonial analysis of bioethics is a class analysis of bioethics.

Clearly, if a country is still under the influence of a colonial master, where education is imported, the manifestation of the exportation of bioethics and its core values will have direct influence on ethics of a semicolonized country like the Philippines. The problems the Philippines is facing with its current form and function of education can be mirrored in the kind of ethics that bioethics will carry with it in the development, formulation, and implementation of ethics by ethical review boards, research education, in the practice of medicine, and other fields where bioethics is used. In this exportation of ethics by imperialist countries that is fully accepted by a country like the Philippines, through the machinations of the local elite collaborators, we are made to ask the question – whose ethics, whose language of ethics is being used, for whom we are using these ethics? Akin to the colonization of the Filipinos’ ‘microbiota’ during the colonization of the Philippines by the Americans, the hygiene policy implemented during this time (Anderson, 2006) has analogies with the importation of the different policies and framework of bioethics (Levitt & Zwart, 2009), an ethical colonization of the Filipino people.

*Curriculum: History, formulation, and limit-situation*

Above, it is revealed that Imperialist countries not only influence their semicolonies through unequal political and economic relationships but also exert influence on the
form and function of their education systems. This influence is manifested in the curriculum, such in the case of the (neo)liberalization of the Philippine education system through the K-12 education system that led to “the abolition of subjects – such as Philippine History in high school and Filipino language, literature and Philippine government and constitution in college – vital to critical pedagogy in a post-colonial set-up” (San Juan, 2016, p. 82). Thus, we can see that the curriculum plays a major role on what will be included and/or excluded, legitimized and/or delegitimized in education, in short, what is transmitted by the teacher to the learners within the boundaries of what is allowed and not allowed.

Vital to our understanding of the current state of education is the understanding of curriculum, as its meanings, perceived and deliberate, will be the basis of the limit-situation (Freire, 2012), where contestation and allowance is accepted or denied. Limit-situations are “perceived fetters, as obstacles to their [people’s] liberation, … or as insurmountable barriers” (Freire, 2012, p. 99) by the people as a result of the oppressor’s naming of the world. Kelly (2004) argues that the term curriculum has different meanings and definitions; as such, we need to be careful how we use the term. Curriculum can be the educational curriculum, total curriculum, hidden curriculum, planned and received curriculum, or the formal and informal curriculum (Kelly, 2004). Given the different formulation of what curriculum is and its attached definition, for Kelly (2004, p. 6) “our definition must embrace all the learning that goes on in schools whether it is expressly planned and intended or is a by-product of our planning and/or practice”. Kelly further adds that we have to be conscious about the politicization of the curriculum, as:

in the hands of a series of politically motivated quangos, which reconstruct themselves – or, at least, rename themselves – almost annually, along with their use and abuse of devices such as assessment and inspections to achieve what are fundamentally political goals, has not only reinforced the need for continued and careful study of all of these aspects of curriculum. (Kelly, 2004, p. 13)
We are made to ask the fundamental question again, ‘education for whom?’ or ‘curriculum for whom?’, realizing that ‘all the learning’ that was mentioned earlier is dependent on a limit-situation that is set by those who define education or curriculum.

This definition does not discriminate as to who is the receiver and who the giver of learning, which responds to Freire (2012) notion of dialogic learning, in which learning is transmitted bi-directionally. This definition gives primacy to the integral role of the school with regard to learning; the curriculum is the template or blueprint that the school puts into writing and materially manifests all learning for the students. Alternatively, this can be reformulated into ‘the curriculum is the template or blueprint that the State puts into writing and materially manifests all learning for the citizens’. Additionally, in their exhaustive review of pedagogy, curriculum, and teaching practices, especially in developing countries, Westbrook et al. (2013) laid down the importance of the curriculum. They argued that it serves as a “key reference point for teachers, particularly in developing countries, where it is encoded in the official textbook and teacher guides, often the sole resource used by teachers” (p. 12). The curriculum mediates the ‘educational goals and content’ with what is happening in the classroom or school; in these contexts, what is officially written and expected is translated by the actors of the learning process – the teachers, students, etc. This is further mediated by the interaction of additional factors such as “student agency, motivation, home language, needs, age, gender and socioeconomic status (SES)” (Westbrook et al., 2013, p. 12). This supports the formulation of learning that Vygotsky (1978) tried to reformulate and re-centre, where learning is not just a singular process that follows a straight path from point A to point B but is mediated along the way by cultural-historical factors.

Curriculum as political: The Lumad school and the Makabayan, Makamasa, at Siyentipikong Edukasyon curriculum

Curriculum defined as political or its politicization is nothing new; this literature review intentionally qualifies its political nature in contextualizing the political nature of
Socioscientific Issues (SSIs) that can influence Socioscientific Perspective Taking (SSPT) and ultimately what could be a decolonized critical bioethics education. Stenhouse (1975) and other researchers have discussed the curriculum’s political dimension and within this context what Bernstein (1973) refers to as ‘valid knowledge’. Bernstein stated, “Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realization of this knowledge on the part of the taught” (p. 176). This validation is what counts as the power struggle in the context of education where limits and boundaries are determined by those who dictate the form and function of education.

This is further elaborated by Bernal and Villalpando (2002) in what they term as an ‘apartheid of knowledge in Academia’ in which legitimate knowledge is contested. This current formulation of knowledge falls under the limit-situation in which (Freire, 2012) argues there is only “an acceptable range of possible epistemologies within the mainstream research community” (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002, p. 169). Those epistemologies that do not fall under the mainstream of what is accepted are not deemed legitimate, thus, do not become part of the curriculum. Braslavsky (2003) also argues that curriculum “refer(s) to the existing contract between society, the State and educational professionals with regard to the educational experiences that learners should undergo during a certain phase of their lives” (p. 1). She further noted that it is an agreement among educational stakeholders, where the State is included, to deal with the questions of why, what, when, where, how, and with whom to learn. Furthermore, she highlights how curriculum is used in the ‘framework of globalization’, where the possibility of an ‘invading epistemology’ may arise (Braslavsky, 2003). Curriculum, or the enacted curriculum, might be treated as a neutral document, one that balances its power to all involved, or as in inert document, which is devoid of power to influence or direct ‘all learning’, but in reality it is neither neutral nor inert. When an institution has the capacity to dictate the political power of individuals, their economic success or failure, their standing in social hierarchy, it is neither politically neutral nor inert. Thus, there is a critical need to evaluate the curriculum and its design and
development, and not treat it as a mere document that should be accepted and followed. The above definitions suggest how SSIs can inform how a curriculum is formulated and framed and impact educational stakeholders as to how they develop their socioscientific perspective, taking in their analysis of SSIs. In the next section, I explore the direct impact of SSIs on the lived realities of national minorities like the Lumad of the Philippines in shaping the nationalist, scientific, and mass-oriented education curriculum framework of their schools that can provide the theoretical foundation of a decolonized critical bioethics education. Together with this context, one must consider how academic debates on the politicization of the curriculum (Kelly, 2004) actually play out in reality when education acts as a tool for liberation.

The nationalist, scientific, and mass-oriented education framework: A curriculum for the right to self-determination and defence of ancestral lands

Everything can be explained to the people, on the single condition that you want them to understand. (Fanon, 1991, p. 189)

The statement above of Fanon might seem innocuous, simplistic, or benign at the surface but applying a critical lens through the microscope of class analysis will show otherwise. In the context of the curriculum, this has implications on what is included and excluded in the curriculum as determined by those in power. As discussed earlier, the past and present regimes’ economic policy of export-orientation and import-dependence is also translated in the importation through the form and function of the education system that benefits foreign capitalists and their local counterparts. The influence that Imperialist countries hold in the education system is quite the opposite to those who push for a nationalist, scientific, and mass-oriented education that will benefit Filipino people such as the different national minorities in the Philippines, like the Lumad. This research will use the term national minorities instead of indigenous peoples to
contextualize their struggles under the attack of the current system of capitalism and imperialism that ensures the collaboration of the few local ruling elite. The use of the term national minority instead of indigenous people symbolizes their right to self-determination and defense of their ancestral lands against Imperialist attacks that also translate to local attacks from collaborationists. Take for example this violent speech of Duterte against the Lumad and their school system:

_Umalis kayo diyan. Sabihin ko diyan sa mga Lumad ngayon, umalis kayo diyan._
_Bobombahan ko ‘yan. Isali ko ‘yang mga istruktura ninyo._ [Leave. I’m telling those in the Lumad schools now, get out. I’ll bomb you. I’ll include your structures.] (Lingao, 2017)

This language is realized through the use of the armed forces:

_I will use the Armed Forces, the Philippine Air Force. _Talagang bobombahan ko ‘yung mga … lahat ng ano ninyo_ [I will really bomb all of it]. Because you are operating illegally and you are teaching the children to rebel against government._ (Lingao, 2017)

This statement was then, as is usually the case, clarified by different government officials with various degrees of deflecting the gravity of the statement of the president against the Lumad and their schools. From bombing only empty schools (Gomez, 2017), as if to make it morally acceptable, to the secretary of education blatantly denying the president made the statement, "You did not order the bombing of any school. No bombs for the children and no bombs for schools" ("Briones denies Duterte ordered bombing of Lumad schools," 2019). These statements from the president and the secretary of the department of education are the material manifestation of a violent society that dictates the reality of the Lumad as determined by the systemic structures that impact their lived realities. This is not just a systemic condition that puts national minorities like the Lumad in an unjust position; it is also an additional authoritarian element that puts them in the crosshairs of a regime that devalues their very existence,
not just in terms of their education. One can argue that these statements might just be an isolated case, especially from an overtly authoritarian regime compared to other regimes before it. The following news articles on the different ‘bakwit’ or evacuation and killing of the Lumad from their communities on their ancestral land due to militarization paints a clearer picture – the Lumad’s existence is one of struggle in the defence of their ancestral land and right to self-determination helped by their own right to education. These include:

- The killing of “Father Pops” Fausto Tentorio ("What went before: How Fr. Pops was killed," 2011)
- Murder of school director Emerico Samarca and tribal leaders Dionel Campos, Aurelio Sinzo (Manlupig & Tupas, 2015)
- Killing of Obillio Bay-ao, a Lumad student (Lim, 2017)
- Greetings of International Indigenous Day from DepEd shows callousness when 55 Lumad schools were closed down by the department (Madarang, 2020)
- Murder of two Lumad farmers and a Lumad student (Umil, 2021)
- 32 attacks on Lumad communities during the pandemic including the closure of 178 schools (Diño, 2020)
- Illegal arrests of volunteer teachers, tribal leaders, and students in Cebu (Luna, 2021)
- The massacre of Lumad volunteer teachers, medical workers, and drivers (Gallardo, 2022).

In fighting for their right to education, for their own liberation to defend their rights to self-determination and defense of their ancestral lands, the Lumad and different groups and individuals who struggle with them are systematically killed. This is exemplified by the case of Chad Booc (Luna, 2021), a Lumad volunteer teacher, who was systematically vilified by the regime, illegally arrested in 2021, and eventually murdered with other volunteers of the Lumad school in 2022. The killing of two Lumad farmers and a Lumad student (Umil, 2021) also reflects this systemic attack against the Lumad,
where the word of the president becomes reality. Duterte, in 2018, ordered his soldiers
to shoot women rebels in their vagina ("Philippines: Rodrigo Duterte orders soldiers to
shoot female rebels 'in the vagina',' 2018) and this was probably realized in the case of
the murder of the Lumad farmers and student, where the women’s genitals were
mutilated, even if they were not rebels. Given these realities, the next question that
should be asked is, ‘who are the Lumad and why are such predetermined conditions set
against them?’ To understand these questions better we can refer to the exhaustive
writings of Arnold Alamon in his book *Wars of Extinction* that details the centuries-old
struggle of the Lumad.

In introducing who the Lumad are in his book, Alamon (2017) first constructed the
foundation of his work, that the current problem that pervades the lived realities of the
Lumad and the “majority of the Filipinos is their continuing economic marginalization
and suffering in revolving regimes of predatory elite rule” (p. 5). This is rooted in the
collaboration of foreign capitalists with the few landed elite for their own class interest in
a semifeudal and semicolonized country like the Philippines. This cycle of
marginalization and suffering shapes the past, present, and the future of the Lumad, as
a group that struggle to defend their ancestral land from destructive and extractive
industries, monoculture plantations, and other forms of violence forced on them by the
few ruling elite that intend to exploit their lands for their own class interest. The Asian
Minorities and Poverty Reduction: Philippines*, which showed that the island of
Mindanao contributes to 31% of the total poverty of the Philippines and where the
highest incidence of poverty is also where national minorities like the Lumad reside.
Diving deeper into the data shows that CARAGA region has one of the highest
incidences of poverty in the country (55%) and urban poverty (43%) (ADB, 2002).
Juxtaposed to this is the metallic mineral production of the region which amounts to PhP
10.37 billion, the second highest in the country in 2009, based on the data from the
Philippine Statistics Authority (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2011). Additionally, the
region is identified as having the biggest iron deposit in the world and second biggest
deposit of nickel; these reserves are estimated to amount in value to US$10billion (Chavez, 2008). Lastly, the years of banning open-pit mining in the Philippines ended when Duterte signed the lifting of the ban at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic ("Philippines ends open pit mining ban to reinvigorate industry," 2021). Extrapolating the relation of the incidence of poverty and the presence of mining industries shows there is a high incidence of poverty where there is mining. Cariño (2012) reflected this in her report that regions in the Philippines with the highest concentrations of indigenous groups (national minorities) received the smallest amount of funding. This reflects the findings of the United Nations Development Programme (2013) “that IPs make up fully one-third of the world’s poorest peoples, suffer disproportionately in areas like health, education, and human rights, and regularly face systemic discrimination and exclusion”. And the UNDP reiterates that historical discrimination and marginalization of national minorities like the Lumad exist because of political processes and economic benefit of the few. This results in the following: “exclusion, loss of ancestral lands, displacement, pressures to and destruction of traditional ways of life and practices, and loss of identity and culture” (UNDP, 2013, p. 1).

Mining and other related industries that are projected to help in alleviation of poverty in the region do not actually translate to this promised value of these industries. Indeed, it could be argued that these destructive and extractive industries contribute more to the poverty of the people in the region, especially of national minorities such as the Lumad, than to their emancipation or liberation. There is a saying among the national minorities: ‘where you can find national minorities like the Lumad is where you can find the gold’. And going back to the arguments of Fanon (1991) and Guerrero (1979), the capitalists and their few local elite collaborators are the ones who benefit from these kinds of transactions, as the class interest of the local elite minority coincides with their and those of foreign counterparts and never with those of the working class and national minorities like the Lumad. Furthermore, the report of Caraga Watch (2009) showed the relationships among mining, displacement of the Lumad from their ancestral lands, and
human rights violations perpetuated against them, and the militarization of their communities, as shown in Figure 2.2.
Figure 2.2. Correlation of presence of militarization in Lumad communities in Caraga region in Philippines. From Caraga Watch (2009).

In Figure 2.2, we see a clear picture on how the state forces creep into the communities and ancestral lands of the Lumad and how this is connected to the entry and protection of extractive and destructive industries like mining that result in the displacement of the Lumad that is indicated in the data provided above.

Given these material conditions, this research is not stopping at defining who the Lumad are based on their ethnolinguistic affiliations but also inherent to who they are, their identity as historically marginalized groups who continue their struggle amidst systemic attacks that are also sponsored by the state. To understand who the Lumad are it is first important to understand that the term Lumad is a Cebuano word, a distinct language in the Philippines, which means native of the land. They are comprised of 18 non-Muslim indigenous ethnolinguistic groups found in Mindanao (Alamon, n.d.): Ata, Bagobo/Ubo, Banwaon, B’laan, Kalagan, Kaulo, Dibabawon, Higaonon, Mamanwa, Mandaya, Mangguwangan, Manobo, Mansaka, Matigsalog, Subanen, Talaandig, Tiboli, Tiruray.

The importance of considering the Lumad is not just based on the definition of the word; rather, the attached history of marginalization and oppression as perpetuated by the state and its machinery for the benefit of capitalist business interest shows that to be a Lumad does not only mean to be native of the land but also that attached to their being are the struggles in defending and reclaiming their ancestral land from different forms of development aggressions. This research is magnifying the value of class analysis together with the different identities that amplify the vulnerabilities of national minorities amplified.

The systemic discrimination against the Lumad is what Alamon (2017) termed the wars of extinction against the existence and the struggles of the Lumad to reclaim and defend their ancestral land, and rooted to this is their own being and existence. This is a result of the products of Capitalist and Imperialist conquest from Spanish colonialism and then...
American and Japanese Imperialism that exhausted all means in the exploration and rape of their ancestral lands in the race to extract the most resources from the colonies. This capitalist exploration and exploitation of the riches of the ancestral lands of the Lumad that is sponsored by the state from various policies and agreements and through its armed forces and paramilitary groups (Camba, 2015) is used to “trammel over resisting indigenous communities or coopting and dividing their unity” (Alamon, 2017, p. 112). This division is evidenced by state-sponsored use of ‘Lumad dealers’, a play on words on Lumad leaders, who are Lumad chiefs who have been coopted to work with the state and companies with business interests in their ancestral lands and not for the defence of the people and their lands. For Alamon, his term ‘wars of extinction’ goes beyond what the definition of ‘structural discrimination’ can offer. He argues that “concerted, systemic, and violent effort to drive away the Lumad from their ancestral domain and territories” and the “systemic state-backed efforts to drive them away from their ancestral lands in the name of foreign-backed mining and agricultural expansion in the guise of counterinsurgency” (p. 113) are worse than what structural discrimination fails to capture. This is already a state-sponsored wars of extinction, not just to discriminate them structurally from various social services including education, public utilities, and social welfare. This echoes the same structural effort to erase different native and first nations communities in North America that came to light due to the discovery of mass graves (Austen, 2021). If in other countries national minorities are being put in re-education camps, the Lumad who struggled with different individuals and groups to put up their schools that follow the National Curriculum have been threatened with closures of these schools.

We see here the dialectical relationship of the economic base and the superstructure in the lived realities of the Lumad, where their ancestral lands with all their resources are being plundered by a local ruling elite minority and their foreign collaborators, and education becomes a tool for them to defend their ancestral land against these attacks. Education is a tool that arms them in understanding their environment, their rights to self-determination, and in how to defend their ancestral lands against Imperialist
plunder. The Lumad schools are therefore the concrete manifestation of the Lumad struggle in defending and reclaiming their ancestral lands. Given the nature of the Lumad schools and the history of the Lumad struggle it becomes apparent that the two are not exclusive of or separate from each other. As a concrete manifestation of their struggle, the Lumad schools are then faced with the same force of the wars of extinction that is being perpetrated against the Lumad (Alamon, 2017; Calsado, 2020; Montero-Ambray, n.d.).

The usual question will be asked, if the Lumad are threatened with wars of extinction, then, why not just join the regular public school? Again, one has to go back to the current form and function of education in the Philippines, which is colonial, elite, and market-oriented and has led to the miseducation of the Filipino (Constantino, 1970; Lumbera et al., 2007). The centuries of struggle of the Lumad against colonization will not flourish in this form and function of education. Rather, they need a Makabayan, Makamasa, at Siyentipikong Edukasyon (MMS Education) curriculum which advocates for their right to self-determination and defense of their ancestral land (Calsado, 2020; Montero-Ambray, n.d.; Sy, 2022a, 2022b, 2023; Sy, 2019). This curriculum framework, through the Indigenous Peoples Education curriculum framework, is in reality respected in both local and international documents that respect the right to education of national minorities (DepEd, 2015; UN, 2007). Thus, there is a space for the development and implementation of a curriculum that will address the needs and rights of national minorities like the Lumad. The MMS Education curriculum framework is a manifestation of a decolonizing form of education that directly confronts the exploitative, oppressive, marginalizing, and deadly nature of Imperialism and Imperialist education. We have seen above that the Lumad do not exist in the abstract politicization of education; rather, there is a direct consequence of the politicization of education for colonized and exploited groups like the Lumad.

The space for the recognition of an Indigenous people’s (national minorities’) education that is both locally and internationally recognized still becomes a space for colonization.
As a result, these conditions define the kind of social movement that the Lumad become part of, not only in terms of the defense of their cultural identities but also in ‘their assertion for self-determination’ (Montero-Ambray, n.d.). The work of Fr. Montero-Ambray with the Lumad, specifically with the Malahutayong Pakigbisog Alang sa Sumusunod (MAPASU) Organization in the establishment of the Alternative Center for Agriculture and Livelihood Development (ALCADEV), explored the contribution of critical pedagogy in a collective formation of a social movement. In his work, the central need for numeracy and literacy education of the Lumad in these social movements that is anchored on their defense of ancestral land, with a curriculum that is framed using critical pedagogy, was key in their struggle for self-determination. This speaks of the material anchor of what seems to be a wholly abstract concept, which is education, that it takes a concrete form in these social movements when it is first and foremost anchored on a material condition such as ancestral land.

I was able to observe this reality when I spent time with the Lumad in different Lumad schools in 2018, where literacy and education are anchored on agriculture, health, and academic subjects studied by the students (Calsado, 2020). Learning mathematics is not only about counting, addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division but also about the exploration of the rate of exploitation. Science is not about telling national minority students, in this case the Lumad students, that science is truth and that they should accept it openly; it is about a student asking why there is day and night and the teacher talking about the shape of the earth, while a student states that the shape of the earth is an oblate spheroid; it is about a student asking if we really came from apes, an intrinsic thirst to understand the nature of evolution, dispelling the notion that their culture will prevent them from this kind of discourse. And this education of national minorities is hindered by the militarization and attack on their ancestral land, an attack on their way of life through the wars of extinction. A liberating education that is anchored in a curriculum that addresses the needs of an exploited group and through pedagogy that develops critical consciousness shows us that SSIs like mining, environmental degradation, monocrop plantation, and others that impact their lived realities should be
viewed through the eyes of the exploited. Translating this to bioethics and bioethics education will provide us with a foundation that is anchored on the liberation of the exploited and oppressed and not the perpetuation of their exploitation and oppression. *Bioethics education and its intersection in the new K-12 curriculum in the Philippines*

Given the arguments in the previous section, this provides the reader with a critical lens on how to evaluate bioethics education in the Philippines and the space it can occupy as a result of the K-12 Education reform in the Philippines. The reality of the life that the Lumad live because of their material conditions, a life of struggle that is helped by a liberating education, provides us with another lens in addressing bioethics education. Their MMS curriculum framework could conceivably have enhanced their language to articulate their struggles based on their responses, but it is primarily their material conditions that provided them with the foundation on which to build their understanding of their struggle. The influence of the MMS curriculum framework on the Lumad students is the basis of framing bioethics education through the lens of postcoloniality and critical pedagogy. This provides a theoretical foundation on how to address head-on the current hegemony of Western/Global North philosophies, frameworks, principles, and guidelines in bioethics education. As Freire (2012) argues, the creation and re-creation of the world is dependent on dialogue; who controls the power in naming the world controls this creation and re-creation. Translating this to bioethics education and education in general, we can say that who controls the language of bioethics education and education determines their form and function, whose interest they will promote, maintain, and perpetuate. Given these conditions, the re-formulation of bioethics through a bioethics education that is aware and conscious of the struggles of persons or groups who sometimes become the currency for bioethical debates is the central objective of this study.

In 2012, then President Benigno Aquino, Jr. of the Philippines signed into law Republic Act (RA) 10533 or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013; one of its primary objectives is the addition of two more years to the basic education system (Official
Gazette, 2012). These added two years are designed to decongest the 10-year basic education program as one of its main objectives, prepare students for the labor market, and also allow other school programs to add specialized classes or electives to address the primary objectives of the RA 10533:

(a) Give every student an opportunity to receive quality education that is globally competitive based on a pedagogically sound curriculum that is at par with international standards;

(b) Broaden the goals of high school education for college preparation, vocational and technical career opportunities as well as creative arts, sports and entrepreneurial employment in a rapidly changing and increasingly globalized environment; and

(c) Make education learner-oriented and responsive to the needs, cognitive and cultural capacity, the circumstances and diversity of learners, schools and communities through the appropriate languages of teaching and learning, including mother tongue as a learning resource.

To address this objective of RA 10533, a special science high school (name withheld) developed the core components of its curriculum which envisions ‘who is a graduate of this school’ through the following core components: learner profile, general capabilities, and curricular and co-curricular programs. Figure 2.3 shows the infographic of the core components of the curriculum from its website.
Figure 2.3. The core curriculum of a special science high school in the Philippines that addresses the core objectives of R.A. No. 1053.

Zoning in on the general capabilities’ core component of the curriculum we can see that critical thinking, ethical understanding, a global perspective, and scientific literacy are objectives fundamental in the development of its graduates. These objectives are intrinsic to any bioethics class as bioethics lessons fundamentally address these
objectives in the debates surrounding issues, ethical dilemmas, thought experiments, and others in the conduct of lessons. Furthermore, a bioethics class addresses the objectives of the Advancement and Specialization years of the scholarship program as it develops a deepening understanding of SSIs, tools such as the language for analyzing and responding to these issues, and preparing students for the ethical realities that they might face as future STEM workers in different fields. The bioethics elective addresses this through a curriculum program that centers on the interrelationship of the different ethical theories used in bioethics with different biological, social, economic, and political factors. Figure 2.7 shows the core objective of this bioethics program and the philosophical foundation used to frame it such as postcolonial theory.

![Bioethics](image)

**Bioethics**

A course that introduces the different ethical theories and their application on different biological, social, economic and political factors that influence our society today. Current bioethical curricula focus on the primacy of Western ethical theories, in this bioethics elective the program will integrate other theories from the social sciences, anthropology, etc. It will be philosophically underpinned by postcolonial theories and other theories which can contextualized the current oppression experienced by people in developing countries.

Figure 2.4. A bioethics elective from a special science high school that addresses the core curriculum as part of the core objectives of R.A. No. 1053.

In Figure 2.4, we see that the enhanced basic education system in the Philippines allows for a bioethics course that can include the SSIs that students might encounter which can address their “needs, cognitive and cultural capacity, the circumstances and diversity of learners, schools and communities through the appropriate languages” (Official Gazette, 2012). These concepts and issues in bioethics are nothing new as application of biotechnology and its wide-ranging implications such as Bt-modified organisms, cloning technology, and other related technologies were part of the curriculum prior to the K-12 reform. Specific research case studies on the integration of bioethics in the biology curriculum have been conducted by teachers from a private high school in the Philippines prior to and after the K-12 reform (Abito et al., 2008; Sagun,
Meanwhile, a sample activity on biotechnology and its application can be found on the Commission on Higher Education’s website (CHED, n.d.). Thus, this shows that bioethics already occupies a space in the Philippine K-12 Curriculum, which can still be enriched through its objectives that learners are then “equipped with the essential competencies, skills and values for both life-long learning and employment” (Official Gazette, 2012). It can then be argued that this enhanced basic curriculum has the necessary requisites to develop among learners their SSPT in terms of SSIs that will be incorporated in the curriculum. But when this is placed on the backseat to respond primarily to the country’s economic goals, such as in preparing students for the labor market, it fails to meet the noble outcomes of the curriculum; thus, it becomes a mere document, unworthy of its worthy objectives.

The integration of bioethics into the biology curriculum, especially through the space that the Philippine K-12 curriculum allows, responds to the argument of Levinson (2018) with regard to curriculum content. He argued that it should not only be focused on axioms and theorems in mathematics, biological and chemical processes, as examples (Vision I) or through the “use of social contexts to illuminate scientific ideas” (Vision II) (p. 11). In this contextualization of curriculum we are able to see the space that bioethics education can occupy, especially through a third vision in which moral-philosophical-existential perspectives are incorporated with socio-political actions (Vision III) (Sjöström, 2017). In here, curriculum is not viewed as a neutral, dormant, and static will of the state and other stakeholders; rather, it responds not only to the socio-political issues that we confront each day but also provides the necessary moral-philosophical-existential perspectives that can guide us. Levinson (2018) argues for this formulation of the science curriculum, which can arm us in objectively critiquing and developing the national curriculum accordingly. This provides us with a working framework on how to develop and formulate a curriculum which is more responsive to the lived realities of learners, educators, and other stakeholders involved in overall learning. In order to address complex issues facing those involved in ‘all the learning’ in the education process, those who are involved in curriculum development should be
able to provide the tools to critically address them. Going back to Braslavsky’s (2003) statement, the curriculum should be able to deal with the questions of why, what, when, where, how, and with whom to learn, not only in the context of the content, the socio-political, and not shying away from the moral-philosophical-existential perspectives that are more difficult to address. Again, all of these are viewed through the lens of the ongoing neoliberal project, specifically in the context of science education, in a (neo)colonized country like the Philippines that resulted in a backward and stunted state of science and technology that includes the culture of science.

Bioethics, bioethics education, language, and thought experiments

At the start of this Chapter, I argued that language and bioethics (as a branch of ethics) have an intimate relationship (Dörr Zegers, 1989; Stevenson, 1944; Super, 1910) but there is still a need to define the two: language and bioethics. The most convenient place to search the meaning or definition of language is to look it up in a reputable dictionary. The Oxford English Dictionary provides two definitions for language, one as a noun and one as a verb. As a noun (Oed.com, 2022), language is “the system of spoken or written communication used by a particular country, people, community, etc., typically consisting of words used within a regular grammatical and syntactic structure; (also) a formal system of communication by gesture, esp. as used by the deaf”. Meanwhile, in Britannica.com (2022), language is “a system of conventional spoken, manual (signed), or written symbols by means of which human beings, as members of a social group and participants in its culture, express themselves. The functions of language include communication, the expression of identity, play, imaginative expression, and emotional release”. These definitions provide us with basic working definition of language, a tool for communication. Meanwhile, Vygotsky (1962) sees the double role of language, “as a psychological tool that helps to form other mental functions and as one of these functions, which means that they also undergo a cultural development” (p. xxx). Culture here is contextualized as the environment that mediates language; thus, together with Freire’s (2012) qualification that language is used by the
oppressor in naming the world (creation and re-creation of the world we live in) and O’Regan’s (2021) analysis of the dialectical free-riding of the English language (true of language in general) on capital, we can now argue that the language of those who control capital controls the creation and re-creation of the world through its realization in language. Thus, in the context of bioethics (through the interplay of ethics and language), it can be argued that bioethics and bioethics education are to a large extent pre-determined by the language, in both its form and function, as it exists and is used in society.

We can observe this in the colonizing character of bioethics through the Universal Draft Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights (UDDBHR) (UNESCO, 2005) and of bioethics education (UNESCO, 2016) which is dominated by the language of the West / Global North. Different published works on bioethics independently address this incomplete or narrow language of bioethics: inadequacy of the language of bioethics (Jaycox, 2012); inadequacy of bioethical guidelines (Jarvis, 2017); how to move beyond moral frameworks (Nie, Li, et al., 2018), vocabulary and structure (Hunt et al., 2014); a narrow analysis of bioethical imperialism (Barugahare, 2019); decolonization of bioethics (Barugahare, 2019; 甘 Zhen-Rong Gan & 伊瑟利 Mark Israel, 2020); decolonizing the medical curriculum (Wong et al., 2021); and the issue of othering (Shahvisi, 2019). Given the reality that there is existing research that addresses the narrowness of the language of bioethics, this research aims to further develop that initial thesis and expose how the narrowness of the language of bioethics is rooted in the dialectical relationship of language and capital which are controlled by the ruling elite minority and at the global scale through Imperialism. This reality of bioethics poses a problem to semifeudal and semicolonial countries like the Philippines, which become the site of exportation of this kind of bioethics and bioethics education that may result in the colonization of the ethics of the colonized.

In qualifying language as a tool of bioethics in communicating, transmitting, and understanding the intricacies of complex bioethical dilemmas, then, there is a need to
examine thought experiments for us to better understand the role of language in bioethics and bioethics education. Thought experiments are qualified as “basically devices of imagination” (Brown & Fehige, 2022). A thought experiment is a device or tool that is used to examine questions in the natural sciences and in philosophy, which we can observe in terms of how they are used to address SSIs that might have real-life implications but are addressed through debates or rational inquiries. Meanwhile, Daly (2010) talks about a thought experiment as a function of our imagination, which also shares the definition provided by Brown and Fehige (2022). Daly (2010) further adds how we use our imagination through a logical sequence of events of imagining a certain situation, the consequences of that situation, and the conclusion we can draw from the situation and the consequences attached to it, a possible theoretical claim. Herein we see the connection of thought experiments to our lived realities, placing our own experiences as situations of thought experiments, but thought experiments fail to follow through on this as they maintain their characteristic nature of being a function of our imagination. What is more interesting in this discussion of thought experiments is the following statement and question: thought experiments suggest that we can learn about the real world by virtue of merely thinking about imagined scenarios but how can we learn about reality (if we can at all), just by thinking in such a way? This statement and question relate to the objective of this study on the material implication of thought experiments on a decolonized critical bioethics education.

On the other hand, another device used in bioethics is a moral dilemma, which is a “general term for any moral conflict” (Sorensen, 1991, p. 291). This research is not focused on the current debate on moral dilemma, such as its definition or problem of vagueness as discussed by Sorensen (1991), providing a more consistent definition of it. Rather, the focus of this research is to present the value of the material conditions of those who address a thought experiment or moral dilemma that results in differences in opinion. The interchangeability of the use of thought experiments and moral dilemmas in this research is based on Sorensen’s (1991) interpretation of the characteristics of moral dilemmas that are akin to those of thought experiments, where he writes, “These
carefully honed hypotheticals are reminiscent of thought experiments that expose indeterminacies” (p. 292). In my attempt to define thought experiments and moral dilemmas, the question that may arise is how does this relate to language as one of the main variables of this research? The value of thought experiments and moral dilemmas also lies in the same paper by Sorensen, where he argued the importance of a ‘word’ used in thought experiments and moral dilemmas as how some words carry with them a certain value of “threshold vagueness” (Sorensen, 1991, p. 292). This quality of a word can be observed in conflict vagueness that is reflected by both thought experiments and moral dilemmas. Given these definitions and arguments on the use of thought experiments and moral dilemmas in this research, this section is focused on how the given thought experiments and moral dilemmas, due to their abstract natures, can be contrasted in addressing the lived realities of individuals, groups, or communities, especially in the context of the colonized-colonizer dichotomy. Thus, if thought experiments and moral dilemmas as devices of bioethics and bioethics education are dependent on the value of the words (as part of language) used, then, based on the arguments of this research, thought experiments and moral dilemmas are implicated by our current social order, based on class analysis.

*Decolonized critical bioethics: The role of class analysis in bioethical dilemmas*

Sandel (2007), along with Jaycox (2012), sees the narrative and language used in current bioethical discussions ‘as too narrow’, lacking the ability to capture the lived realities of those who are oppressed and subject to certain bioethical dilemmas. As Fanon (1991) asserts, when the colonized are forced to speak the language of the colonizer, they are then also forced to accept their reality – evil and sin are identified with the colonized and purity and righteousness with the colonizer. Furthermore, Young (2003) argues how language also exists in a hierarchy, as colonial language dominates the language of the colonized, which is then devalued by correcting the deficiencies of the colonized language and ultimately the colonized. Translation can then be equated to domination; violence is enacted through language, culture, and, ultimately, not just the
language being translated but also the colonized themselves being translated or transformed, which has complex and intersecting ways to ‘a subject’s experiences of personhood’ (Nash, 2008). This is an assertion which agrees with the dual-world argument that was proposed by Rentmeester (2012) that prevents the colonized from finding their bearing, as they lack the agency of their own language to understand their reality as imposed by the ruling class.

Class analysis as a function of postcoloniality in arriving at a decolonized critical bioethics provides us with a working template to argue for the language used to address bioethical issues, which will help in better equipping learners and educators in developing their SSPT (Kahn & Zeidler, 2019). Let us take Singer’s (2009) drowning child thought experiment as an example, which tries to elicit a moral response with regard to helping or aid-giving, in general. He maintains that most people will agree that they should help the drowning child, which is admirable, regardless of whether it will ruin their new shoes and render the suit wet and muddy, as the life of the child is more important than these personal items. Meanwhile, Peter Unger (1996) reformulated Singer’s thought experiment by adding a vital criterion to the drowning child dilemma – “uncertainty about the outcome of our sacrifice” (Singer, 2009, p. 14). Putting these two thought experiments in perspective, they agree with the goal of Kahn and Zeidler’s (2019) work on perspective taking, as it tries to develop among learners different perspectives in addressing real-world problems through a thought experiment or bioethical dilemma. Here, the learners are being equipped not only through their logic, reasoning, and argumentation, they are also being exposed to real-life issues, for which the learners’ answers, if implemented, might have far-reaching consequences.

But is the use of thought experiments enough to develop a critical understanding of life situations among learners, especially in the development of their SSPT, which influences their ethical development and judgment? The reality of the implications of these kinds of thought experiments, which rest on the valorization of helping or addressing poverty, for example, is critically discussed in the work of Frenzel (2013).
Slum tourism, poverty tourism, and volunteer tourism or voluntourism are just some of the implications of the drowning child thought experiment, which tries to develop ethical judgments through charity and aid-giving. In reality, charity and/or aid-giving are not only measured in terms of the help that was given; their impact/s on the giver and the receiver through ethical, political, economic, social-dependency, and some underlying factors are sometimes invisible to the actors involved in these ethical exchanges.

The slum tourism in the favelas of Rio de Janeiro (Frenzel, 2013) and the massive aid work failure on Haiti after the huge earthquake that struck the island country in 2010 (Binder, 2013) and volunteer tourism that caters to both local and foreign tourists in the Philippines and other countries can illustrate the invisible facets of the real-world implication of the drowning child thought experiment when language is limited. In contextualizing this aid-giving to the poor, initially, through gut reaction and impulse, we might argue that poverty tourism is morally permissible. But this is not as simple as saying yes to saving the drowning child (or the poor), as other issues like politics play a role in the alleviation of poverty, since policies will tangibly affect equity and income distribution (Frenzel, 2013). Frenzel (2013) further maintains that there is a need to revisit our assumptions about poverty and how we base our ontological and epistemological questions regarding it. This aligns with the argument made in this thesis regarding how the epistemology of curriculum should be revisited in order to achieve the goals of education, in this case, a decolonized critical bioethics education.

Poverty tourism producers and poverty tourists are both responsible for the construction and reconstruction of what poverty is and the perception of how tourism helps in its alleviation, creating a bubble for the justification of those perpetrating these kinds of tourism (Freire-Medeiros, 2009). But in the end, this falls under the valorisation of poverty through the different tourism activities connected to it, where poverty is mainly commodified (Freire-Medeiros, 2009; Rolfes, 2010). In turn, poverty is then essentialized, fetishized, and romanticized (Freire-Madeiros, 2009), turning it into a spectacle of consumption (Linke, 2012), which can then be argued to have implications
for how oppression can work, even if intentions are good. Those who have the political and social capital now also hold the moral capital to help those who are in need; thus, morality becomes unevenly distributed or even monopolized by those who have the means to help; there is a form of moral consumption and transaction that exists as a result of decontextualization and differentiation. This is what is lost in our naïve use of thought experiments such as Peter Singer’s (2009) drowning child example, that through the lens of postcoloniality and Freire’s critical pedagogy becomes more visible.

Given these various arguments on the issues of poverty and tourism, the notion of valorization and the semantics involving it “may lead to the ‘real’ abstraction of commodification in which slum and poverty are being exchanged into monetary value” (Frenzel, 2013, p. 126), an issue which this research tries to contextualize. In terms of SSPT in the context of SSIs, it is now pertinent for us to examine thought experiments that try to address these issues through a different ontology and epistemology. We have to do away with a Eurocentric, Western or Global North epistemological perspective, which “presumes that there is only one way of knowing and understanding the world, and it is the natural way of interpreting truth, knowledge, and reality” (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002, p. 171). Merging moral transactions, SSPT, and other constructs related to coloniality may provide us with a better understanding of moral permissibilities as opposed to the idealized examples that thought experiments can provide. Thought experiments may be well-intentioned, but their applications to real-world problems might not result in the expected, accepted ethical outcome/s, such in the case of poverty tourism where instances of inequity still arise and might even be exacerbated.

As has been shown in this section of the literature review, the value of charity and charity work cannot be dismissed but without its contextualization, especially the knowledge of the oppressed who experience the systemic and institutional oppression, we might all agree that we ought to help the poor, the marginalized, the oppressed without thinking of possible consequences, perpetuation, and/or reproduction of injustices. Thus, charity or charity work are not benign constructs. This is also true for
our moral developments, as Fanon (1991) argues that the colonized are not only deemed as lacking in values but are “declared insensitive to ethics; representing the absence of values and negation of it” (p. 32). This difference plays into the argument by hooks (1992) in which she states that “the commodification of difference promotes paradigms of consumption wherein whatever difference the Other inhabits is eradicated, via exchange, by a consumer cannibalism that not only displaces the Other but denies the significance of that Other’s history through a process of decontextualisation” (p. 31). Here, the difference in the construction of what is moral or what one ought to do hinges on the difference created by the current system, which again banks and denies the other’s or the oppressed’s history through processes and systems of decontextualization. More importantly, this difference should be clearly delineated as relating to differences in class status that influence how we view what is moral or not. This again responds to the drowning child thought experiment, where difference among those who can give and those who are given becomes the conduit for ethical transaction and exchange. But without the contexts argued for by Frenzel (2013) and others, such activities will not be deemed as more than neutral as they create a perceived positive moral transaction, where both agents benefit from the moral exchanges.

It might seem that there is no need to qualify the discussion on bioethics through a postcolonial lens, as oppression is a central theme of social justice education, but oppression as a systemic and institutional construct that deprives ‘others’ of their ‘rights’ is only part of what postcoloniality tries to uncover. Postcoloniality, under the epistemology of Imperialism (Césaire, 2000), also talks about the dehumanization of the Other, the implication of the colonizing gaze which intersects with issues of power relationship, the primitive and the modern (Nandy, 1988) that deal with the constructs such as different knowledges. Thus, this review tries to show what a tricontinental (Young, 2003) or postcolonial epistemology can offer, such as in the development of SSPT with regard to SSIs that students and teachers encounter in the discussion of bioethics with an emphasis on the value of class analysis in these ethical transactions.
On critical bioethics

The importance of language in pursuing a decolonized critical bioethics education cannot be stressed enough but a possible critique to this argument is provided by asking: how will it be different from the current formulation of bioethics education? If language is limited in the formulation of current bioethics education, then by incorporating issues of oppression and social justice, which are some of the key constructs argued here, this problem might already be resolved. Studies on decolonizing bioethics already exist (Fayemi & Macaulay-Adeyelure, 2016; Wong et al., 2021), but as argued from examples of real-life scenarios, and as suggested by the implication of some thought experiments on charity and aid giving, there is still a disconnect between what is being developed and used within the four walls of the classroom and the lived experience/s of those who take part in ethical transactions in bioethics education.

This is the space that critical pedagogy will occupy in the development or formulation of a critical bioethics education. It addresses the dominating facet of education, where, through the language of the oppressor, the oppressed internalize the consciousness of the oppressor (Shudak & Avoseh, 2015). Thus, we should not be remiss in contextualizing language, as it is part of the structure and system that is in place to enforce a colonizing social consciousness on learners especially in its interplay with socioscientific issues. This is where postcoloniality and critical pedagogy intersect in formulating a decolonized critical bioethics education. Critical pedagogy is able to “incorporate(s) an understanding of those things in a person’s life that limits the fullness of their cognitive, social, emotional, etc. development” (Shudak & Avoseh, 2015, p. 465), which is grounded on the effect of language on individuals’ internalizations of social systems and structures.

The conception and application of critical bioethics to dilemmas faced by researchers,
clinicians, and participants are nothing new. The works of Parker (1995), Hedgecoe (2004), and Árnason (2015), to name a few, have forwarded and formulated a critical bioethics that is not constrained by current frameworks, such as those normative philosophical constructs that inform and influence the discipline. Such authors extensively argued for a critical bioethics as a response to the ‘incompleteness’ (Hedgecoe (2004) of the current discipline, as they deem that the current formulation of the discipline fails to address the experiences of all participants on the ground, whether through clinical practice, research, or something else. Callahan (1999) supports this: “ethics cannot be ethics at all unless it offers some guidance in knowing how to identify an ethical problem” (p. 288), and an incompleteness in the language adds to this ignorance to the extent of understanding ethical implications, especially as a social construct (Hedgecoe, 2004). This is observed in the drowning child thought experiment; there is a failure to identify the other ethical dilemmas present in it that are carried by the object of the thought experiment.

When bioethics is only concerned about philosophical analyses and public policy (Hedgecoe, 2004), failing to understand social implications and lived experiences, then it suffers from a myopic understanding of what it can offer, and serves only its academic or philosophical interest. For Hedgecoe, this ‘incompleteness problem’ stems from the discipline itself through the philosophical method inherent to the discipline. He further argued that ‘conceptual analysis’ might be powerful enough to differentiate meanings of constructs such as autonomy, beneficence, and others that are used in constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing moral dilemmas, but it fails to determine which definition of the constructs occur in the clinic or on the ground. That is why the use of argumentation, logic, and reasoning are not enough to critically assess bioethical dilemmas, as they also fail to determine the ‘right’ bioethical construct to use (Hoffmaster, 1992).

In order to address this concern of ‘incompleteness’, Parker (1995) put forward an initial critique to the dominant formulation of bioethics through the use of “critical self-reflection
on the nature of bioethics and the decisions it supports” (Hedgecoe, 2004, p. 134). When bioethics becomes critical or is critical, it develops ‘an object of its own gaze’; this does not diminish the ‘power’ of the discipline – rather, it gains more through introspection and self-critique. For Parker (1995), when she assessed the relevant ethical issues that stem from breast cancer, these cannot be addressed only by philosophical method; rather, the discipline will benefit from an interdisciplinary approach where views are addressed opposite actual practices (Davis, 1994), providing a space for lived experiences of participants of the ethical transactions within the clinical or research practice. Furthermore, Parker (1995) argues that it provides “discursive qualities and their potential as practical strategies or vehicles for effecting alliances both inside and outside of the social practice of medicine and among those with differing normative and conceptual commitments” (p. 314). Thus, in reformulating bioethics into decolonized critical bioethics, it benefits from the different perspective that other disciplines such as those in the social sciences can provide, as opposed to the critique that it makes the discipline weaker because it lacks decisiveness due to multiple perspectives.

Parker (1995) introduced the need for an interdisciplinary approach and introspection or reflexivity; Hedgecoe (2004) built on this foundation in applying “relevant rigorous normative analysis to lived moral experiences” of participants of the ethical transactions (p. 120). He listed the following prerequisites for a critical bioethics: 1) rooted in empirical research; 2) challenging theories using evidence; 3) reflexive; and 4) skeptical of claims of ‘experts and professionals from the field’. Here, Hedgecoe (2004) responds to the quandary faced by the participants of the moral transactions as argued by Parker (1995): there is value in both the lived moral experience of the participants and in theories of the discipline; together, these can possibly lead to a better moral outcome for the participants and the discipline. Even though there is a push from philosophical bioethics against the benefits of drawing on social science (Hedgecoe, 2004), it is clear that social science strengthens bioethics rather than making it more problematic.
For Árnason (2015), critical bioethics involves the use of communicative rationality, as a vital aspect in the evaluation of critical thinking as the primary method of bioethics, and through social theory, which focuses on power relations that are absent in mainstream critical thinking. For some, critical thinking is flawed as a result of “premature criticism, uncritical self-understanding of theoretical assumptions, and narrow framing of bioethical issues” (Árnason (2015, p. 154), thus adding to the incompleteness of the language of bioethics. As regards social theory, which focuses on the analyses of power relations, critical bioethics falls short of its goals as a result of a lack of normative dimensions as a function of the social sciences as disciplines. This is why the role of critical consciousness-raising is an important element of this research as it argues that theory and action that lead to praxis are critical elements in a decolonized critical bioethics education; they help learners understand the social and individual implications of ethical transactions and appreciate what ought be done in this context.

*Critical thinking as the primary method of bioethics*

In the development of critical bioethics, Árnason (2015) argues that bioethics is inherently critical as a philosophical discipline, since it employs “critical evaluation of concepts, positions, and arguments, as is typically associated with critical thinking” (p. 154). He uses the trans-disciplinary definition of critical thinking, as part of interrelated modes of thinking, such as scientific, mathematical, historical, moral, and philosophical thinking, to name a few (The Foundation for Critical Thinking, 2019). Critical thinking is further defined through constructs such as the “intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing … and/or evaluating information gathered from, observation, reasoning … as a guide to belief and action” (The Foundation for Critical Thinking, 2019). Important here is how critical thinking was qualified using the different constructs, leading to its use ‘as a guide to belief and action’, which differentiates it from critical consciousness (Assante & Momanu, 2020; Barrera et al., 2017; Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016; Freire, 1973, 2012; Freire et al., 2014; Heberle et al., 2020). Critical thinking only serves as a guide to belief and
action, whereas in critical consciousness through critical pedagogy, praxis is a direct result of the dialectical relationship of theory and action where social impact is at the centre of this praxis. As part of ethical and philosophical thinking, critical thinking does not necessarily lead to ethically permissible transaction as constructed here, based on the limited language of current bioethics. Since the criticality of philosophical bioethics mainly rests on analytical criticism, it is subject to different intellectual flaws such as: (1) premature criticism, (2) uncritical self-understanding, and (3) narrow approaches to bioethical issues (Árnason, 2015).

The practice of analytical criticism in philosophical bioethics has a tendency to nit-pick on arguments and statements of an author, and as a result can fail to understand the overarching point of the author under ‘investigation’. Also, as analytical criticism is mainly based on logical reasoning and argumentation, the context of the argument and/or of the author is seldom considered, which results in decontextualization, losing much of the potential meaning and significance; this is a result of premature criticism. For uncritical self-understanding, there is a need to evaluate individual prejudices, which might blind bioethicists in their attempts to understand and resolve a moral transaction. Reflexivity on the worldviews, attitudes and ideas of individuals can play a role in our understanding of their moral positions, which does not necessarily mean being shared or accepted by others. Rather, it arms us to better assess critically the moral transaction and position of the individual, which is also reflected socially. Lastly, narrow approaches to bioethical issues overlook social and existential issues related to moral dilemmas posed by bioethical issues. As shown in the other issues ‘invisible’ from the primary issue that the drowning child thought experiment aims to address and respond to, as it is so eager to resolve the primary issue it sees, it is blinded from the systemic and structural issues inherently connected to it. How questions are posed is vital for what issues will be highlighted and what issues will take a backseat or become completely invisible, but this does not necessarily mean that one needs to address all the issues that might be related to the given ethical dilemma. These might be impossible to address, but what is important is the consciousness to address possible issues we can
envision. Árnason (2015) provides a possible template for how we can make bioethics critical through the following questions: 1) do we question enough where we are heading; 2) how are issues and questions to be discussed; and 3) how do we regard the unintended social consequences of bioethical dilemmas on social practices and institutions? This makes his conceptualization of bioethics critical through a dialogical problem-posing process very apposite, where:

The central place of dialogues as interactive processes in dialogical empirical ethics implies that the ethicist does not primarily act as an expert with specific knowledge or moral authority regarding a specific subject, but rather as someone who enhances interactions between groups of people, and between practice and theory. (...) The ethicist will try to make sense of what stakeholders express from his own perspective, and this may include a critical examination of ideas expressed by stakeholders. This, however, is not an external critique but the start of a dialogical learning process, in which both the ethicist and the stakeholders change. (Widdershoven et al., 2009, p. 248)

This dialogical process is still different from the dialogical process of Freire, where action for social change is a critical component. Lastly, Árnason (2015) included the role of power relations and structures in current bioethical practices; this is one of the criteria he put forward for bioethics to be critical, which is also a component argued in this review. The acknowledgement and understanding of these hierarchical power relations allow us to better weigh up the implications of our moral transactions, which are not without power dynamics.

The role of critical pedagogy in critical bioethics

Carrillo (2007) summarized the arguments and assumptions that Freire constructed, deconstructed, and reconstructed that influence the development of critical pedagogy. For Freire (Carrillo, 2007), education means: 1) a critical understanding of reality; 2) a
commitment to utopia and changing reality; 3) training those who will make this change; and 4) dialogue. Vital in these assumptions is the development of intellectual and moral powers among individuals, which is a key component of critical thinking, not just to face structures of inequity and dehumanization, but more importantly, to dismantle them (Avoseh, 2009). Given these liberating characteristics of education, as influenced by critical pedagogy, these can enable administrators, educators, and learners to undo the colonizing nature of education and prevent its further consumption and reproduction.

Problem-posing questions, together with critical thinking, are an inherent pedagogical tool used in analyzing bioethical dilemmas (Arnason, 2015; Widdershoven et al., 2009), a feature which is also characteristic of Freire’s critical pedagogy, through a dialogic approach to teaching (Freire, 1973, 2012; Sy, 2022b). So how does this dialogic approach in critical pedagogy differ from problem-posing questions that are already being used in current bioethics and from a dialogic approach in critical bioethics? If it is already being used, then what is the need for critical pedagogy in the formulation of critical bioethics education? First, critical pedagogy recognizes that education is political and influenced by the power relationships that exist, which is not necessarily the case in problem-posing questions. Árnason (2015) forwarded power relationships in his formulation of critical bioethics, but as an independent construct from teaching itself. This responds to the initial argument presented in this thesis on the political nature of education and how ethics is also political. Secondly, this dialogic approach from critical pedagogy argues that theory and action work in tandem and complement each other in developing praxis that aims to enact social, political, and ethical changes in our world. Regardless of whether it is seen as a tool or an outcome, critical pedagogy is responsible for critical consciousness-raising.

Freire (2012) argues that consciousness has three levels: magical, naïve, and critical (Assante & Momanu, 2020; Barrera et al., 2017; Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016; Freire, 1973; Freire et al., 2014; Heberle et al., 2020). Magical consciousness takes life at face value, whereas naïve consciousness sees the self in a marginalized
society but instead of changing it accepts it as the material reality due to a lack of capacity to identify systematic oppression. Through a process of reflection and action, praxis as Freire (2012) termed it, one’s critical consciousness is developed and engaged in the material reality, acting to change the inequities and oppression that exist. This supports Arnason’s (2015) argument on questioning the current system, especially the kind of questions being posed in a bioethical debate or discussion. For Freire (2012), epistemological curiosity is part of the critical consciousness of persons who have the capacity to ask the pertinent questions to challenge current existing systems, especially how they and others are affected by this system. This is shown by the work of Freebersyser (2015), where critical pedagogy can affect awakening and subsequent conscientization of an individual who perpetuates inequities in the current system. Through critical pedagogy, enriched by theoretical frameworks from Critical Race Theory, Liberation Theory and Care Ethic Theory, Freebersyser (2015) was able to observe her personal journey as a white middle-class teacher, in interacting with students of color, having an in-group mentality of internalized racism in the classroom, to an attitudinal shift as a catalyst for educational equity. This responds to Freire’s (2012) definition of conscientization, where individuals as part of a community are able to develop critical consciousness through praxis as a result of an understanding and a commitment in changing the status quo.

Currently, critical consciousness (CC) as an outcome or process of critical pedagogy does not have a unified framework in its practice and theory (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016; Jemal, 2017). As an antidote to systemic inequity that is maintained and reproduced, many scholars have tried to advance the research and development of CC, which has resulted in a richness and diversity of CC research but has also left cracks in its theoretical base (Heberle et al., 2020; Jemal, 2017). Jemal (2017) tried to resolve the inconsistencies and discrepancies in the field to further develop CC to a new construct called ‘transformative potential’. Previously, McLaren (1998), on the other hand, did not view the diversity of CC’s theoretical base as problematic, as he argued that CC is not formed by a “homogeneous set of ideas” but that practitioners “are united
in their objectives: to empower the powerless and transform existing social inequalities and injustices” (pp. 163-164). This reality, accepted by critical pedagogy practitioners, of the lack of a universal and unifying theoretical base is succeeded by its emancipatory and liberating qualities which challenge the status quo to eventually change it rather than perpetuate it. With this in mind, this research will follow the CC framework of Shudak and Avoseh (2015) on education and critical pedagogy, where the limit-situation occupies the negative pole and critical transitivity occupies the positive pole, these being connected by education, acting as the axis between the two poles.

Education can be dehumanizing, especially when it acts as a conduit in perpetuating the oppressor’s consciousness to the oppressed (Freire, 2012). This is the theoretical intersection of critical pedagogy and postcoloniality, where “internalization – housing – and the constant measuring is what prevents – limits – one from becoming what it is they were meant, or want, to become” (Shudak & Avoseh, 2015, p. 465). For Freire, this is what he calls limit-situation, which prevents the realization of individual consciousness by housing the oppressor’s consciousness, and, as a result, perpetuating and reproducing it. A banking approach to education, as a tool by the oppressor to perpetuate and reproduce their consciousness on the oppressed, reproduces these limit-situations, as it does not allow individuals to reach their full consciousness (Freire, 2012). Furthermore, this limit-situation is also found in what Freire terms the oppressor’s naming of the world. The ruling class that names the world determines the limits of our understanding of the world; thus, in the context of bioethics and bioethics education, the ruling class determines what is ethical and what is not. As exemplified by the drowning child thought experiment, even if it is characterized by the different processes involved in critical thinking, as it fails to comprehend the fullness of the ethical transaction, including the construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of oppressive systems, it becomes a tool in the perpetuation of oppression. It might be characterized by a problem-posing question, but it is not dialogical, based on the conception of Freire; as such, by failing to become a tool for ethical liberation, this incompleteness in CC raising results in a reflection that fails to comprehend the fullness
of social and ethical issues attached to it.

On the other side of this pole is critical transitivity, the ultimate goal of critical pedagogy. This critical transitivity or critical consciousness is a result of a shift of a person’s consciousness that leads to action, which ought to be liberating. Shudak and Avoseh (2015) classified consciousness into four parts on a spectrum: intransitivity, semitransitivity, naïve transitivity, and critical transitivity, as opposed to the three (magical, naïve, critical) of Freire (2012). As the axis that connects these two poles, limit-situations and critical transitivity, the goal of education becomes to acknowledge and address the limit-situations that exist in our current social and moral systems and progress persons from having a dehumanizing intransitive form of consciousness to a humanizing critical transitive consciousness. The Lumad schools through their MMS curriculum framework and use of critical pedagogy in the dialogic discussion of their lived realities, that addresses their right to education, right to self-determination, and defense of their ancestral lands, try to achieve this (Montero-Ambray, n.d.).

Even with an understanding of this role of education, it should not fall prey to its limiting-dominating qualities, where good intentions for its application may still lead to participants being twice commodified. What I mean by twice commodified is when the lived experience(s) of persons and the result of research from these lived experiences, especially as a product of inequity and oppression, do not lead to any form of benefit to them. When bioethics only exists as an academic tool and product for consumption, not taking a form and function for liberation and emancipation from oppression, it still acts as a dehumanizing limit-situation. This is where participants (their being, lived realities, oppression, etc.) become products for consumption of the educational process; Freire (2012) argues that education becomes liberating only if the oppressor and the oppressed are liberated from a dehumanizing form of education. Thus, for decolonized bioethics education to be critical, such as in the case of moral dilemmas and thought experiments in bioethics discussion, a decolonized language should replace the colonizing gaze of educators to prevent perpetuation of oppression both academically
and via direct actions. A critical pedagogy might be possible in initiating the process of a person’s consciousness moving from intransitivity to critical transitive consciousness. This is the intention of this research, to resolve the limited and narrowness of current bioethical language through the language of postcoloniality and Freire’s critical pedagogy in addressing what is missing in critical thinking through the development of critical consciousness.

**Understanding the limitations of the theoretical frameworks**

Re-reading Freire’s critical pedagogy, for me as a researcher-activist, exposed certain flaws in the epistemology of his writings, especially with regard to activism, that has implications for consciousness-raising, specifically, class consciousness. With this in mind, coming across Stanczyk’s (2021) ‘The critique of the critical critique of critical pedagogy’ has provided me with another lens through which to read critical pedagogy and assess how it aligns or does not align with the objectives of this research. Freire’s work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire, 2012) satisfies the objective of this research on the value of critical pedagogy in raising critical consciousness as some of his other works are a reiteration of his thesis on critical consciousness (Freire, 1973; Freire et al., 2014). The different academic works on critical consciousness, especially with regards to their application to education, fully address the analysis of this research through critical pedagogy (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016; Heberle et al., 2020; Jemal, 2017; Shudak & Avoseh, 2015). Other studies on critical pedagogy, such as on its application to privileged groups (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Frueh, 2020; Gates, 2011; Malott, 2017), exposed its epistemological weakness as argued by Stańczyk (2021), but at the same time the role of critical pedagogy on a decolonized critical bioethics was strengthened as I became conscious as to how I could apply the concept in my analysis.

I think in writing a piece of decolonized research it is important not to be static or to be boxed-in to the initial frameworks that are at first identified as appropriate to addressing
the research questions and objectives set at the start of the research process. Decolonized research is critical, and by critical I mean that the initial framework can be critiqued so that there is a wider space not only to explore how it addresses the research questions but also how it fails to address these and become an anathema to the whole aim of the research. Zoning back into Freire’s (2012) work on critical pedagogy, even though he qualified the oppressor-oppressed dichotomy, he was not clear on how people will side with the oppressed in forwarding their struggles. Freire (2012), in some ways, considers activists as a class enemy of the oppressed in the same way that he considers oppressors as a class enemy of the oppressed. This weakness of his work should not limit the works of academic-activists, like myself, in doing solidarity work in the form of decolonized research with oppressed groups.

This is also true for the use of postcolonial theory as the language of this research, as the commentary of Chibber (2012) on postcolonial theory proved to be powerful enough for me to take a step back and re-assess my position on the merits of postcolonial theory. Given this realization, my initial sentiment is that I might not be following postcolonial theory as a whole, rather, the works of Frantz Fanon and others as postcolonial studies academics writing about postcoloniality. The move to use postcoloniality instead of postcolonial theory has a lot of weight, since postcolonial theory, as a body of work, carries with it specific sets of ideals and principles which are contradictory to mine as a researcher-activist. But the use of postcoloniality as a framework allows me, as a researcher-activist, the use of Fanon’s work as part of a whole body of work under postcoloniality that addresses the issues of colonization through the lens of Imperialism where class is central to this analysis. More importantly, I see myself as a researcher-activist because while I undertake research to understand, from an academic perspective, how national minorities have been and continue to be oppressed, I am also committed to taking action now to counter this oppression.
CHAPTER 3 Methodology and methods

Decolonization has been defined and re-defined in different ways with the work of Tuck and Yang (2012) being particularly influential. I am also of the opinion that decolonization is not a metaphor and is a violent process (Fanon, 1991), as a counter action against colonization, and I am more inclined to take a class-based analysis to decolonization as the theoretical framework of this research rather than employ an identity-based approach (Cassell, 2017). This analysis is rooted in the classical works on capitalism (Marx, 2010; Marx & Engels, 2015), on imperialism and colonization (Lenin, 1970), the political and economic analysis of a colonized society (Guerrero, 1979; National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017; Sison, 1987), and of particular importance, on decolonization works that primarily use a class-based analysis (Césaire, 2000; Fanon, 1991). This theoretical framework is key to this research; it tries to ensure focus in the analysis, specifically for addressing the question ‘for whom?’ that is central to the position I am taking as a researcher-activist. Lastly, as I view decolonization as a class struggle, it is also important to understand this in the context of the society we are living in, so I need to emphasize that the Philippines is a semifeudal and semicolonial society (Guerrero, 1979; Mao, 1965). This analysis cannot be divorced from the decolonized theoretical framework of this research as the struggles of the Lumad are rooted in this condition as much as in the curriculum of the Lumad schools. This is the concretization of Fanon’s (1991) analysis of the value of land to the colonized, given that colonization, and therefore also decolonization, is primarily rooted in economic struggles. This differs from the exploiter-exploited class dichotomy analysis of Freire (2012), as his analysis fails to consider the alliance among exploited classes and in highlighting that the ruling class is the narrowest class enemy of the exploited classes.

Given this theoretical framework and associated criteria, the dichotomy between the exploiter and exploited class is highlighted using a theoretical framework anchored in the class positions of the two groups, as exposed in the data. Thus, in addressing the differences between the two groups using language as our medium and site of analysis,
Critical Thematic Analysis (CTA) (Lawless & Chen, 2018) under the wider umbrella of Thematic Analysis (TA) (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2019, 2021; Maguire & Delahunt, 2017; Merton, 1975; Owen, 1984) in terms of addressing the use of language and power relations in our current social order was used. Additionally, the use of a counter-storytelling analytical framework (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) from Critical Race Theory (CRT), through its methodology, allows this research to make visible the stories of those who are ‘othered’ or exploited in our society.

Given the theoretical framework and overall methodology, there are four sources of data that were collected and analyzed in this research: 1) documents of presidential speeches on the Philippine government’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic and other related sources such as government documents and news articles; and interviews of 2) Lumad school volunteer teachers, 3) Lumad school students, and 4) former bioethics students. Data from (1) represent the language of the exploiter class in protecting their class interest in addressing an SSI through the COVID-19 pandemic, while data from (2) (3) and (4) represent the language of the exploited class that resist the violence of the exploiter class. Thus, the overall methodology mentioned above is used for the final analyses of the data of this research, through a decolonized theoretical framework, which aims to address the first research question on understanding what a decolonized critical bioethics is, through a class-based analysis.

This research is conscious of the position that I, as a researcher, took in the conduct and analysis of this research which subscribes to the argument presented by Braun and Clarke (2019) on the reflexivity of TA as a methodology and its criticality (Lawless & Chen, 2018), that allows for an explicit political stance and self-reflection of researchers. This is the same stance that Solórzano and Yosso (2002) presented in the use of critical race methodologies (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995) through the counter-storytelling framework they developed. Lastly, if this position that I have taken as a researcher in this study might be misconstrued as personal bias that can negatively impact the validity and reliability of the research findings, I think this is refuted by what Datta (2018) shared as his ‘personal decolonization and reclaiming story’. He argued, as I also reflect on my
position and the voice that I have taken in this decolonizing research, that “decolonising research training creates more empathetic educators and researchers, transforming us for participants, and demonstrating how we can take responsibility for our research” (Datta, 2018, pp. 1-2).

The impact of the COVID-19 global pandemic to the conduct of research

The COVID-19 pandemic, which affected countries in varying degrees due to measures from different government responses, upended what many researchers expected in terms of the conduct of their fieldwork. Due to the restrictions implemented by the Philippine government to address the problems posed by the COVID-19 pandemic in the country that started on March 17, 2020 and spanned the duration of the fieldwork (See, 2021), the different methods expected to be used in the conduct of this research had to be adapted to the material conditions of the research site and availability of the research participants. Some of the methods in this research as initially developed were changed or completely removed, such as classroom observations in Lumad schools, but the objectives of the research remained the same: to understand and contribute to a decolonized and critical bioethics education in the Philippines and to bioethics in general.

The pandemic exposed the material conditions, especially the political situation of the Philippines, that have material implications not just in education generally but also specifically to bioethics education. The pandemic exposed the capacity of the government to respond to the political, social, economic, and other factors that affect the country and its people. SSIs were front and center as a result of the pandemic; meanwhile, speeches made by the president and different government officials that were then manifested in public policies became primary data that addressed CTA’s object of analysis. These responses ranged from the speech from the president regarding the use of gasoline to disinfect face masks, that the virus will die a natural death, to loosely using terms like ‘flattening the curve’ and ‘herd immunity’, and to the
longest lockdown that was implemented in the world [started on March 17, 2020 and at the time of writing in July 2022 has still not categorically been lifted] (See, 2021) which lacked scientific and holistic socioeconomic response.

Data Analysis

To determine the number of participants to be interviewed and all other data to be collected in the research, this study followed the arguments of Green and Thorogood (2018) and O'Reilly and Parker (2012) in relation to data saturation. For Green and Thorogood (2018) saturation in a study is reached when categories are fully accounted for; for O'Reilly and Parker (2012), it is the point when there are few surprises or new emergent patterns in the data. Additionally, this research followed the argument of Guest et al. (2006) that a minimum number of six participants for one-to-one interviews may be "sufficient to enable development of meaningful themes and useful interpretations" (p. 78). Relatedly, Starks and Trinidad’s (2007) conception of saturation argues that the complete range of constructs needs to be represented by the gathered data in addressing the research questions. Based on my assessment of the data collected and analyzed, these minimum requirements in achieving data saturation were satisfied by the research in fulfilling the aims of this research through the research questions.

Interviews with the teachers and students of the Lumad schools proved more difficult than had been expected, as there were several administrative hurdles that had to be overcome, such as cancellation of pre-approved face-to-face interviews by a different school administrator to the administrator that pre-approved the interviews. As a result, the first interview was only conducted on September 22, 2020 through an online interview as the intended (and approved) face-to-face interviews of the research participants were denied on the day they were due to be conducted. Nevertheless, even with the difficulty of online interviews due to slow internet connectivity in the location of the Lumad school participants, a total of 16 interviews were conducted, the last of these
on October 14, 2020. Based on initial assessment of the online/field interviews, given that Miles et al. (2020) argue that “data collection is an inescapably selective process” and that “conceptual framework and research questions are the best defense against overload” (p. 55), I determined that there were enough data analyzed, also in relation to my determination of data saturation, to satisfy the aims of this research.

This research used purposive, convenient sampling (Baxter & Jack, 2010) and ethnographic methods (Perryman, 2011). Audio recording was used to document the narrative of the community but personal data of the research participants were withheld to prevent their identification. Pseudonyms were used in presenting the research participants’ responses to the interview questions. Complete translation of some transcripts of representative interviewees (Appendix 3.1) was undertaken and transcripts of extracts of the audio recordings that were used in the final thesis are presented in the English language due to the limitations allowed for the word count of the thesis. As mentioned earlier, three sets of interviews were conducted: with Lumad school volunteer teachers (Appendix 3.2), Lumad students (Appendix 3.3), and former bioethics students (Appendix 3.4). The students from the Lumad agricultural community school were Grade 11-12 students at the start of the fieldwork, and were aged 17-21 years old, but due to the lockdown moved up from their grade levels from Grade 11 to Grade 12 and from Grade 12 to university students (Appendix 3.3). My former bioethics students were in their first year of college at the start of the fieldwork and were in second year of college when the interviews were completed; they were 18-21 years old (Appendix 3.4).

The students were asked to consider the following bioethical dilemmas in the semi-structured interview, which aims to address how their SSPT in answering SSIs is influenced by their social realities and curriculum framework. These semi-structured interviews centred on the following moral dilemmas: 1) the drowning child thought experiment (Appendix 3.5); 2) a climate crisis thought experiment that I developed that touches on the issue of environment and natural resources (Appendix 3.6); 3) an exogenesis (artificial) womb, which addresses technology-based bioethical dilemmas.
(Appendix 3.7); and 4) pictures of poor children under the context of poverty from a developing country used by international charity organizations (Appendix 3.8). As bioethical dilemmas represent a type of SSI, this research aims to investigate how students responded to bioethical dilemmas they faced without directly experiencing bioethics classes, or several years after taking bioethics classes.

The drowning child thought experiment was used in this research as it represents the abstract and limiting nature of thought experiments as discussed in Chapter 2. The objective is to observe if the participants will address the thought experiment only through its narrow objective or if they will be able to address the deeper underlying issue it represents. The second thought experiment aims to engage the participant with an abstract dilemma that is either directly experienced by the participants (volunteer teachers and Lumad students) or abstractly understood by the participants (former bioethics students). The objective is to understand if these two groups will have differing positions and what positions they will hold in addressing the thought experiments. The third thought experiment aims to address the position of the participants with respect to new and emerging technologies, to see whether such a technology is negatively or positively accepted by the different groups based on their sociocultural backgrounds. And lastly, the fourth thought experiment cycles back to the first thought experiment in making an abstract thought experiment concrete based on the different experiences of the group of participants with respect to charity or aid-giving. The thought experiments aim to address the third research question of this study in exposing the positions of the participants vis-à-vis their sociocultural backgrounds through a decolonized theoretical framework and the approach of counter-storytelling (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) which will be further elaborated in latter sections (p. 96).

Meanwhile, records of the speeches of the Philippine president given from March 13, 2020 to April 12, 2021 were downloaded from the website of the Presidential Communications Operations Office (https://pcoo.gov.ph) and cleaned of data interference such as official letterheads and other such information which can add noise to the data when processed through NVivo version 20. Coding and other steps for
qualitative analyses of these speeches followed Miles et al. (2020) and Owen (1984) steps on analysis. CTA was used in analyzing the position or the context of the statements in these speeches with respect to other government documents, news articles, and interviews in relation to the socio-historical background of the Philippines as the people in power are viewed, in this case, to those who influence the context of bioethics education in the Philippines.

I reflected on the result of the analysis of the presidential speeches on COVID-19 in the early analysis (Miles et al., 2020) of the three sets of transcribed interviews that formed the initial impression of the interviewees’ stories and how these initial impressions are situated in the research or how the initial picture formed from their stories related to decolonized critical bioethics education. In the analysis of the data, these initial findings were then juxtaposed to the final analyses of the interviews that form the interpretations that represent the counter-stories of the exploited class.

Lastly, the inclusion of my former bioethics students provided a lens to determine if they have attained a postcolonial language and critical consciousness when faced with a certain bioethical dilemma or SSI. In collecting data from the research participants, as a former teacher of the bioethics students and an activist working with the Lumad, this research used what Mercer (2007) described as the ‘insiderness-outsiderness continuum’ of the researcher in a given research. As a former teacher to students who have taken my bioethics class and a researcher-activist working with the Lumad agricultural community school, these roles are well known to the participants. My role exists somewhere between an outsider researcher and an insider teacher/activist who is trying to understand the role of class analysis in the development of a decolonized critical bioethics in addressing the objectives of the research. In the language of activism in the Philippines, this exists in the context of solidarity in the struggles of the ‘othered’ communities in terms of my relationship with the Lumad community.
Meaning-making through thematic analysis and critical thematic analysis

The different documents (i.e. speeches, news reports, interviews, and others) in this research present challenges in their organization for analysis and processing to arrive at a unified and coherent thought. Miles et al. (2020) argue that there is no one way nor specific steps for analyzing a set of interviews, speeches, or documents in order for conclusions to be drawn. Erlingsson and Brysiewicz (2017) had also maintained this and point out that there is “no step-wise analysis process that can be applied to the data like a pattern cutter at a textile factory” (p. 93). In their research they summarized the different works on content analysis by Hsieh and Shannon (2005) on conventional content analysis; on inductive content analysis; and of Graneheim and Lundman (2004) on qualitative content analysis of an interview text. The research presented in this thesis is particularly interested in the ‘synopsis of content analysis’ and ‘content analysis as a reflective process’ that they discussed in their article (ibid.) to make thematic analysis (TA) deliberate and rigorous (Braun & Clarke, 2006). A key contribution is their presentation of the objective of qualitative content analysis, which is “to systematically transform a large amount of text into a highly organized and concise summary of key results” (Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017, p. 94). This step is crucial in the processing and analysis of 67 speeches that span a year, forming the regime’s narrative that influenced the policies, laws, and guidelines in their response to the global pandemic brought by COVID-19, specifically, in how TA is used in this research (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2019, 2021; Owen, 1984).

The use of qualitative content analysis helps in the organization of the available pre-transcribed speeches made by the president in the formation of categories or themes, or, as Erlingsson and Brysiewicz (2017) put it, in the translation from ‘the manifest and literal content to latent meanings’ (p. 95). Sub-categories, categories, and themes do not come from the interview questions themselves (Braun & Clarke, 2006); rather, they are revealed through a deliberate and rigorous analysis of data, in this case, the presidential speeches. This was done through reading and re-reading of the speeches.
to form an initial idea or understanding of the narratives that are coming from the regime in addressing a particular SSI that can influence SSPT of the masses (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2019, 2021; Lawless & Chen, 2018; Owen, 1984). Lastly, the use of a word frequency search to grasp the general picture drawn by the speeches is valuable as Pennebaker and Chung (2013) argue that small words have implications for the consequences of the language employed (Appendix 3.10, Appendix 3.11, and Appendix 3.12). Owen’s (1984) initial formulation of thematic analysis put emphasis on the value of recurrence, repetition, and forcefulness in the documents analyzed as they provide the hint on the themes that are formed; thus, reading and re-reading and the use of word frequency search helped in the development of the themes from the speeches.

This formulation of TA by Owen (1984) was further developed by Lawless and Chen (2018) in identifying the possible existence of “ideologies, power relations, and status-based hierarchies” in the themes created (p. 92). Furthermore, Braun and Clarke (2019, p. 6) point out:

> Themes do not passively emerge from either data or coding; they are not ‘in’ the data, waiting to be identified and retrieved by the researcher. Themes are creative and interpretive stories about the data, produced at the intersection of the researcher’s theoretical assumptions, their analytic resources and skill, and the data themselves.

The implication of this in this study is that the creation and formulation of themes in the analysis of the president’s speeches is influenced by a decolonized theoretical framework. The analytical lens that was used was deliberate and conscious in addressing the second research question, mainly through the position of the exploiting class in responding to a concrete bioethical issue as manifested by the COVID-19 pandemic. This is possible as CTA brands itself as an approach that has a more open framework to attend to all relevant macro structures, issues, and forces without being sensitized to a specific theoretical lens such as critical race
theory, intersectionality, or critical feminist theory. (Lawless & Chen, 2018, p. 104)

This is valuable as this research also uses critical race theory’s counter-storytelling approach (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) in teasing out the position of the exploited class, as compared to the exploiting class through the president’s speeches, in responding to the second Research Question of this research.

Reading and re-reading the speeches of the president provided an initial understanding of the direction or theme/s of the discourse of the president, as the representative of powerful elites in the country, in trying to maintain authority through the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most glaring pieces of information that the speeches provided were the words that the president was using most frequently through recurrence or repetition, that takes the central narrative and discourse of his speeches. These were observed in his frequent mention of following the rules in/of a militaristic lockdown used by the regime (recurrence) and the high number of the words military, police, and their other permutations in the speeches (repetition) (Appendix 4.1). On the other hand, what is not being said by the president or not being given weight in his speeches vis-à-vis the common call of the people became more apparent through forcefulness. In this case, I view forcefulness in the negative (negation) and positive (affirmation) lens as these kinds of positions are found in the speeches. In the case of mass testing, a term that was seldom mentioned in the speeches (negation) in relation to the call of the people in making vaccines available to the general population or when mentioned (affirmation), the position of the government was to deny its implementation.

The above statements are the result of what Erlingsson and Brysiewicz (2017) identify as another contribution of qualitative content analysis in understanding the milieu of human experience, as a reflective process. This reflective process balances the notion of pre-understanding or one’s current worldviews and biases that can influence the data under analysis. Balancing does not mean that researchers have to take a completely
neutral or benign position to the research analysis. The intention of this reflection is not to forcibly mold the data to the framework being used for the research. In short, this research follows Erlingsson and Brysiewicz’ operational definition of analysis as a reflective process ‘of working and re-working your data that reveals connections and relationships’ (Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017, p. 95). The analysis of the speeches of the president, as representative of the ruling class, will be presented in Chapter 4.

**Understanding critical consciousness through counter-storytelling methodology**

The work of Solórzano and Yosso (2002) on counter-storytelling methodology that includes theory, pedagogy, and in this case its approach that pushes back on majoritarian views not only in education but also in research in education has provided researchers with a theoretical framework to conduct decolonized research on bioethics education. This is more apparent in the current state of affairs of the world where researchers are pushing back against imperialist forms of education and research in studies in medicine (Wong et al., 2021), and also on the challenges in conducting research during a pandemic. In this case, counter-storytelling as an analytical tool was used in exposing the current gaps in the dominant narratives from bioethics, addressing the second and third Research Questions of this study. For Solórzano and Yosso (2002), counter-storytelling can be used in telling the stories of “people whose experiences are not often told such as those on the margins of society” (p. 32), like the Lumad in this case. More importantly, it can be used as a “tool for exposing, analyzing, and challenging the majoritarian stories” (p. 32), such as the current narratives in bioethics vis-à-vis the discourses from the Philippine government’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic which marginalized the ‘othered’ groups. Counter-storytelling and other research methods that give voice to the voiceless and platforms to the invisible are as legitimate as other standard quantitative and qualitative methods in research.

This agrees with the work of Datta (2018) in addressing Western quantitative and qualitative research methodologies whose principles were deemed challenging, as
research that does not employ decolonizing methodologies can lead to the exploitation of communities. Furthermore, this consciousness of using decolonizing methodologies during a pandemic is a way that “incorporates and bridges Western and Indigenous research, with people learning to challenge past wrongs and restoring participants’ voice in a show of respect, reciprocity, and responsibility” (Datta, 2018, p. 21). It only benefits the whole of the research discipline if we are able to incorporate the positive values of Western and Indigenous research, especially in difficult times, in order to make the invisible visible and the voiceless heard, while preventing their further exploitation, oppression, and marginalization.

Contextualizing this in the aims of this research, the greater value of counter-storytelling methodology is in the evaluation of critical consciousness among the research respondents, through the analysis of their responses in the interviews and the thought experiments. There are attempts in unifying critical consciousness (CC) as a theory (Heberle et al., 2020; Jemal, 2017) and in some cases in developing a systematic way of its analysis in the development among individuals (Diemer et al., 2014). There is value in the development of these scales and tests for the analysis of CC to prevent distortion or a proxy measure (Diemer et al., 2014) but on the other side of the coin is the value of qualitative data in exploring CC through the interview questions and thought experiments in making visible the invisible.

Critical consciousness is composed of the dialectical relationship of critical reflection and critical action (Diemer et al., 2014; Freire, 2012), but other studies also include critical motivation (Assante & Momanu, 2020; Diemer et al., 2016) as another component of CC. This study is not focused on the development of CC among the individuals interviewed; rather, it determines whether CC is present in them through their responses to the interview questions and thought experiments. As defined in the work of Diemer et al. (2016), critical reflection is the process of understanding how our society is organized that results in the marginalization of othered groups and in the end in questioning them; critical motivation refers to the “perceived capacity and
commitment to address perceived injustices” (p. 216); and critical action is changing those perceived injustices. In Chapter 2, through the struggles of the Lumad and the concretization of these struggles in the Lumad schools, it can be argued that the Lumad students and volunteer teachers have already developed some form of critical reflection and critical action. The volunteer teachers’ years of being part of the Lumad school and the Lumad Bakwit school manifest their understanding of the plight of the Lumad and concretizing that struggle for the right to education of the students. This will be further explored in the interviews with the volunteer teachers in Chapter 5, where the volunteer teachers shared why they stayed in teaching in the Lumad schools despite the harassments and militarization they experienced while in the school. Meanwhile, critical action is manifested in their active participation to the Lumad Bakwit school, as it is a concretization of their commitment to fight for the right to the education of the Lumad in bringing this campaign to the capital of the country. The Lumad students are also argued to already possess the capacity to understand the dialectical relationship of critical reflection and critical action, not just because of their constant reference to the spiral relationship of theory and practice but actually in living that theory and practice. This can be better observed in Chapter 6 of this research, where the Lumad students shared their struggles for the right to education, health, food security, and, ultimately, self-determination. Given this, the focus of this study in addressing research questions 2 and 3 is in understanding and teasing out the existence of critical motivation among the Lumad students and volunteer teachers. The same analysis is applied to the responses of the former bioethics students, but with equal evaluation of the presence of critical reflection, critical motivation, and critical action as they were exposed to critical pedagogy and the language of postcoloniality in their previous bioethics class.

Given the understanding of critical consciousness (CC) in the context of this study, this will be juxtaposed to the presence of semitransitive magical and naïve transitive (Assante & Momanu, 2020; Freire, 2012; Jemal, 2017) if the components of CC are not observed. This is the case in Chapters 5 and 6, where some volunteer teachers and students stayed within the boundaries of the thought experiments, reflecting the
possibility of a naïve transitive consciousness. Meanwhile, in Chapter 7, Janice, a
former bioethics student, seemed to show a magical consciousness in addressing some
of the thought experiments, as she tended to respond with an acceptance of the
implication of the thought experiment even if this would result in marginalization of
othered groups. These are just some examples of positions that might reflect the
consciousness that the participants hold against different situations as captured by the
thought experiments. Some of the respondents were consistent in their position when
responding to the different thought experiments, which might reflect the existence of a
critical consciousness, while others show more inconsistencies as they tend to move
from holding a magical, naïve, or critical consciousness depending on the thought
experiment asked. All of this will be explored in more detail in Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

**Ethical issues**

This research follows the ethical guidelines and process as set in the Research Ethics
Guidelines by the IOE, Faculty of Education and Society (UCL, 2022) and the Ethical
Guidelines for Educational Research as set by the British Educational Research
Association (2018). Ethical approval was granted on October 29, 2019.

Before the fieldwork was conducted, a letter was sent to the chair of the board of
trustees of the Lumad agricultural community school to gain approval as part of the
original plan of the research (Appendix 3.13). Attached to the letter was an information
sheet to provide details of the study (Appendix 3.14) and an informed consent form
(Appendix 3.15). Before any interviews were undertaken, the information sheet and
informed consent form were provided to the participants – teachers, school students,
and undergraduates. For participants who required the information sheet and consent
form in their own language, this was provided together with a discussion of the
implications of the study. Only when consent was given by the research participants and
consent forms were returned did the interviews commence.
This research has made every effort not to disclose the identifying information of the research participants but due to the unique position of the Lumad school and its students and teachers to the current social realities of the Philippines, it will be quite difficult not to ‘out’ them as a group. Reflecting on this, without outing them individually, it is important for their struggle, especially on their right to self-determination and to their ancestral land through education, that this research takes a position of solidarity with them. Solidarity in this instance takes a form of revealing their stories, hence the use of counter-storytelling methodologies, that can add the wealth of indigenous knowledge that directly confront imperialist forms and functions of education. Thus, this research and its methodology take a position of solidarity as an ethical way of addressing the issues confronted by the research by revealing their identity as an othered group but also critical in not outing their individual identities as participants of the research.
Chapter 4 Dominating ethics: Ethics of the ruling class in response to the pandemic

In Chapter 3, I laid down the theoretical framework of this research and the methodology that was used in the collection, systematization, and analysis of the data from different sources. This chapter analyzes the discourse emanating from the Philippines’ ruling class, through the president of the Philippines in his nightly Talk to the People in addressing the COVID-19 pandemic. The president’s speeches were in dialectical relationship with their realization through the National Action Plan (NAP) against COVID-19 and other government policies which are found in government documents and news articles on the government’s response vis-a-vis the people’s counter response to the pandemic. As mentioned in Chapter 3, I also drew on qualitative content analysis in systematizing the rich data that I collected and encountered to reveal the language of the ruling elite in addressing a socioscientific issue (SSI) that was represented by the COVID pandemic. In connection to the COVID-19 pandemic, the policies, laws, guidelines, and narratives from the speeches will serve as the concrete manifestation of the regime’s socioscientific perspective taking (SSPT) in addressing an SSI. These data were then unpacked and juxtaposed to the constructs central to the decolonization of bioethics such as the dichotomy of banking and dialogic learning translated to state policies and people’s counter response, otherness, issues of dehumanization in the context of ethics, exploiter/exploited class analysis within the context of colonization, the colonizing gaze, limit-situation, and the centrality of colonization as primarily an economic struggle (Fanon, 1967, 1991; Freire, 2012).

Through the theoretical framework of this research, as mentioned in Chapter 3, the exploiter-exploited dichotomy is analyzed through the centrality of class, with this reality being brought about by the dialectical interaction of the base structure and superstructure in our current world that is dialectical to the exploitation of the othered class. The centrality of class in the analysis of this research does not negate its intersection with other identities, such as race, gender, beliefs, and other characteristics.
that are also possible causes of othering or oppression (Cassell, 2017; Stańczyk, 2021). Rather than the construction of identities, this chapter and the next three chapters will focus on how these identities are reflected in discourses that address SSIs. In naming the world, as a Freirean construct, the exploiter class determines what can be, what will be, which is also in dialectical interaction with the limit-situation that they create as it influences what is the end (limit) of our understanding of the world. We can observe this in the case of the response of the Duterte regime to the pandemic, in which that regime influenced what can be and what will be, such as for example the use of COVID-19 vaccines as the sole solution to the pandemic and mass testing as an implausible response to it. As opposed to vaccines as the sole solution to the pandemic, the basic sectors in the Philippines, together with progressive organizations, government critiques, activists, and others, argued that vaccines are an important part of a holistic response to the pandemic. The acts of the regime and the corresponding reaction of the people to them do not have a cause-and-effect relationship; rather, as will be shown in more detail later, these actions and reactions are bound in a complex dialectical relationship situated within the current social order. These are just some of the examples of the discourse that reflects the current reality in responding to an SSI between the exploiter and exploited class.

COVID-19 and Philippine Foreign Policy: A semifeudal and semicolonial country’s response to the pandemic

Dialogue is the encounter between men (sic), mediated by the world, in order to name the world. Hence, dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world and those who do not wish this naming—between those who deny others the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak has been denied them. Those who have been denied their primordial right to speak their word must first reclaim this right and prevent the continuation of this dehumanizing aggression. (Freire, 2012, p. 88)
In a semifudal and semicolonial society like the Philippines, dialogue does not occur between the ruling elite and the exploited class; rather, those in power impose their class interest for the exploitation of the othered class. Freire (2012) touched on this through the banking concept of education where the teacher (those in power) projects an idea of absolute holder of knowledge and the students (exploited class) are the necessary opposite whose existence is of ignorance. Thus, dialogue cannot exist between the two and only those in power have the capacity to name the world, and through their word, act in their class interest.

Instead of communicating, the teacher [ruling class] issues communiques and makes deposits which the students [exploited class] patiently receive, memorize, and repeat. This is the “banking” concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing, and storing the deposits … Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry. (Freire, 2012, p. 72)

This is observed in how the Duterte regime responded to the COVID-19 pandemic, in imposing its own class interest in addressing the pandemic instead of the interest of the Filipino people as a whole. It started with the news on the position of the Philippine government through Duterte, as the president of the Philippines, and Duque, as the Secretary of the Department of Health, on the proposed policy banning mainland Chinese tourists entry to the country, which shaped and ushered the reality of the Philippines with regard to the COVID pandemic ("Duque rejects ban on Chinese tourists, cites diplomatic, political repercussions," 2020). The Secretary of Health of the Philippines maintained the position of the president in relation to the entry of Chinese tourists to the Philippines, dated January 29, 2020, more than a week after the first positive case was recorded in the Philippines on January 21, 2020 ("Philippines confirms first case of new coronavirus: health minister," 2020). This reflects the primary position that the regime had taken: the country’s diplomatic relations privileged over the
possible control of the entry of the virus to minimize its spread; the possible political repercussions privileged over the safety of a country that does not have the necessary capital to address the possible onslaught of an unknown virus on its population, though an indication of its likely effects had been seen in other countries (including China, France, Japan and Italy) (Cepeda, 2020). In this news article, the debate between an incumbent lawmaker (Legarda) and the Secretary of Health showed that the regime underestimated the impact of the nCoV disease (the name initially used for COVID-19) in which the Secretary of Health shared that the situation was a “... very tricky and difficult issue”, while the lawmaker made a clear statement that she “... value(s) too much the health of the Filipino people”. This statement is in connection to her initial statement where she states that the “government may be incapable of handling a medical crisis of the same proportion as the Wuhan outbreak, prohibiting entry ... can be a prudent way to prevent a similar outbreak in the Philippines”. Additionally, in the same news article (Cepeda, 2020), Duque provided an argument that the “confirmed cases are not limited to China”; thus, he argued that “if we do this, then the concerned country, China in this case, might question why we’re not doing the same for all other countries that have reported cases ... It’s very tricky”. He is stating this as if these are facts in a time of a crisis, that diplomatic and political repercussions take precedence over the health of the population. Another lawmaker expressed concern on this position of the Secretary of Health, where he argued that the concern of the Secretary of Health is misplaced. The same lawmaker added that foreign relations should be left to the foreign relations department while the Secretary of Health’s concern should be in protecting the health of Filipinos, echoing the earlier sentiment of Legarda (Mercado, 2020). In this regard, the lawmaker argued that absolute equality should not be applied to all countries that had reported positive cases: “I don’t think we should compare with other countries that have reported positive coronavirus patients. We can’t compare it with China and say ‘how about them?’ because the disease originated in China, that is the source” (Mercado, 2020).
The language of the Health Secretary is a manifestation of the language of those who are in power, whose political stands are biased towards those who have more capital in terms of politics and economics. The juxtaposition of the statements of the Health Secretary on standing for diplomatic and political repercussions versus the lawmakers on protecting the interest of the Filipino people, especially their health, shows that politicoeconomic conditions play a role in determining the wellbeing of the population and, in some cases, the right of the people to an accepted standard of health (WHO, 2017). Here, we are already seeing the intersection between politicoeconomic determinants of health that address an SSI (COVID-19) and bioethical principles/frameworks/guidelines that are inherent in their discussions (standard of health). In this case, the Duterte regime chose politics and economics, though not in relation to their recognized intersection to health outcomes, over a recognized standard right of individuals and populations, ceteris paribus, a right to the highest standard of health but one that cannot be achieved when the political and economic stand of the regime prevents its attainment. Further reading of the news articles during that timeframe shows where the position of the Secretary of Health in relation to a possible travel ban is anchored. His position stands firmly anchored on the viewpoint of the president on the foreign policy of the regime with regard to China, thus, on the travel ban vis-a-vis the COVID-19 situation.

In a CNN Philippines news article, Duterte stated that, “[It is hard to say that] you suspend everything because they are not also suspending theirs and they continue to respect the freedom of flights that we enjoy” (Peralta, 2020). This statement further echoes the position of the regime with regard to its diplomatic ties to China; it reflects the position of the Health Secretary on absolute equality and the notion of respect, even though the possible negative implications of this position might be more harmful to the Filipinos than to China. In the same article, the Chinese Consul General Li seemed to echo the sentiment of the two Philippine officials where he stated that, “As of now, we cannot understand why there is a need to impose a ban on Chinese nationals. I wish that the mayors carefully study the proposals and talk with the DOH before they decide
if it is really needed”. This is not a benign and a neutral statement coming from a Chinese official, as China has a history of choosing strong and selected language to impose their position on an issue they are involved with, such as in the territorial dispute in the West Philippine Sea (Ramos, 2021).

Guerrero (1979) and Fanon (1991), in their assessment of the influence of colonizers/neocolonizers/Imperialists on the colonized, argue that people in positions of power take the class interest and position of the colonizers/Imperialists rather than those of the people they should be serving. This is an example of a mastery of the language of those who inhabit the position of oppressors, as they deem themselves to have the moral high ground in any debate, where China can be seen as an Imperialist power and neocolonizer of the Philippines (Fanon (1991). Given these statements, this position of key players was further reinforced by Duterte himself in his statement using the xenophobia card (Tomacruz, 2020). He stated that, “If the question is if I will bar Chinese from entering, the answer of course is no. That is an utter disrespect to a human being ... This mentioning [of] the Chinese and blaming them is xenophobia”; he further added, “Stop this xenophobia thing”. This is further reinforced with the statement that, “It happened in China – at least the first [case] – but that is not the fault of anybody. Not of the Chinese, not the Filipinos, not of anyone”, a case of cognitive dissonance imposed on the Filipinos by those in power.

But where is the narrative of xenophobia coming from? Whose analysis is it that the issue of a travel ban for Chinese Nationals constitutes a case of xenophobia? Is ensuring the highest attainable standard of health among Filipinos, which is a product of a travel ban, a case of xenophobia? Using a Critical Race Theory (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995) lens, where racism is seen as a form of structural oppression, can we actually say there is structural racism against the Chinese in the Philippines, especially in the case of a ban on their entry into in the Philippines? Looking at the current history of the Philippines’ relationship with China, the unequal power relationship between the two states is biased towards China. From the issue of territorial encroachment to
politicoeconomic projects, China holds power over the Philippines. Thus, we cannot say that this ‘issue of xenophobia’ against China is a case of racism. If this is not a case of racism, is it a case of racial bias towards China and its people? There is a possibility that there is a growing anti-Chinese sentiment in the Philippines due to cases of territorial and maritime disputes that led to maritime incidents, Chinese workers in priority sectors and prioritized in housing tenancy, and other such issues of imbalance of power relationship (Nubla, 2019; Ramos, 2021; Romero, 2019) but this negative sentiment cannot be used to conclude racism or xenophobia. What Duterte is actually manifesting is false empathy towards China, where “he believes he or she is identifying with a person of color, but in fact is doing so only in a slight, superficial way” (Delgado, 1996, p. 12). This is not the same false empathy that Delgado formulates in his analysis where a person in a position of power over people of colour is manifesting empathy; rather, this is a case of a person in power superficially manifesting empathy to a group of people of color (Chinese) who have power over another group of people of color (Filipino).

These initial responses, statements and policies following the outbreak of COVID-19 within the country represent a case of false narratives from those people in position of power. Here, we learn a lot from Critical Race Theory, where these kinds of attitudes should not be seen for ‘purely benevolent reasons’ but rather as a ‘malady’ (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005, p. 16), which is being used by those in power in the oppression of the marginalized. Additionally, the position of Bell (1995) on the principle of ‘interest convergence’ covers the narratives of Duque and Duterte on their position on a travel ban:

... the interest of blacks [in this case, of Filipinos] in achieving racial equality will be accommodated only when that interest converges with the interests of whites [people in power] in policymaking positions. This convergence is far more important for gaining relief than the degree of harm suffered by blacks or the character of proof offered to prove that harm. (p. 69)
This narrative of equality is a false equality which is anchored on a silent covenant (Bell, 1995), where the interest of Duterte (a person in power) and of China, represented by their Consul General, converge so that ‘diplomatic and political’ relations are not soured. Furthermore, this is a case of self-interest, anchored on politicoeconomic interest, rather than the attainment of racial justice (Bell, 1995) as there is no racial justice under the banner of oppression of another group. Fanon (1991) captures this succinctly:

We find intact in them [local elite] the manners and forms of thought picked up during their association with the colonialist bourgeoisie. (p. 41)

This false empathy, as argued by CRT, is mirrored by a postcolonial analysis, that those in power are the concretization of the convergence of the class interest of foreign bourgeoisie and their local counterpart over the interest of the majority. It becomes clear that the issue of race and class converge through the lens of exploitation of one group over another group.

So, the next question now is how these narratives fit into the initial analysis of the speeches and the research questions stated in this research. False narratives and how language is being co-opted are tools of the oppressor, used to impose their will on the oppressed; as Freire (2012) argues, this is the naming of the world by the oppressor. We have seen how the narratives of (false) equality and (false) empathy, and other (false) narratives, paint those in power as acting justly to balance an existing power imbalance, whereas in reality they are pulling the weight of the balance towards those who have already accumulated capital through the marginalization and oppression of the othered or exploited class.

Given these points, then, why discuss the Philippines’ National Action Plan (NAP) against COVID-19 in this section? How does it relate to the findings and arguments that were stated above? Here, I view the NAP as the concrete realization and manifestation of the narratives, rhetoric and discourse that the regime wants to impose on the people
and in the current debate on the pandemic and what it intends to implement. In this case, the NAP as a policy represents the naming of the world by those in power, which bounds the exploited in the limits of this policy. Later in this chapter, the implication of the policies to the exploited will be shown to be a very restrictive policy at the minimum and deadly at its worst. This section forms the first part of the deeper analysis of the speeches coming from the regime with regard to the pandemic and its response to it. The second part is a deeper dive into the speeches in terms of how they sit within the bigger picture of the puzzle that this research aims to address.

**NAP(ping) against COVID-19**

The analysis of the National Action Plan Against COVID-19 of the Philippines entails the review of the different Inter-Agency Taskforce for the Management of Emerging Infectious Diseases (IATF-MEID or IATF) resolutions released since the start of the pandemic response in the Philippines (2020). The National Action Plan (NAP) against COVID-19 is the national strategy of the Philippine government in combating the disease itself and its effects; in short, in the analysis of this research, it is the concretization of the class interest of those in power. Additionally, it realizes the naming of the world of those in power in the Philippines on how it limits the agency of the Filipino people through a policy that needed to be received, filed, and stored (Diemer et al., 2016; Freire, 1973, 2012). It suffers from a failure to specify the calibrated response to the pandemic and its milestones for each of the phases of the plan. It reflects the general attitude of the government in responding to the problem, where it is unprepared at best and reactive at worst. This is reflected in the different COVID-19 pandemic policies of the government such as different quarantine measures that lack a well-crafted guideline, language that should be easily understandable and does not lead to confusion, and accessibility to the masses when they are activated and implemented. This is reflected by the large number of resolutions that were crafted only to revise and/or recalibrate the guidelines (DOH, 2022). An example of this is the case for the opening of barbershops and salons, which became a national concern that required a
resolution from the IATF (Resolution No. 41), which was in contradiction to the strengthening of the local government units and pushing for a pro-people response to the pandemic as stated in Resolution No. 25 and a number of resolutions that aimed at recalibrating the guidelines. In short, as argued earlier, the plan lacked the coherence needed to address the pandemic; it only wanted to show that those in power are doing something to address the problem (Fanon, 1967, 1991; Fanon, 2018).

The first mention of the NAP is quite interesting and is included within the following section of the March 24 Talk to the People¹:

The Department of National Defense (DND) and the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG), along with the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) and the Philippine National Police (PNP), are now ramping up the implementation of the National Action Plan or NAP, as we speak, to reinforce the efforts of the Department of Health in containing COVID-19.

You know there are just three of them: Department of National Defence, Department of Health, Department of – that of Rolly, DSWD and the DILG – some of the most important departments that are now in action.

Reports on our progress on the National Action Plan will be given regularly by the Secretary of National Defence, serving as the National Action Plan chair with the Secretary of the Interior and Local Government as vice chair. [partially translated]

To contextualize this statement, we need to backtrack to the start of the speech where Duterte thanked the healthcare workers, stating, “let me reiterate my sincerest gratitude to all our courageous frontliners in this war, especially our healthcare workers – our doctors, nurses, medical technologists, and other allied health professionals”. This was further reinforced by the following comment, “I am saddened by the news that the virus

¹Throughout the thesis, quotations are labeled ‘translated’ if translated by myself from the original Filipino, or ‘partially translated’ if the original is in a mixture of Filipino and English.
has claimed the lives of our doctors along the way. All of them are heroes and not only that, I truly admire them. You are not in this world anymore, but I truly admire you”.

However, he then made an effort to position uniformed personnel as important frontliners and framed the situation as more of a peace-and-order issue than a health-and-medical issue: “To the brave men and women of the Armed Forces of the Philippines and the Philippine National Police, thank you as well for ensuring peace and order in these trying times”. Why is this contextualization important? As we go back to the first mention of the NAP, we can actually see how it is being framed: as a peace-and-order issue, rather than, a health-and-medical problem. We can see in the framing, where priority is given to the Department of National Defence (DND), Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG), Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP), and Philippine National Police (PNP) over the Department of Health (DOH), which should be heading the efforts in addressing the COVID-19 pandemic. Again, there is a reiteration of the position of the DND and DILG, with the addition of the DSWD in the implementation of the NAP.

This reflects the class interest of the Duterte regime that mirrors their initial response to the health crisis (see previous section on banning of Chinese tourist) and this is more of a politicoeconomic interest than a medical response for the many. Further evaluation of these government institutions are the personalities heading them, all of whom are retired military officers; even the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) is headed by a retired uniformed person. One can argue that the Inter-Agency Task Force for the Management of Emerging Infectious Diseases (IATF-MEID) is headed by the Secretary of Health, but in the context of the NAP, uniformed personnel head the overall pandemic response. What is most telling is how, in relation to the NAP and the key departments involved in this, the contextualization is that the situation is a war situation:

I now call on every Filipino to participate in this war by following the guidelines set by the national government and your local officials. Nothing is more important
[now] than your cooperation. I repeat: Stay home. Do not be hard-headed. The outcome of this war depends largely on you as well. [partially translated]

It now becomes clearer how the pandemic was framed as an SSI; it is a peace-and-order issue that in its highest form is a war, but a war against whom or what is not entirely clear, but will have collateral damage that will directly impact Filipinos. What was clear in this speech was that the NAP was mentioned but its specifics were not. On the same day, the IATF Resolution No. 15, the resolution that included the proposed NAP, was released. As the specifics of the NAP were missing in the March 24 speech, we are now directed to analyze the content of the NAP through the contents of the IATF Resolution No. 15. The NAP is just section A of the IATF Resolution No. 15, that included sections A to M (DOH, 2022). In this introduction of the NAP, there was no clear phasing of the intended actions of the government to address the COVID-19 pandemic; however, it outlines the following objectives:

1) information and communication

2) containment and mitigation for detection, identification, and isolation

3) sustain the operations involving human resources, logistics, and finance

4) mitigation of consequences to social, economic, and personal security

5) adoption of the organizational structure where IATF becomes a policy-making body and the NTF-COVID-19 (National Task Force), as headed by the Secretary of DND, is the operational command.

The IATF Resolution No. 15 was supposed to provide us with a clearer plan on how the regime will address the COVID-19 pandemic, but we were only given a general outline of what they intend to do.
As the NAP leaves the readers wanting more information, I examined the other speeches where the NAP was mentioned to see if there were any more specifics that were later discussed in relation to its implementation. In the April 8 speech, Sec. Galvez, as the chief implementer of the NTF-COVID-19, relayed the success of the NAP and how it was currently on track. Below was his statement:

To our countrymen, we will just report that really our plan which is the National Action Plan is on track. Our capacity, of the DOH, is getting better now. Our testing has increased now; it is 2,400. [translated]

This was used as a justification by the regime of what they deem as the successes they have achieved and wanted to advertise in addressing the pandemic, which they also used to justify the use of the lockdown, as stated below:

Right now, we have seen that the lockdown is very successful in what we have done as it pushed the curve towards a one-month delay. [translated]

He further argues for the success of the regime in addressing the pandemic through the number of recoveries in the country and comparing these to the high death rate among other countries, which should be contextualized through the low rates of testing in the country at that time:

Right now, we have very good news because we have 11 recoveries today. If we will look at other countries, their death-death rate is very high. [translated]

And the regime comparing these data to the US which had around 1,000 deaths every day during that time represents how the regime used their platform in showing their habit of misinforming the public. In this instance, they use a false sense of equivalence, where the regime attributed the low number of cases recorded in the Philippines at that time as due to an effective government response, when in fact it was due to a lack of
testing capacity. This language used by the regime will be reflected multiple times in later sections, especially in its reiteration on the value (or lack thereof) of mass testing. The cases of Japan and Singapore were also compared to the Philippine situation, in that even though they are wealthier countries, they were struggling to address their cases. And the most interesting part of his speech is this:

We saw that our beloved president made a good decision when we were first in what we call a travel ban of countries that have COVID cases. [translated]

Two things are clear in this statement. Firstly, the NAP was only used as a justification for the actions or inactions of the regime, without further discussing what is in the NAP. Secondly, a false narrative re-emerged, this time with regard to the ban on travellers from countries with known COVID-19 cases, which the regime stated to have been activated at the start. This is in stark contradiction to the statements and position of Duterte and Duque when a travel ban was being called by lawmakers and the general population to limit the possible entry of the virus into the country as discussed in the earlier sections of this chapter. Additionally, the narrative that was being put forward here is the success of the regime’s response to the pandemic, given the number of cases in the country in relation to other countries that were reporting high number of cases. During this time the country had very low testing capacity; thus, the numbers were misleading as they do not paint a picture of the real number of cases or deaths during that time compared to other countries that had higher testing rates and thus reported high numbers of cases as they were able to identify who had the virus.

In the May 12, 2020 speech, there is more discussion on how the NAP is being used to address the pandemic and its impacts. In the presentation of Sec. Galvez, an “updated NAP operational framework to prevent and contain the COVID-19 virus” was given. In this updated plan, the objective of the intervention is focused on the carriers, or what they deemed as a COVID carrier-centric plan. Sec. Galvez further commented:
Our revised operational framework added the prevention prior to detection phase and the adoption of the end-to-end T3 management system for COVID-19 carriers, which mean test, trace and treat.

This is a stark departure from previous mentions of the NAP, as there are clearer objectives and planned actions that were included in the presentation. Furthermore, these actions seemed to be informed by the WHO; he stated the following:

As a background, some precautionary measures have been given by the World Health Organization with the recommendation on easing of quarantine restriction. According to WHO, any plans to ease quarantine restriction should be carried out gradually and in a phased manner – like, Mr President, slowly – to prevent resurgence of infection and that a strong and resilient health system should be in place, like testing and tracing. Otherwise, this will likely lude [sic] – prelude to resurgence of the disease. [partially translated]

This also translated to consideration of how lockdown measures will be relaxed during the transition to less restrictive lockdown measures which were being considered at that time. Thus, the discussion of NAP here is more substantial than in the first two speeches where it was mentioned, but, still, it suffers from a lack of definitive phases in addressing the pandemic.

In the May 19, 2020 speech, the inclusion of the NAP in the discussion still comes from Sec. Galvez, as the chief implementer of the regime’s COVID response. An interesting part of the speech is the language used in one of the sections, where Sec. Galvez stated:

So, this is good because we are able to catch those who are testing positive. [translated]
The language of Sec. Galvez as a person in a position of power, also as a retired uniformed person, reflects his sociohistorical background (Fanon, 1967, 1991; Fanon, 2018; Freire, 1973, 2012; Vygotsky, 1962; Vygotsky, 1978). When he said, “this is good because we are able to catch those who are testing positive”, this an indication of the narrative that the regime is using in addressing an SSI, through the language of peace and order and not through a health-and-medical language. The use of the word catch here is in the context of the language being used by military and police personnel in catching lawbreakers, which will be discussed in further detail in later sections, where a number of Filipinos were arrested due to ‘quarantine violations’.

Additionally, as mentioned in IATF Resolution No. 25, Section A, “The IATF adopts a national government-enabled, Local Government Unit (LGU)-led, and people-centred response to the COVID-19 health event”, it is already a foregone conclusion that the regime is using a decentralized approach in responding to the pandemic. However, Sec. Galvez stated:

So, for our way forward, what we will do is we will localize the National Action Plan through the LGUs. This means we will make it smaller. What we will do is the barangay [local government unit] which has cases is the one we will put into lockdown so that we can preserve our economic – our economic … [translated]

The statement above seems to show that the NAP was still in the process of being implemented or translated into the local level. Furthermore, the granularization of the lockdown was already proposed here to preserve the economy, but this did not materialize to scale as the Philippines was until at the end of the collection of data (April 14, 2021) still in a regional lockdown and implemented policy had not gone down to the barangay or to the smaller local unit level. Lastly, again, there was no discussion of the specifics and phasing of the NAP, which makes it clear that the pandemic is primarily seen as an economic rather than a medical issue.
In the July 7 speech, out of nowhere, phase 2 of the NAP was stated during the meeting by Sec. Galvez as having been approved by the IATF, but this is not to be found in the list of IATF resolutions, as if there have been mentions of the phases of the NAP previously (DOH, 2022) and even in quick searches online. Also, based on the language used by Sec. Galvez, the Phase 2 of the NAP was conceived due to current factors and variables at the time and not because objectives had been met that activated the transition to the next phase of the NAP:

And in order to address the resurgence of COVID and also make an opening of the economy, we have already formulated the plan. And with your indulgence, sir, we can present it to you, sir.

Saying, “And in order to address the resurgence of COVID and also make an opening of the economy, we have already formulated the plan” shows that the plan was a reaction to the current resurgence of COVID. This phase of the plan was not initially developed to address possible resurgence and the transition to the opening of the economy; rather, it was formulated because there was an ongoing resurgence and a political push to open the economy despite that ongoing reality. Sec. Galvez further added the three imperatives of Phase 2 of the NAP: 1) people’s compliance and vigilance to the minimum health standard or the changing of people’s mindset, 2) unity of effort and collective leadership, and 3) the capacity of the national government and LGUs to address and manage cases, especially in the context of Davao province as a model province in its COVID response, the home province of the Duterte clan. Two things are striking within the statement: 1) the focus on changing people’s mindset and 2) Davao province which is currently governed by Sara Duterte (the president’s daughter) as the exemplar province. The first imperative is striking because we now have a clear manifestation of the imposition of the pressure on the people in addressing the pandemic, as the solution to the pandemic is deemed to be individually behavioral and psychological, which subscribes to the peace-and-order solution to the pandemic, rather than taking health-and-medical steps to address it, which clearly originates from the
The second imperative is striking because it uses Davao and Sara (Duterte) as an exemplar geopolitical region and leader that allowed for a better pandemic response. This is a manifestation of the presence of Davao as a highly mentioned word during the word frequency analysis (Appendix 4.1). There is significance in how Davao and its leader is being mentioned to provide a narrative that embodies the rhetoric and narratives from the regime, which at that point is already being mentioned in running for a national position. Reflecting on this, Sara Duterte ran for Vice-President and won a questionable national election in May 2022 (Mercado, 2022; Sands, 2022).

To support the existence of the NAP and its phases, a web search was done but only resulted in the same statements that Sec. Galvez provided in the cabinet meeting for the COVID-19 response ("Gov't, LGUs balance 'life and livelihood' under NAP Phase 2", 2020; Sadongdong, 2020).

In the July 21, 2020 speech, the appointments of the different czars for tracing, testing, isolation and treatment were shared. This is the phase of the NAP that also focuses on the prevent-detect-isolate-treatment-reintegration strategy of the regime. But again, just like in the other speeches, this was not expounded; rather, this was only mentioned through a short statement:

Sir, I will just follow on what Secretary Duque has said pertaining to our positioning of the four czars. Because the frame of our National Action Plan is composed of test, trace, isolate and treat. [translated]

This strategy, together with the objectives of the NAP Phase 2 discussed in the July 7, 2020 speech, was talked about in detail in an Aseanpost article in which it was shared that the NAP Phase 2 has the following “salient features and objectives (a) to contain and manage new COVID-19 cases in high-risk areas; (b) to sustain the wins against COVID-19 and continue best practices; (c) to balance the nation’s health and economic welfare; (d) to localize COVID-19 responses by rallying people’s support and participation; (e) to keep a low fatality rate including non-coronavirus cases; (f) to
institutionalize the Prevent-Detect-Isolate-Treatment-Reintegration Strategy (PDITR) and the Zoning Containment Strategy; and (g) to focus and concentrate efforts on expanded and targeted testing and contact tracing” (Malindog-Uy, 2020). Additional mentions were found in other news articles (Cordero, 2020a; "Gov’t, LGUs balance ‘life and livelihood’ under NAP Phase 2 “, 2020; Kabagani, 2020; Valente, 2020), but, again, this was not included in the speeches, an arena where such features and objectives of the NAP could have been discussed more specifically.

In the August 10, 2020 speech, the NAP was mentioned in the context of the issues that sandwiched it which is quite interesting in the contextualization of the NAP in addressing the pandemic. In the first issue, Duterte was referring to the increasing number of positive COVID cases in the country that prompted different medical associations to call for a timeout, which means a move to a stricter lockdown measure (Barcelo, 2020; Cordero, 2020b; Mendoza, 2020). We have to remember that, by this time, due to the NAP Phase 2 and its salient feature of the opening of the economy, this allowed for a more relaxed lockdown but also resulted in an increase in the number of positive cases. As a result, a group of doctors asked for a ‘timeout’ against this more relaxed lockdown measure, which the president did not take lightly, as he ranted in his speech:

Now, this is what you get. We cannot prevent those, those acts criticizing the government. I told you I cannot prevent all of you. The police cannot be everywhere and anywhere all the time. The military is not part of the governance yet in the matter of using force or at least intimidating you with soldiers. Far from it, we do not have that plan. [partially translated]

Again, the reiteration of the pandemic as a peace-and-order issue rather than a health-and-medical one. Then, after this, there is the reiteration of the strength of the NAP:
Our National Action Plan against COVID-19 is also strong and we are doing everything, all the things we can do to stop COVID we are doing. But for those reasons of economy, food of the people, you balance it to the lockdown. That is all we can do; we are following on it. [partially translated]

And later, proceeding to the first mention of the vaccine as the sole solution to the problem, he mentioned how we should go about the vaccination process:

Well, let us inject a few then let us observe the results. You will be given the vaccine and the reaction of your body will show if it will be accepted or not. So, there will be volunteers. For me, when the vaccines arrive, in public, so that there will be no extra comments, in public I will have myself injected. I will be the first that will be experimented. That is fine with me … Let us see if it works. If it works on me, it will work on everybody. [translated]

Duterte presents here the unethical notion of vaccine development as a matter of personal preference for experimentation, instead of ethically sound, valid and controlled experimentation. This can be read as an attempt to show the safety of a vaccine of unproven safety and effectiveness through coercion by a person in authority which subverts ethical standards on human experimentation for investigation on new medical procedures or drugs.

I turn now to the last two speeches where the NAP was mentioned. In the October 14 speech, Sec. Galvez only reiterated the value of the implementation of the NAP to the lower levels of governance (barangay level/community level). This was justified by the achievement of the province of Bataan, where contact tracing ratio of 1:15 was achieved through the help of the tracing czar. In the October 19 speech, the mention of the NAP is just a reiteration of the PDITR, but does not mention phasing and milestones that have been achieved or should be achieved in order to transition to the next phase of the NAP. As this is the last speech in which the NAP was mentioned, even though
there is a publication of the NAP Phase 3 (*National Action Plan Against COVID-19 Phase III: Saving lives and mitigating impacts as one towards economic and social recovery*, 2020), first published in news articles during late September 2020 and early October 2020 (Bajo, 2020; "Galvez on NAP Phase 3: No more trade-offs in Covid-19 response," 2020), it was not mentioned in detail through the regime’s speeches for the public.

As policies were not formulated or crafted in expectation of possible outcomes or leading to an outcome based on sound policies of the government in addressing the COVID-19 pandemic, one can see that the resolutions suffer from micromanagement at best and failing to formulate sufficiently broad and specific guidelines that can be easily understood and applied to different scenarios at worst. Even when the guidelines are crafted with the help of experts, such as medical experts on addressing the quarantine rules, for example, there are no unified, clear guidelines that determine the activation or inactivation of one policy or the move to another form of quarantine, for example. This can be observed in the implementation of the quarantines which took different forms from enhanced community quarantine (ECQ), modified enhanced community quarantine (MECQ), general community quarantine (GCQ), modified general community quarantine (MGCQ) and general community quarantine with heightened restrictions ("GCQ 'with heightened restrictions' in 'NCR Plus' until May 31," 2021; "NCR Plus eases to GCQ with 'heightened restrictions' starting May 15," 2021).

The activation and inactivation of these quarantine rules are not set in stone as they are implemented depending on how the regime and its experts view the extent of the spread of COVID-19 at the time, rather than on specific, predetermined and calibrated parameters. Thus, one can see that when the different quarantine levels were activated and inactivated to move to a different lockdown level, one will see different reasons why the levels were activated. An example of this is the first implementation of ECQ in NCR on March 2020, when the number of cases were in the hundreds, and then implemented again at the end of March 2021 and early April 2021 when cases were in
the thousands. As we shall see when comparing this to the guidelines for the COVID-19 responses of Vietnam and UK, for example, both countries are clear and specific on the activation and inactivation of the different levels of their response to the spread of the pandemic.

So, what did we learn from the analysis of the speeches with regard to the discussion of the NAP in addressing the COVID-19 pandemic and the aims of this research? In naming the world, as Freire (2012) posits, the people in power mold the world in their conception of what the world is and what it should be; here lies the limit-situation in which the oppressor bounds our understanding of the world. In the case of COVID-19 and the response of the Duterte regime to it, this naming of the world is represented by the narratives coming from the speeches and discussions of the response to the pandemic – the NAP is the concrete manifestation of this naming. Here we see a reactive solution to the problem that is also reflected by the IATF, their different resolutions and the personnel within the IATF themselves. In the different times that the NAP was mentioned in the speeches, only its general objectives were provided and, in some cases, where there was an attempt to discuss it in detail, only the salient points and features of Phase 2 of the NAP were discussed. As to the milestone(s) it aimed to achieve through the Phases of the NAP, these were missing from a space where they can be discussed and shared with the people.

In the end, we can see in the NAP how it reflects the conception of Freire of the banking approach to education; in this case, we see how it is translated in policies in governing and controlling the exploited and othered group. There was no dialogue to be had here, as in the case of medical doctors questioning and asserting the need to stop the relaxation of the lockdown measures for the benefit of the Philippine economy but to the detriment of the people’s health; it was shut down by the president as a critique that was not needed at the time. Furthermore, it is clear that political and economic interests are inherent in a medical issue such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the class interests of those in power are clearly reflected through the aims and objectives that create to
address it. In this case, it was clear that those in power in the Philippines will serve their class interest rather than the interest of the greater number of Filipinos.

*COVID-19 Talk to the People: The Art of Distraction*

The first sections of this chapter introduced some of the content of the speeches of the president that contain the Philippine government’s response to the pandemic and the policies, news, and other documents relating to these speeches. This section is a deeper dive into the 67 speeches of the president with regard to the regime’s COVID-19 response and on how an institution with the range of available resources at its disposal addressed a current SSI that impacted the lives of the people now and in the future. To start with, as an example of the narrative or path the speeches took, compared to other countries, especially Vietnam (Dabla-Norris et al., 2020; Vu & Tran, 2020), the language used by the regime was not very clear. Below is one of the most telling positions that the regime took in addressing the COVID-19 pandemic (March 16, 2020 speech):

> My countrymen, again we discuss our most potent weapons in this war against COVID-19 are not bullets or ammunition, but our compassion and consideration for our Filipinos in the next few weeks. This, this is not war. The — the problem here, the bullet of the disease. Of sneezing, of coughing … whatever, that will pass. While others will touch on … Our countrymen, our most potent weapons in this war against COVID-19 ... Ah, this is nothing. Here, I will just make a shortcut. This is too long. [partially translated]

This shows a leader of a country failing to elaborate on how to effectively address an unknown outbreak and reassure the public on the steps that the regime has taken during the preceding months and intended to take in the upcoming days to limit the impacts of the disease. This is one of the first manifestations of a ‘split personality’ (Bhabha, 2004; Fanon, 1967, 1991; Fanon, 2018; Rentmeester, 2012) in addressing the pandemic, where in one part of the speech Duterte stated that the current situation is a
war situation. “We are at war against a vicious and invisible enemy, one that cannot be seen by the naked eye. In this extraordinary war, we are all soldiers” [partially translated]. But then he changes this to say:

**This, this is not war. The — the problem of this, the bullet of the disease. Of sneezing, of coughing … whatever, that will pass.** [translated]

Then closing with a comment:

**Here, I will just make a shortcut. This is too long.** [translated]

The last statement showed the attitude of the person holding the highest position in the government on how he wants to respond to the current global and national crisis; he does not have the patience to finish reading his prepared speech, opting instead for a garbled ad libbing in addressing the crisis. We are witness to a leader who failed properly to communicate the plan of the regime in responding to the pandemic and informing the public on how to properly respond to the crisis, which seems to foreshadow the position of the regime to the pandemic. More importantly, this ‘split personality’ is not just an abstract concept of a postcolonial work but is concretely manifested through violent policies not just in the exploitation, oppression, marginalization, and dehumanization of the othered groups as these policies led to the death of a number of individuals at the height of the lockdown (Lovett, 2020; See, 2021).

Given the above example of the narrative and discourse present in the speeches of the president in addressing the COVID-19 pandemic in the Philippines, I was able to classify the response of the regime into three major groups (categories?) that reflect the attitude of the regime in addressing the pandemic in the president’s speeches:
1) Failure of communication, where the language of addressing the pandemic does not form a coherent and united tone and function for the benefit of the majority of Filipino people;
2) Through the lockdown measures that represent the peace-and-order response to the pandemic and ultimately the vaccine as the sole solution to the pandemic and how it is related to the foreign policy of the government;
3) The issue of governance as a tool of misdirection related to political enemies and related issues of corruption: government critiques like Senator de Lima, Vice-President Robredo, and the Left progressive groups the president tagged with the communists and corruption.

Based on the low-cost, effective response of Vietnam (Dabla-Norris et al., 2020; Vu & Tran, 2020), the language used in addressing the pandemic is very important as it prevents miscommunication, ensures an effective and efficient response, timely action from the public and private sectors, and does not lead to unnecessary loss of resources. The speeches that manifested failure of communication, where the language of addressing the pandemic does not form a coherent and united tone and function, can be divided into the following subgroups:

1. Failure of communicating the policies and information;
2. Stating that there is no cure, or it will just die a natural death;
3. Discussing the biological nature of the disease, but then proceeding to order the people to simply obey the orders of the government;
4. Provides a solution that does not exist yet;
5. Framing the outbreak as a peace-and-order issue;
6. Highlighting the role of the military even though they do not have the capacity to address the crisis;
This failure to properly communicate the response of the government to the pandemic only led to more confusion. We see this in Duterte’s attempt to divide his speech into separate sections, such as in the speech delivered on April 6, 2020, before proceeding to talk about different issues that did not actually divide the prepared speech into coherent sections, just like in the March 16, 2020 speech.

Then, one can observe the inclusion of God a number of times, how God can help in addressing the situation, showing that the government cannot do anything about the current situation. The statement below shows that the president relies on God’s blessing in acquiring vaccines:

We are awaiting God’s blessing so that we can have a vaccine either from whichever bright boy there: China, Russia, America. I’m sure if they already have, they will share it with the rest of the world. (April 1, 2020 speech) [partially translated]

In the case below, talking about not disturbing God, in response to the comments of critiques, leads to an expletive-laden tirade against doctors requesting for help from the government (August 2, 2020):

But for as long as you are not a part of government and you do not know better, worse is you pretend to be an adviser then you will say – you will tweet this, “God help this country”.

Let us not disturb God. It is better if you are not part of a team. I can see an ambition in a man’s face. So … Then will comment … Why did not you advise us? So, what can you advise about COVID?
Tell me, if you are a doctor, what can you advise? What’s the best solution? Best solution is you go into your house, stay there, do not crowd in other places, mingle.

So, what are we doing? What are we doing? What can we do? Give money? We do not have the money. Then there are those who are *expletive* bright, Neanderthal instinct. Bright but modern but Neanderthal thinking. Rides on the government, keeps on critiquing the government.

*Expletive* it is like this, you animals if you are really bright then you could have, you could be in the position and do what you want. But for as long as you are not part in government, you can criticize but do not be a double standard idiot pretending to advise then you criticize. [partially translated]

Then there are sections where he talked, out of nowhere, about relieving himself twice before trying to explain a term, like the words ‘finite’, ‘infinite’, the virus, and the biology of the disease. The statement below captures the absurdity of the language of the president in responding to the pandemic (April 6, 2020):

Now you criticize because it is COVID now, quarantine, you do business. We have nowhere to put [corpses] but the Manila Bay is there, just throw them. The fish will get fat in truth and will taste better.

I told you not to. Now today, it’s a thing which is – I said rampaging all throughout our country and every country for that matter. Do not try the government because even if the government is already desperate.

Me, I am also already desperate. I told you I just look out the window to look … Do I get sleep? A while ago I woke at around 3 a.m. And then – I urinate twice before going to bed. I really just urinate once and then it is already morning.
One night, I woke up, I was looking at the dark sky. Well, it’s a private thing but I was praying. I prayed for the country. Because the others, they have a different God.

My God is the true God. It’s only one God. It is only there that I … Only one God for me so that only one word. I do not have a lot of intermediaries, like the saints, there is a checkpoint. I have a direct contact. And I do not go to church anymore. And my God is the God the Father. He is only one. [partially translated]

One can also observe statements that are more detrimental to the situation than beneficial, for instance when he talked about how angry he is with the virus and that it can be killed using boiling cooking oil, as shown below (March 16, 2020):

Do not be scared about this. Do not be scared like this. You can go out, individually, buy some food. And if the eateries and the – the restaurants, carinderias [eateries] are able to operate, so by all means ...

Well, the this here is the – do not be alone. Anyway, the cooking oil. If you have an oil there boiling, please just pour it, the virus there …

*Expletive*– that is why I’m not changing the – I am really angry about that virus.

My fellow Filipinos, I fully understand the apprehension that – that you feel. And I know it will be difficult for many of us in the next few days while in this quarantine – while this quarantine is in effect. [partially translated]

This discourse from the ruling elite as articulated by the president is representative of the overall communication strategy and efforts of the government in addressing the COVID-19 pandemic. The regime was ill-prepared for this crisis; thus, this lack of preparedness is manifested in their communication and efforts to lay down their plans in
addressing the pandemic. We are also witness to the class attitude of the president in the communication of the government; there is a sense of resignation in responding to the pandemic. The speeches are littered with qualifiers: “that we cannot do anything about it, there are no more resources, there is no cure, just rest everything to God”, and others. This reflects the evaluation of Fanon (1991) of those who have power in a colonized society, that as a function of their class status they feign resignation when they encounter difficulties.

As the person holding the highest position in the government, communicating these statements of resignation does not spark confidence among the population; it only adds to the growing sentiment of futility in a crisis. The speeches were only peppered with talk of science in instances where he deemed who should be the people in position to address the situation, such as when he stated:

In here, it’s Secretary Duque, and Secretary Duque would articulate what he learned, what new information he received and he would tell us what to do. So, it’s very important to give credence to what he says. What is important is you follow. [partially translated]

Given this statement, even though Sec. Duque as the Health Secretary might be able to provide the country with the required scientific response, the speeches stopped short here and did not follow this through with possible sound scientific responses to the crisis. Furthermore, as shown through these speeches, even though the president relied on the IATF-MEID and sometimes talked about the heroism of doctors, nurses and other healthcare workers, a valid scientific response that is centered on a humane, efficient, effective and adaptable resource management was not present. The government did not fail to make itself seem available, present and on top of the situation at the time of the pandemic; however, as the crisis requires a systematic scientific response grounded on the socioeconomic realities of the conditions, the government’s mere presence was not enough. Lastly, Duterte manifested the banking approach that
represents those in power, his statement, “What is important is you follow”, is a clear indication of this banking approach that stops the process of dialogue in effectively addressing the pandemic.

As the regime failed in how they communicated their response to the pandemic, the second theme that emerged was the specific scientific response to the COVID-19 pandemic and how it devolved into a peace-and-order response. This second theme can be divided into the 1) lockdown/quarantine measures that the government imposed as its focal pandemic response where other responses emanate from, and rely upon, 2) a not-yet-available vaccine to resolve the crisis. There is a scientific argument that can be made about the use of quarantine/lockdown measures during an outbreak. There are good reasons why these are one of the most common responses that different governments used during the COVID-19 outbreak, with Sweden, which tried to test if lockdowns are significantly beneficial in curbing the effects of COVID-19, being an exception (Paterlini, 2021). Given this, there is an argument to be made on the scientific validity and soundness of the use of lockdown/quarantine measures in the Philippines; even though these can lower disease transmission by reducing interactions in the community, they can also have negative impacts on the economy and other social services (Shiva & Molana, 2022). What is clear in the use of lockdown/quarantine mechanisms in controlling the spread of the disease in the Philippines is its militaristic character more than its scientific basis.

The speeches revealed how the use of the military and police force in the quarantine and lockdown measures is not only anchored on controlling the spread of the disease but more importantly on the peace-and-order framing of the crisis in controlling the people to act as an imposition of a medical martial law (Robles, 2020). The high number of mentions of the military and the police (Appendix 4.1) related to the response of the government shows the predilection of the regime to use military and police forces to implement a rigid and heavy-handed approach to the lockdown/quarantine measures as a peace-and-order solution to a health-and-medical crisis. Again, this is true to form for
those who represent the colonizers in a colonized society; in this case, the Duterte regime uses force to control the people (Fanon, 1991; Fanon, 2018). Furthermore, in his speeches, the president backed up this approach of the military and the police with the following sample statements [partially translated]:

I do not want you to be interrogated by the police together with the military. It could be messy. Because – some of you are snobbish. And the police together with the military, they have their orders to enforce.

It’s always the military who keep things in the country in order.

You follow the police because the police only follow orders here from the top. For me, policy from the top. This, do not do this. This, what you should do. That. And the police together with the military will enforce that. I do not care at the end who will be arrested.

My orders are to the police together with the military, add the barangay, that if there is trouble and if there is an occasion that they resist and your lives are put at stake, shoot them dead.

The previous comments can be summed up as the orders to the military and the police in maintaining the peace-and-order situation coming from ‘above’ and the possibility of a shoot-them-dead policy, just like in the policy on the war on drugs, if needed. It is, then, clear that the scientific character of the lockdown/quarantine measures was diminished to a peace-and-order response. Also, without the presence of the worst scenario of people resisting or fighting the authorities, the speech from the president tried to condition his police and military to use force against the people, which actually became the reality as discussed in previous sections.
In relation to the other scientific response to the crisis, the vaccine response, the president already reassured the public regarding the impending health crisis even though he stated that there is no vaccine yet that can be used against COVID-19. Combing through the 67 speeches, mentions of vaccine in its different derivatives are found in: 13 speeches that included Russia in relation to vaccine, 19 that included Moderna, 20 that included Sinovac, 10 that included Sinopharm, 21 that included Pfizer and 21 that included AstraZeneca; overall, 55 of the 67 speeches included the term vaccine. Here one can observe the priority of the government: there is a definite focus on vaccination as the major response to the crisis. And what is most telling here, is that vaccines were always mentioned in connection with diplomatic relations with China, Russia and the USA. The position that the government took while mentioning vaccines and its diplomatic relations with these countries is an unbalanced power relation where the Philippines is framed as having to beg for them. It is notable that these speeches were delivered in the context of the regime knowing that a working, effective, safe and proven vaccine was not yet available. Here we see that the government banked on a solution that was not yet available and might be expensive, which is quite opposite to the effective response of the Vietnamese government which was apparently fully aware of the resources available to it and the long-term impact of the crisis (Dabla-Norris et al., 2020; Vu & Tran, 2020). In truth, the Philippines accumulated billions of dollars in debt in its acquisition of vaccines and other COVID-19 related responses, but still rated low in COVID-resilience rankings (Lopez, 2020b; "TRACKER: The Philippines’ COVID-19 vaccine distribution," 2021); as important is the question whether corruption played a part in the deal with Sinovac (Rita, 2021).

There are other pandemic responses that the government could have implemented early in the crisis, such as the effective use of testing to identify infected individuals to prevent further spread of the disease (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2022). Out of the 67 speeches, the word ‘test’ was mentioned only 44 times, which shows the lack of priority the government put on testing. Further, in terms of mentioning ‘test/ing’ in a more important context, mass test/ing was only found twice in these 44
speeches. Figure 4.1 provides a part of a word treemap of mass test/ing in the president’s speeches, generated from NVivo.

Figure 4.1. Part of a word treemap of word search of mass test/ing in the 67 presidential speeches analyzed.
Mass testing was mentioned in the May 19, 2020 speech, which came from Secretary Lopez of the Department of Trade and Industry, where he said:

That is one of the bits of good news – the partial opening. What we have to specify as workers are getting back to work, so that we remove the confusion of the people because of the news that is spreading, is that mass testing is being required; all workers will be tested before they can work. Time and again we are reminding DTI, DOLE, which includes the DOH, we released guidelines, a protocol on what should be followed by companies as they accept back the workers. Among other things like social distancing, wearing of face masks, sanitation, so it is written there. [partially translated]

And in Senator Go’s statement, on April 24, 2020, where he commented:

LGUs must also ensure that necessary quarantine measures and mass testing for COVID-19 are in place to prevent those possibly infected from spreading the disease. Let us transfer the people in the right time and if the experts say that it is already safe, do it. [partially translated]

This clearly shows that, given other available effective, humane, holistic, science-based measures, the government opted for just two responses: lockdown/quarantine as the focal point of the response to the pandemic; and a yet-to-be available working, effective, safe and proven vaccine. They shunned other measures that would have been inexpensive but helpful to the country’s defense against COVID-19, like Vietnam’s response to COVID, and when a measure entailed a high cost, such as the use of mass testing, they opted to completely ignore its positive value and devalued its positive impacts due to its high cost. Testing a high number of individuals might be expensive, but it can also be implemented effectively and that might be less expensive in the future, as it can lead to the control of the spread of the disease. As shown by countries like New Zealand, Vietnam, Thailand, South Korea and China, the effective use of testing
ultimately ensures a reduced cost to the government as it leads to the control of the spread of the disease, since mass testing allows identification of the point of spread of the disease (Burki, 2020).

Lastly, the third theme that emerged from the speeches is focused on the issues surrounding governance, politics or political enemies and other critiques of the government in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic and on issues that centred on corruption. This last theme is well captured by Fanon (2018, p. 560) in his book *Alienation and Freedom*:

> Rather than stare reality head-on and analyse the causes of the ill in all honesty, France’s rulers [in this case the Duterte regime], more preoccupied with their own personal and clan interests than with the destiny of their country, engage in demagoguery and seek alibis for their failures. Yesterday it was Nasser’s fault! Today the ill stems from the communist international and also from the covetousness of Anglo-Saxons for Saharan oil.

Focusing on the issue of corruption and combing through the 67 speeches, there are 18 speeches where a large portion of the talk is reserved for doing a roll call of government personalities involved in some form of misconduct or corrupt practices. As example of this is shown below from the November 10, 2020 transcript:

> [name withheld] – note it here, PRRD appointee [appointed by the president himself]. He was suspended by the Ombudsman. If you make a mistake again next time, I will personally see to it that you are out.

> [name withheld] – just the same, next time for you are for dismissal. You are just suspended this time.

> [name withheld] – just like that, suspended. Next time I’ll dismiss you.
[name withheld] – you are just suspended by the DPWH for six months, misconduct. [partially translated]

This started on November 10, 2020 and continued on November 17, 23, 30, December 7, 17, 28, January 4, 14, 18, 25, February 8, 15, March 1, 8, 22, 24, 2020 and even in the last speech included in the analysis, on April 12, 2021. In occupying a large portion of the Talk to the People as the government’s response to the pandemic, the mention of these individuals who are possibly involved in corrupt practices is not relevant to the government response to the pandemic. It only serves the purpose of the regime’s objective of identifying the presence of corruption in the government as a reason that prevents the effective and efficient delivery of services in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. Juxtapose this to the corruption that involved personalities connected to the regime (Cepeda, 2021; Romero, 2020), especially on funds for the State’s COVID response; the regime was silent on this or did not cooperate in the investigation. Ultimately, this does not support a scientific response to the pandemic and it is just a mechanism to support the peace-and-order framing of the regime in its response to the pandemic.

As an issue of peace and order that centers on national security, that still relates to misdirecting blame on the regime’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic, there were 16 instances where the New People’s Army (NPA) was mentioned; this should be analysed in connection with the arrests and killings of progressive left-leaning activists during the pandemic as discussed in the earlier sections. The NPA is the armed-wing of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP). Together with the National Democratic Front (NDF), the regime reserved a large space in the speeches for discussion of the CPP-NPA-NDF, which was not even tangential to the discussion of the COVID-19 pandemic. Among the speeches, the March 24, 2020 (6 mentions), May 12, 2020 (10 mentions), December 7, 2020 (7 mentions), December 21, 2020 (7 mentions) and December 27, 2020 (4 mentions) were the ones that referred to these organizations the most.
Additionally, the term *komunista*/communist was mentioned in 16 of the 67 speeches, being referred to most frequently on March 13, 2020 (3 mentions), April 24, 2020 (6 mentions), November 30, 2020 (9 mentions), December 7, 2020 (12 mentions), December 17, 2020 (3 mentions), December 21, 2020 (8 mentions) and February 8, 2021 (3 mentions). Again, six decades ago, Fanon already captured this misdirection as a tool of those in power to put blame on othered groups to free themselves of culpability. The most telling context where NPA/CPP/NDF/*komunista*/communist was mentioned was in the December 7, 2020 speech that contained this phrase:

> And this organization of yours, simply communist, all of you, you know the act of one is the act of all … The act of a soldier NPA, is the act of Zarate, a congressman. [partially translated]

In the language of the West, this what is called McCarthyism, a political act connected to red scare or for the purposes of red-tagging, as more commonly known in the Philippines. This practice in its milder form is used to character assassinate an individual or group; in its worse form can lead to the death of an individual, especially a political enemy; a recent victim was Chad Booc, a volunteer teacher of the Lumad schools (Gallardo, 2022).

The mention of the NPA/CPP/NDF/*komunista*/communist does not in any way contribute to the government’s response to COVID-19, but as the response was framed as a peace-and-order crisis, these kinds of issues matter to the narrative of the government. Additionally, on the other part of the spectrum of the issues concerning political enemies, the mention of Diokno, de Lima and Robredo are also framed as issues that are related to the COVID-19 pandemic; they are all the Nassers that Fanon mentioned as object of blame by those in power. Diokno was one of the first personalities who was mentioned because of his active stance against the militaristic response to the pandemic that resulted in various human rights violations due to the
imposition of the lockdown/quarantine response of the regime. Meanwhile, Robredo (Vice-President) was initially defended by the president in his April 4, 2020 speech, saying:

Leni was calling the private sector to help. She asked for help. That is right … This time the vice-president is not at fault. She looked for help. Why will she be investigated? [partially translated]

In context, the president was saying that the vice-president is asking for help from the private sector, which should be commended. But later on, the president took a harsher tone whenever Robredo was mentioned (February 15, 2021):

I don’t know if it’s a pretended ignorance by Lacson. But this thing from Robredo, I said, ma’am, if you are the president, you do not know your job, you should not – you should know that, you are a lawyer – that you should not be opening your mouth while we are negotiating because America has a lot of sins against us. [partially translated]

This tone is further reflected in the following:

Do not believe her – this dilawan [Liberal party] – I hate to mention her name, but this Leni, keeps talking nonsense. You know what Leni, if you want – if you really want to do away with the COVID, let us spray the Philippines or Manila with pesticide from the airplane to kill everything. You cannot – you cannot exterminate the – the COVID by these things alone. And you’ll just – the only thing that we can do really is to wear a mask, wear a face mask, and that’s it and wait for the vaccine. It’s COVID-19 equals vaccine. [partially translated]

The two statements, just like the other statements of the president, reflected his attitude towards the crisis that the country was facing, that he was incapable of responding to it
and that he intended to rely on dehumanizing, if not the common Filipino, at least those whom he deemed to be his political rivals or critics.

Given all these factors, we now see how the government used its platform in communicating their response to the pandemic. First, given the platform that the government resources allowed, they still failed to utilize it to provide clear and guided communication informed by science, history and data in addressing a pandemic. Then, even when a response that can be backed up by science was possible, the regime was still able to restructure or reformulate it as a militaristic response to the pandemic or, in the case of the vaccine, a scientific response that is greatly influenced by unequal politicoeconomic relationships between the Philippines and more powerful countries (China, Russia, USA). Lastly, as an issue of governance, not even tangentially related to the COVID-19 response, the speeches were constructed to reserve a space for creating a narrative centered on corruption issues becoming a roadblock in the COVID-19 response and issues involving those from other political affiliations that present a threat to political stability and security.

The goal of this chapter was to build and critique the narrative that the regime constructed, through the data from the 67 speeches that were collected and analyzed, in addressing the COVID-19 pandemic. This is not to argue that the regime did not respond to the pandemic, but rather that the narratives found in the speeches indicate the position of the regime on how they addressed a current SSI that has affected the country. The speeches suffer from a form of split personality where they try to address the pandemic situation in the first instance but then mutate into a form of communication with rants, expletives and others features whose main function may be to distract the audience from the real material conditions affecting the country. Those who hold power have the capacity to influence the rules of engagement in addressing an SSI, and the rules and their engagement are reflective of their class interest.
In ending this chapter, it is clear that there is a definite dialectical interaction among the politicosocioeconomic factors in a society and their socioscientific perspective taking (SSPT) in addressing SSIs. This SSPT is concretized and materialized in government policies and guidelines that address an SSI. SSPTs are anchored on sociohistorical/sociocultural contexts, whose base economic structure and political/cultural superstructure are in dialectical relationship with them. This can serve as the foundation of the interaction of politics, economics, history and bioethics which will be explored in subsequent chapters. A society’s mode of production (Marx, 2010) that includes the forces of production and relations of production, where social classes and other social determinants to health are in dialectical existence, can be used to further elucidate how bioethics can be understood and framed in addressing SSIs that involve bioethical issues.

Freire’s work on critical pedagogy in the development of critical consciousness is anchored on the role of the environment influencing an individual’s dynamic interaction of their theory and praxis. This is also true for Fanon’s take on postcolonial studies which sees the material basis of the problem as one of an economic and cultural nature that is influenced by the environment, in the case of the colonized, the environment dictated by the colonizer. Thus, through the lens of a decolonized critical bioethics, we can see that the relationship between bioethical issues framed through thought experiments and moral dilemmas and a society’s social order are not blurred. This chapter shows that those in power hold an ethics that domimates and subjugates those who are othered and exploited; this is a dialectically violent ethics that is used by those in power to maintain their position in society. From the language of ‘shoot to kill’, dehumanization of othered groups by likening them to Neanderthals, lack of resources to respond to the pandemic even with the highest pandemic debt among countries, these are just some examples of the violent ethics of the oppressor against the oppressed. How we in the Philippines address these bioethical issues or SSIs is in dialectical relationship with our current social order and those who have control of it; the pushback can only be started if it is also anchored in our material conditions that directly
address unequal relationships in the current social order to veer away from its oppressive nature. This chapter has shown how those in power control the ethical rules of engagement through naming the world of the othered groups, which limits their agency. The next three chapters will explore the pushbacks or an ethics of resistance that othered or exploited groups hold and use against the violent ethics of their oppressors.
Chapter 5 Immersing with the masses: The ethics of volunteer teaching in the Lumad schools

The Lumad schools as culture circles

The Lumad school is a collective term for different indigenous people’s schools that not only cater to the education needs of the Lumad, but more importantly are the material manifestation of the struggle of different Lumad communities and their solidarity with different allied organizations (Calsado, 2020; Montero-Ambray, n.d.). The Lumad Bakwit school is the mobile counterpart of the Lumad school that was created to address the education needs of the Lumad even when they are experiencing evacuation due to internal displacement as a result of armed conflict and also in support of their campaigns to inform the public of their plight (Caruncho, 2019; Ecarma, 2021; La Viña, 2021). In his work, Montero-Ambray (n.d.) explored and investigated how the Lumad school curriculum, the Makabayan, Makamasa, at Siyentipikong Edukasyon (MMS) curriculum, which is framed by a form of liberating education through Freire’s critical pedagogy, became a material manifestation of a collective social movement that advances the Lumad’s struggle for self-determination in reclaiming and defending their ancestral land. This curriculum framework serves as one of the sociocultural backgrounds that influence the volunteer teachers and their immersion with the Lumad in not only understanding the lived realities of the Lumad but more importantly in living these realities. Given this context of the Lumad school, this serves as a ‘culture circle’ which raises awareness of the reality of the Lumad and helps in changing that reality, for both the Lumad and their allies (Freire, 2012; Homer, 2011). This context of the Lumad and Lumad school contradicts the assertion put forward by Tuck and Yang (2012) in their highly cited work Decolonization is not a metaphor that Freire’s critical pedagogy fails to grasp the struggles of the colonized, unlike the work of Fanon. I am mentioning this early in this chapter, as this assertion of Tuck and Yang (2012) is contrary to the position of my research, especially in its theoretical framework of
melding the liberating epistemological positions of Fanon and Freire. Their position is stated below:

Freire situates the work of liberation in the minds of the oppressed, an abstract category of dehumanized worker vis-a-vis a similarly abstract category of oppressor. This is a sharp right turn away from Fanon’s work, which always positioned the work of liberation in the particularities of colonization, in the specific structural and interpersonal categories of Native and settler (Tuck & Yang, 2012, pp. 19-20).

As a work that is highly cited and mentioned in decolonization discourse, not only in scholarly works but also in different fora and discussions, which I personally encountered here in UK as I was conducting this research, it might seem that my theoretical framework is already fundamentally weak even before starting this research. Fundamentally weak in the sense that there seems to be a general acceptance of the thesis of Tuck and Yang (2012), that includes their critique on Freire’s critical pedagogy. Another point that Tuck and Yang (2012) mentioned in their work, which I find highly demanding and which leaves only a narrow space for the solidarity work that I am doing as a researcher-activist with the Lumad, is how they label works with national minorities and other decolonization works as a ‘move to innocence’. While I may agree that decolonization should not be used as a ‘move to innocence’ and that we should be clear as to how decolonization and social justice works, I find this claim highly demanding and acts as a gatekeeper in preventing the forwarding of the struggles of national minorities like the Lumad. Fanon (1991), unlike Tuck and Yang, without gatekeeping decolonization work, decades ago already qualified the harshness of decolonization work:

National liberation, national renaissance, the restoration of nationhood to the people, commonwealth: whatever may be the headings used or the new formulas introduced, decolonization is always a violent phenomenon. (p. 35)
In framing some works with national minorities as settler guilt’s ‘move to innocence’, this accuses any form of solidarity struggle as a way to cleanse oneself from having benefitted from the impacts of colonization, especially in the context of settler colonialism. I thought I was alone in dealing with these predicaments, but in a blog entry, Ayush Gupta (2017) states that “Tuck and Yang leave a very narrow path to follow” and goes on to say that if the demand for repatriating land is not argued in the literal sense, but is a metaphor, then for him it is “surprising given that the argument is against using decolonizing in a metaphorical sense”. This made me circle back to the theoretical framework of this research, that Freire’s critical pedagogy will not only reside in the abstract if it is anchored on land struggle, which is the primary struggle of national minorities like the Lumad in claiming their ancestral lands and right to self-determination.

My fieldwork with the Lumad and being immersed with them during the conduct of this research before the lockdown was implemented, and other works like that of Montero-Ambray (n.d.), showed that indigenous futurity, as Tuck and Yang (2012) argued, is also anchored in work on solidarity struggle with different sectors of society. The Lumad school and its mobile counterpart, the Lumad Bakwit school, are the manifestation and the realization of the theoretical works of Freire and Fanon that address the theoretical concern of Tuck and Yang in decolonization works. Furthermore, Stańczyk (2021) makes a strong argument on when and how to use critical pedagogy in education work, especially the importance of being conscious and aware of its shortcomings as a theory or methodology. For me, there is a need to clarify the theoretical position of this research, to show how it responds to the theoretical demands of Tuck and Yang, to set the valid theoretical argument of a decolonized critical bioethics and to determine where it is anchored.

Given the theoretical clarification above, the next section is focused on the first part of the questionnaires given to the volunteer teachers of the Lumad schools (Appendix 3.9),
during the individual online interviews that were conducted. The first part tried to elicit the experiences of the volunteer teachers in the Lumad school, their current experience as Lumad Bakwit school teachers during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, and their lived experience as teachers under the current and past regimes. Their own personal experiences and the experiences they gained from their teaching and volunteering in the school provide the sociocultural background that is explored within this section (Freire, 1973, 2012; Freire et al., 2014; Vygotsky, 1962; Vygotsky, 1978), providing insight into the possible influences on their responses to interview questions. The counter-storytelling method described by Solórzano and Yosso (2002) was used to tease out and bring forth into our consciousness their responses to the questions that are seldom seen in mainstream bioethics education. In addressing the question of who they are and why they are part of the Lumad school, and why they continue to be part of the school even with the threats to those who become part of the Lumad struggle, two lenses emerged – one from those who have personal historical experience with the Lumad and one that is completely unaware of the struggle of the Lumad and their history, as a result of which they developed their conscientization. These lenses provided the positions of those who become part of the struggle of historically othered and exploited groups beyond their theoretical or abstract understanding of the struggle of the Lumad. Lastly, critical reflection, critical motivation, and critical action are highlighted in the responses of the participants, whenever present, to show the existence or development of critical consciousness or, if not present, qualified as magical or naïve consciousness.

Teaching, immersing, and returning: The different experiences of volunteer teachers in Lumad schools and Lumad Bakwit school

I can no longer passively participate in the racism of my family, friends, and community; I must lean into the hard conversations. I must dedicate myself to living without armor, to being real. The realization that I must embrace my racism and bigotry, that I must continue to research social justice issues and I must act
in a positive, authentic way in my school, my community, and my home, defines the next stage of my journey. I embrace the idea that we are all unfinished; it is our duty to move forward while we cling to our authentic selves. (Freebersyser, 2015, pp. 111-112)

The above statement is from the work of Freebersyser (2015) on her personal journey on understanding the development of her conscientization as an educator for whom social justice exists and is of increasing importance. Authenticity is the key qualifier that was raised in her research discussion, as (Freire, 2012) argues:

> Only in this interdependence is an authentic praxis possible, without which it is impossible to resolve the oppressor-oppressed contradiction. To achieve this goal, the oppressed must confront reality critically, simultaneously objectifying and acting upon that reality. (pp. 51-52)

Freire also asserts that an authentic praxis should not reside in the abstract, which means that education should come from and lead to concrete social actions, which the Lumad schools have been doing over the past several decades. If it is the case that the Lumad schools stand as the concrete manifestation of the struggles of the Lumad, then how do they materialize as the mediator of this authentic education? What does authentic education look like from the perspective of the Lumad schools? Lumad education is framed using agriculture as the central point around which other components of the curriculum (Nationalist, Scientific, and Mass-oriented Education / Makabayan, Makamasa, Siyentipikong Edukasyon) revolve, like academic subject components and health-related components of the curriculum (Calsado, 2020) which address the central needs of the Lumad – food security and defense of ancestral land, literacy, numeracy and scientific education, and individual and community health. In practice, Sy (2019) shared that this represents how citizen science is actually realized, as “real-life experiences nourish the science behind sustainable farming” (p. 45), achieved through the curriculum framework of the Lumad schools. This is the backdrop
to this research and provides context for the reading of the responses provided by the five volunteer teachers from the Lumad schools (see Appendix 3.2) where they are committed to teaching and to being immersed with the Lumad people.

For example, teacher Bella shares that she is part of the Lumad school and continues to be part of it because of her understanding of the struggles of the Lumad through her education in the Lumad school and being a Lumad herself. As a former scholar of the Lumad school, she stated that the length of her return service as a scholar does not matter, as being a volunteer teacher is not dependent on the years of return service that she should serve her community. As a Lumad herself, she understands the Lumad struggle, and despite of all the threats shared that:

I welcome the challenge to serve my community and the people who are in need. [translated]

This sentiment was echoed by the other volunteer teachers, like teachers Maricel and Roberto, who are also former Lumad school scholars who viewed teaching as a form of solidarity struggles with the Lumad students and their community in fighting for their right to education, consistent with this statement made by teacher Roberto:

Even with all the threats against us, I continue teaching because who will teach the students if there are no volunteer teachers in their schools? That even though our schools were closed down, cast out of our own community, we continue to struggle with them [Lumad]. The education of the Lumad youth continues. This is not just for me. [translated]

Teacher Maricel further elaborates by sharing that, in her immersion with the Lumad:

You feel their thirst for justice, and you can really witness what is happening. Not the things on how they are being portrayed like this or that. That is not the truth.
In immersing in the Lumad school, I can say that all the accusations to them are not true … Once I realized that if no one will help them who else will? [translated]

The responses above show that it becomes apparent that volunteer teachers’ motives for teaching do not only reside on their own betterment but more importantly they are driven to educate the Lumad youth. At this early stage of the presentation of the analysis of the responses from the volunteer teachers, it is apparent that critical reflection, critical motivation, and critical action (Diemer et al., 2016) are already ingrained in them. The central theme of the responses revolves around serving the communities and the importance of truth, determining the truth of othered groups (Freebersyser, 2015; Freire, 1973; Freire et al., 2014). In immersing themselves with the Lumad, the volunteer teachers showed their rich understanding of the plight of the Lumad. Even though one of the volunteer teachers is not a Lumad herself (Maricel), living and immersing herself through the Lumad schools, made her understand the constant and continuing threats against them and their schools. This is a reflection on the value of community immersion among teachers in understanding the struggles of the different community stakeholders (Waddell, 2013) and affirms the impact of critical pedagogy on the development of conscientization among teachers (Zion et al., 2015). First-hand experience of the struggle of the Lumad does not give volunteer teachers the license to be the voice of the Lumad; rather, they become allies in amplifying the calls of the Lumad in demanding justice, defending and reclaiming their ancestral lands and, in this case, through the form of transformative education.

Teachers Albert and Elvira, the two volunteer teachers who did not have prior direct experience with the Lumad and Lumad schools, reflect the reasons for continuing their volunteer teaching in the schools; again, their immersion with the Lumad students, through the Lumad Bakwit school, cemented their willingness to continue to teach voluntarily. Furthermore, they reiterated what the other teachers experienced in volunteering with the Lumad, that they learned from the experiences, as shown in this statement on what motivates teacher Elvira in continuing working with the Lumad:
If we talk about the threat to the Bakwit [evacuation] School, of course, you will be worried especially if you are just new to this … But since I came to know who the students are, little by little, I came to understand why they are here [Lumad Bakwit school]. I became closer to them and I understand their struggles. This is the reason I choose to continue to teach in the Lumad Bakwit school. As of now I am not yet thinking of teaching in another school. I continue to be part [of the Lumad Bakwit school]. [translated]

The different responses that were given by the volunteer teachers showed that by becoming fully aware of the difficulty in continuing with the struggle, even though they are new to the struggles of the Lumad, their understanding of the ongoing threat to the school and the community is not a hindrance but an eye-opener in fully grasping the Lumad socio-cultural context. This forms the critical motivation (Diemer et al., 2016) of the volunteer teachers in continuing their struggles with the Lumad, as a reflection of the existence or developing critical consciousness among them. Lastly, the response below of teacher Albert captures best what solidarity can achieve when individuals become immersed, live the lives of othered groups, and become fully aware of the struggles of groups like the Lumad, so that their solidarity work is translated into transformative acts:

In my view, the Lumad school is like a rudder that aims to unite and sharpen and not to separate, or the Lumad school has an advocacy not to differentiate the students and teachers, in terms of, like there is no authoritarian rule when it comes to teachers who will always be followed. When it comes to the Lumad school there is freedom to question, the students are free to ask why is it like this or like that? This can be developed together [by teachers and students], that is how beautiful the Bakwit school is. Even though you cannot follow some of the lessons in the class but you will understand, your talents and skills as students will naturally come out and not because it is dictated by the [current] form of education. [translated]
In this extract, teacher Albert shares the value of the Lumad school as an institution that aims to develop transformative education not only among the students but also among volunteer teachers; he was able to capture the essence of the culture circle proposed by Freire for transformative education (Freire, 2012; Homer, 2011). Within his statement, there is an evidence of the use of a dialogic approach to education rather than a banking approach that stifles the development of a form of liberating education (Freire, 2012). Instead of acting as a tool that separates or delineates the roles of the teachers and students in the learning process, teacher Albert argues that the education the Lumad school aims to provide is one that transforms in uniting the teachers and students. In the end, the goal of education is not to impose what students should become through the lessons and classes that they take; rather, it is counter the goals of an imperialist, colonial, neoliberal, and elitist education (Constantino, 1970; Lumbera et al., 2007). Rather than following the dictates of the market, Lumad education is providing a form of ‘eudaimonia’ (Huta, 2013) or a flourishing life for the students and their communities in defending and reclaiming their ancestral lands, not a flourishing life that is dictated by the current dominant social, political, and economic systems.

Furthermore, juxtaposing this to the position of the current and past regimes and the elite minority which dictates the path of a colonized country like the Philippines, as discussed in the previous chapters, we can now observe the position of the marginalized and oppressed class that is different from the class in power (Simbulan, 1965/2005; Villegas, 2009). In Freire’s conception of naming the world, the position of those in power mimics the position of the imperialist countries that they are subservient to; meanwhile, the marginalized and oppressed do not have to follow this same path if they are equipped with the material experience and theoretical foundation to name their environment based on their aspirations. Saying that the students can become who they want to be, not based on the dictates of the current form and function of the education system, is a clear manifestation of a praxis for social transformation and the development of conscientization among the teachers. Even without the deliberate and
conscious use of the language and theses of critical pedagogy and postcoloniality, the teacher was able to manifest the aims of these two theoretical frameworks.

Lastly, the same teacher provided a glimpse of a material manifestation of a decolonized critical bioethics, as being part of the Lumad school, when he said,

Like I became human, it helped me in progressively developing how I see things [translated].

The use of the word ‘human’ or phrase ‘becoming human’ in looking at things, especially in how the teacher sees things around or his environment, reflects the naming of the world of othered groups that resists the domination from the exploiter class (Freire, 1973, 2012; Freire et al., 2014). This humanization is counter to the dehumanizing nature of the current capitalist system, and to literally, objectively, and freely manifest this response shows the influence of a transformative education upon a teacher exposed and committed to this kind of education framework. At this point, this research is beginning to explore the differing positions held by an othered or exploited group compared to the position of the ruling class, as shown in Chapter 4.

The next questions that were asked of the research participants built on the initial responses that tried to set the tone of the interview to draw a clearer picture of the ethical class position of the volunteer teachers. The volunteer teachers were asked what is the reason that the Lumad school should exist (Appendix 3.9), given that the public school system exists to cater to every Filipino’s right to education (Official Gazette, 2012). Additionally, they were asked what the school represents for them as volunteer teachers. What emerged from the responses of the volunteer teachers is the primacy for the Lumad schools to exist first, thus addressing the need to cater to the needs of the community and the difficulties those communities experience in accessing education. One teacher stated the challenge of travelling to the nearest public school, more than an hour’s walk, while another recalled that the teachers from regular public
schools come on Monday and leave by Thursday in these remote regular public schools; this leaves fewer schooling hours for the Lumad students.

But where is ethics in these responses, one might ask. As a researcher might I be stretching the concept of ethics in these responses where none is really evident? By looking at a simple definition of ethics as the ought to dos in a situation or as helping indicate what is morally right or wrong (Dörr Zegers, 1989; Super, 1910), then education as a human right (UNESCO, n.d.) lies within the province of ethics. Those who are responsible for the lack of access to education of othered groups are therefore committing a moral wrong, especially when such restrictions are systemic. This difficulty in providing proper education to the Lumad communities is a manifestation of a structural problem that marginalizes the Lumad and puts pressure on the teachers of these regular public schools – both are victims to these violent structures, biased against them. Furthermore, the need for an education that caters to the needs of the communities is equated to their emancipation or freedom from different forms of deception, especially with regard to their ancestral lands where their *katungod* (rights) are anchored. Thus, it is no overstatement to assert that the schools are the concrete manifestation of the Lumad’s struggles for reclaiming and defending their ancestral lands.

The appropriateness of the current form and function of education to the Lumad and their communities also emerged in the responses of the volunteer teachers. Here lies the initiative of the elders and the different communities to unite in the development of an education that is appropriate for them, that addresses their needs in terms of Health, Agriculture, and Numeracy and Literacy. This is a community-led initiative in terms of education that is anchored in their material conditions and not imposed by outside ‘experts in education’, especially in the movement for the decolonization of the school curriculum. This provides evidence that these kinds of solidarity struggles can exist which are not ‘moves to innocence’ of settler colonials as these resulted in a form of
liberating education among the Lumad. The following statement sums up this argument of teacher Maricel:

The Lumad school is important because it provides a contextually appropriate education … what it [Lumad school] teaches is for the benefit of the Lumad themselves. It does not teach that after you finish your studies you move abroad.
[translated]

This touches on what was discussed in the previous chapter, the implication of a semifeudal and semicolonial society, that a country is forced to export its resources, in this case the human resource and talents of the Philippines (Banyan, 2010; Pernia, 1976). This is true, as the Philippines is known to export not just skilled labor (domestic help, caregivers, construction workers, others) but also professionals such as scientists, engineers, teachers, doctors, and others (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2020, 2022).

Even within the current enhanced basic education law or R. A. 10533 (Official Gazette, 2012) that dictates the form and function of the Philippine education system, one can see that it is anchored on an education that develops a globally competitive labor force that exports to other countries (National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017); again, this primarily caters to the economic needs of the market rather than the development of the students. Lastly, this statement of teacher Albert captures the essence of the existence of the Lumad schools through the lens of an outsider in relation to the reality mentioned above:

For me, the existence of the Lumad school is about agriculture, that if the Philippines is an agricultural country, then why will you teach lessons that does not tackle agriculture, right? There are a lot of people, even those I personally know, my former classmates, after their classes they have nothing to do but go back to their farms. Here lies the question on why will you detach the education that should be anchored or central to agriculture in their lives. If there are millions or a large number of children whose lives are already centered on agriculture,
education should be made appropriate to this condition, which is what the Lumad schools are currently doing. Education is developed appropriately or fits to the day to day-to-day livelihood of the Lumad, which I hope which will be the same … [translated]

Given the above statement, this becomes an appropriate foundation for understanding what the Lumad schools represent for the volunteer teachers in the role of outsider-insider within the community. Defense. Struggle. Tools. Ancestral lands. These are some of the words that emerge that represents what the Lumad school is for the Lumad community as seen and experienced by the volunteer teachers. The Lumad schools are seen as the material or objective manifestation of not just the Lumad’s desire to achieve their right to education, but also their historical struggles to defend their ancestral land from those who have economic interests in those rich lands (Alamon, 2017; Montero-Ambray, n.d.; Sy, 2022a, 2022b, 2023; Sy, 2019). Thus, the central analysis of their oppression is not that they are oppressed because of their identity but because of the abundant resources from their ancestral lands that are forcefully taken from them (Alamon, 2017). For one volunteer teacher, this is the reason that the schools are threatened with closures, which have been realized during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic (Diño, 2020; Madarang, 2020). The statement below, made by teacher Roberto regarding some of the deceptions that occurred in the past, where portions of the Lumad’s ancestral lands were taken through unjust transactions, shows how the kind of education the Lumad schools provide to the community is a safeguard against these kinds of transactions:

The Lumad schools represent, not just for them [Lumad], not just for the youth. This represents the protection of the ancestral lands like those in their lands that mining companies have interest in, who want to destroy their ancestral land. If there are no Lumad schools they will be easily deceived; they will just be given freebies like in the past like when their elders were given dried fish, canned
goods; then their ancestral lands will be easily taken over and the trees will be cut down. [translated]

The Lumad schools, with their MMS curriculum framework, show that Freire’s critical pedagogy is not antithetical to Fanon’s decolonization works; rather, the benefits of melding the two theoretical frameworks are greater than the perceived epistemological contradictions of their theoretical foundations. Furthermore, the statements above from the volunteer teachers show the effects of their immersion in the Lumad schools in the development of their conscientization and indicate how this can be used as a starting point of analysis for a decolonized critical bioethics.

Reflecting conscientization among teacher volunteers: Development of critical consciousness

As discussed in the previous chapter, the response of the Duterte regime reflected the class interest of the ruling elite in addressing the pandemic. The implication of this socioscientific issue (SSI) to the Lumad school and its teachers and students resulted in further marginalization of the Lumad as access to education was one of the main problems during the pandemic (Magsambol, 2020b; Ranis et al., 2021). Aside from the closure of the schools, which should have been able to address the challenges of conducting any form of schooling during the height of the pandemic as the Lumad schools are boarding schools (Sy, 2019), it could have shielded the students and teachers from possible infection and also allowed the continuation of their education. Central to the response of the volunteer teachers to their experience of the lockdown imposed by the government were: 1) government inaction or failed response to the pandemic and 2) the difficulty in continuing education during the lockdown. They felt acutely the government’s inaction or failed response to the pandemic through their experiences of coping with the lockdown measures and the experiences of other sectors as a response to prevent the transmission of the disease. For instance, the teachers can empathize with the difficulty of the jeepney drivers – jeeps are the
major mode of transportation in the Philippines – as the drivers resorted to begging in the streets as the government halted their operations as one of the major policies to prevent the transmission of the virus ("Hungry and homeless: Philippine 'jeepney' drivers hit by virus," 2020; "In Pictures: Philippines’ iconic jeepneys pushed off the road," 2020; Ranis et al., 2021). This policy was then connected by teachers Roberto and Maricel to the inability of the regime to respond appropriately to the pandemic, and for teacher Roberto this is evidence of the government’s lack of action that made it difficult for the people to attend to their daily needs. He stated the following:

It is very disheartening … because the government did not act, there was no action taken. They just left the people … like the jeepney drivers, right? We all know that they are really miserable because they are already begging in the streets … The government did not act. [translated]

The volunteer teachers also related the experiences of those who were still able to continue their studies in the regular public schools, that the form that the Department of Education (DepEd) chose for education to continue did not meet the material conditions of the learners and teachers. Opting for remote learning through online education made it difficult for the learners as there are internet connectivity issues within their communities, because these are situated in the mountains, alongside financial difficulties associated with purchasing equipment and the daily expense of maintaining devices (Hallare, 2020; Magsambol, 2020a). Teacher Maricel shared the experience of the Lumad students before all the schools were closed down:

There are others which were not closed down but chose not to operate this school year due to lack of communication [internet connection]; there are no materials for schooling as all classes are held online, so that’s what makes it difficult, and our schools are in the mountains. Sometimes there is no signal. [translated]
She further added her reflections on the effect of the lockdown upon their schools:

It had a great effect in our schools, first of all the closure of our schools; it is one form of being a fascist of our president Duterte. Then and now, the Lumad youth are in a difficult situation because they cannot continue with their studies, especially now that it is not clear if the school year 2020-21 will proceed. So, that is one huge crisis that the Lumad is facing. Especially in the communities, the teachers are gone who are the lines of communication in the communities. [translated]

Meanwhile, teacher Roberto added this observation:

It really affected the Lumad schools because all of the schools were closed down with ease, no difficulty, were shut down in an instant. It had a huge effect, especially the Anti-terror law; the situation of the Lumad schools worsened. [translated]

Where it seems that the response of the teacher was off-topic, especially in connecting the anti-terror law to the experience of the Lumad schools, this has to be viewed through their experience of militarization of their schools (Alamon, 2017; Camba, 2015). Thus, there is a direct connection between the weaponization of the law and those working with the Lumad and other human rights defenders in the Philippines. An example is the volunteer teacher Chad Booc of the Lumad school, who was before his murder, a staunch critic of the law was threatened with different trumped up charges (Buan, 2021) and was illegally detained during a raid (Sararaña, 2021) in a Lumad Bakwit school in Cebu, a province in the Philippines. This is just one of the different cases of illegal detention and killing when the Anti-terror law was passed during the pandemic; there are other cases like the murder of peace advocate Randy Echanis (Buan, 2020), the bloody Sunday massacre (Talabong, 2021), and most recently the detention of a community healthcare worker who spent years working with the Lumad
(Reyes, 2021). Since it was shown in the previous chapter how the Duterte regime prioritized their class interest in responding to the pandemic, the ill effects of the anti-terror law as a priority law of the regime during the pandemic is the concretization of the ethics of the ruling elite against the oppressed groups.

Teacher Albert provided another lens on how to assess the ethics of the ruling class during the pandemic through lack of access to food:

If education is anchored on agriculture, they have the capacity to be sustainable in terms of food, but this is not the case; the system of education and also of governance is detached from the needs of the people. This is the reason for the current reality, especially during this pandemic, that the government has no capacity or is incompetent to provide food and other social commitments for the people or public. [translated]

In essence, teacher Albert is sharing the lack of understanding of the plight of the people on the part of the government which leads to amplification of their hardship during the pandemic. This was further related to an education that is anchored on sustainable agriculture and health, that the problems of food availability and security during that time which resulted from the failed lockdown could have been addressed ("62% of households experienced having no food amid the COVID-19 pandemic — survey," 2021; House of Representatives, 2020; Wright, 2021). Here we see the capacity of the volunteer teachers to relate their personal experiences in the Lumad school to the problem of national interest. Their experiences are not restricted only to the experiences of the Lumad and the value of the Lumad school in the defense of their ancestral land as this can be scaled to other matters such as those of national interest. This reflects the applicability of the objectives of the Lumad school curriculum framework at the scale of addressing national issues. This is the point that Lodge (2021) raised, on the value of critical perspectives in the classroom, especially in science education to contribute ‘democratic fairness and social change’. It can be argued that
the responses of the teachers through their personal experiences, which tend to touch on national issues, without further prodding that provides a critical response to the issue reflect critical consciousness among them. They are ever ready to provide a nuanced response that touches on the root cause of the problem in the Philippines, the social characteristics of the country and its implications, and how to respond to these issues given the conditions. In short, they exist beyond the limit-situations of their current social conditions or, as Freire (2012) puts it, they are living authentic lives.

Juxtaposing the closure of the schools with the importance of a school that caters to the specific needs of national minorities, we are reminded that the closure of their schools also represents the intrusion of different capitalist interests onto their ancestral lands, an intrusion sponsored by the state through its various policies and armed forces. The response below of teacher Albert highlights this form and function of a liberating education in the Lumad education:

Their education is not forced by a semicolonial culture. For example, in teaching the alphabet, introduction of the alphabet, it is not through the use of ‘apple’, but using their own words. Another example in maths, instead of teaching only numbers, we connect it to farming, like what is the measurement of this, how many are those, and that. It is all connected to how they will live when they return, which is not the case in public schools. [translated]

This point is an exemplification of the statement of Fanon (1991, 2018) on the value of land to the colonized; as a right that holds the most value and is most concrete, it will give them dignity. Such dignity is sought through the defense of their ancestral land where education not only plays an abstract role (Freire, 2012) for the colonized but can also be as concrete as land, since education is anchored on the land that they struggle to protect. Education starts to take a concrete form and function when it is anchored in the struggle for land, not only for national minorities but also for other basic sectors of our society which have been deprived of their right to land. Furthermore, the competitive
nature of the current school system that pushes you to move to other countries for better opportunities also starkly contrasts with the aim of the Lumad school which helps the students in realizing the value of giving back to their communities, a point made very clear in the responses of the volunteer teachers. From an outsider’s perspective, this might seem like forcing students to stay ‘primitive or indigenous’ (Nandy, 1988), forgoing their advancement in different aspects of life that the dominant system can offer. But in reality, going back to the first section of this chapter, returning to their community is not a return to primitivity, as their lands are not only romantically rich but literally rich in resources and cultivated by their knowledge systems in further enriching their lands.

In terms of the different regimes that have impacted the lives of the Lumad through their different policies which have affected the Lumad’s ancestral lands and schools, the volunteer teachers are in unison in their response to this question – the different regimes did not benefit the Lumad and the Lumad schools, and this situation deteriorated during the time of the Duterte regime, as shown in Chapter 2. Militarization, threats to the communities and teachers, and killings were already present in past administrations but they worsened in the time of Duterte, and the closure of all Lumad schools happened in his time. Where the interest of the regime and the Lumads are in direct collision, we witness the outcomes in the form of the closure of the Lumad schools by State policies and the continuing struggle of the Lumads for the existence of their schools. This is in contrast to, but runs alongside, the current policy of the government regarding the renewal of mining permits in the country, which is counter to the lives and struggles of the Lumad (Chavez, 2021; "Philippines ends open pit mining ban to reinvigorate industry," 2021; Rivas, 2020). Teacher Roberto shared:

> The administration did not contribute anything, not even a nail; even that they were able to give, we did not receive anything. Even just some aid from them. And then just in one day, they closed down the Lumad schools; it makes you feel angry and sad at the same time because they did not contribute [teacher Roberto
cried and became very emotional], they did not help in building the Lumad schools. And then they just closed it. They did not contribute anything; we did not receive anything, not even a peso from them. [translated]

Teacher Roberto felt anger and sadness at the same time, as it is quite difficult to understand how the authorities could close down these schools, schools that they did not help to build. This even seems to mock or ridicule the Lumad’s struggles with the construction of government-funded schools in Lumad communities, through the whole-of-nation approach of the government to ending armed conflict in their ancestral lands (Colina IV, 2019). The construction of these government schools should be viewed through the lens of critical pedagogy and postcoloniality, as there is a need to remember that the current dominant form and function of education is also one of the structures that marginalize and oppress national minorities like the Lumad. The curriculum framework of these mainstream public schools is not anchored on the defense of the ancestral land of the Lumad; rather, it pushes or will push the Lumad to move out of their ancestral land to become part of the workforce for the current dominant market economy, which the volunteer teachers argued against (Lumbera et al., 2007; Pernia, 1976; San Juan, 2016; Sy, 2022b, 2023).

The promised construction of the schools in the Lumad communities is another manifestation of the dual reality that the colonized elites live a kind of duality (Bhabha, 2004; Rentmeester, 2012; Young, 2003) where they deceive their countrymen (Lenin, 1970; Sison, 1987), as in the case of the Lumad, for their own and the local elite’s benefit and also for the benefit of their counterparts in the colonizing countries. This was experienced by the Lumad when Duterte promised a better life for them when he was still campaigning and then he took a 360 degree turn when he said that he would bomb the Lumad communities. Teacher Elvira shared this here:

When Duterte was still new, when his name carried a sweet smell in the community, for the Lumad it is one of his [promises] that he will help the Lumad
when he was still campaigning. That if he wins he will help the Lumad. But after he wins, there was a SONA [State of the Nation Address] in 2017; he himself said he will bomb the school, leave that place [Lumad ancestral lands].

In other words, he removed from the [Lumad] youth their right to education. In the time of PNoy [previous president], and the other administrations, they are all the same that their own interest they [look after]. They are the ones that allow mining companies to enter [the ancestral lands]; they are the ones that destroy the ancestral lands of our Lumad communities. [translated]

Teacher Albert shared the same sentiment but peppered his response with a little sarcasm, a form of critique of the contribution of the government to the Lumad schools:

None; they did not help aside from harassment, the murder of Lumad leaders, the closure of [Lumad] schools, maybe those are their greatest contributions. Also, entry of mining companies [in the ancestral lands], displacement of many Lumad communities, and the militarization of communities. Maybe those are the greatest contribution of this administration. Even from Duterte … from the other presidents, they really … the Lumad schools of the different administrations because of their want to remove the Lumad’s right to self-determination. They are being prevented from exercising those rights because of land itself, that can be taken by powerful people. [translated]

Examining the latter part of the response of teacher Albert, we can observe that he grasps the theoretical underpinnings of a decolonized critical bioethics, on the value of land and the struggle of the colonized, othered groups. It is worth noting that the displacement of national minorities like the Lumad and their exploitation are centered not just on their identity as national minorities but more importantly on the resources in their ancestral lands, which indicates the value of looking at what is going on through the lens of class. The education that the Lumad schools provide, through its form and
function, becomes a barrier against those with political and economic interest in the ancestral lands of the Lumad. Thus, the closure of the Lumad schools is equivalent to an attack on their ability to exercise their democratic rights.

In analyzing the value of the MMS curriculum framework of the Lumad schools, teacher Elvira sums up the value of the school and its curriculum in the struggle for defending and reclaiming the ancestral lands of the Lumad and its bigger implications for the education system of the Philippines. This form and function of education can address the needs of the country based on its material conditions, such as in the case of responding to SSIs and problems like the COVID-19 pandemic. She stated:

The value of the MMS education to the community is great. Even me, in my personal capacity, I was amazed at this curriculum that will really benefit the community. The value of MMS education is that it will remove individualism, remove the bourgeois culture, it will teach the students how to be collective in all activities. In terms of personal attitude, the students develop in themselves the value of being collectivized. Because of their mass-orientation … nationalist … they will return to their communities to help; they will act first for their own personal interest. In the struggle, it is a great help, this MMS education, where the students will learn about their rights to their land. They will not just be like this – ‘because they are Lumad they do not know anything’. This is the reason why the schools are always being threatened and are being closed down. For them not to know anything, they do not become aware of their rights. This is why the MMS education is really great, that it does not develop individualism but is for the collective. [translated]

The quotation above shows that a class-based analysis as the foundation of a decolonized critical bioethics can be represented by the objectives of the curriculum framework of the Lumad school. First, it is anchored on their land and their struggle to defend and reclaim it and how their rights are anchored on their land and their struggle.
Education in this case is not an abstract concept. In here, we see the amalgamation of the thesis of critical pedagogy and postcoloniality, specifically of Fanon’s postcolonial studies, as anchoring education in land struggles can lead to liberation or the continuing liberation of oppressed groups like the Lumad. It is not specific to the Lumad as a colonized group, as other sectors in the country might not suffer the same war of extinction that the Lumad face every day. Those from other sectors of Philippine society also suffer the same structural marginalization and oppression in other forms, as a result of a semicolonial and semifeudal society where land is appropriated by the elite and their colonizing counterparts for their own benefit. Additionally, the statements of the volunteer teachers reflect the differences in how they viewed and how they will respond on an SSI like the COVID-19 pandemic. As the Lumad and Lumad schools were not immune from state fascism, through the closure of the schools and other forms of harassment, the volunteer teachers pointed out how the regime should have responded. A pro-people response to the pandemic would have looked like this: from allowing the Lumad schools to operate, as they can shield the teachers and students from spreading the virus, to the value of agriculture in addressing food security during a crisis, and addressing the basic social needs of the people instead of passing laws, like the Anti-terror law, that do not address the pandemic.

In short, the responses showed the kind of social action that critical pedagogy espouses, especially as a condition to verify the development of critical consciousness among individuals (Assante & Momanu, 2020; Barrera et al., 2017; Freire, 1973, 2012; Freire et al., 2014; Jemal, 2017). But then again, we have to be reminded that currently there is no one qualifier on how to determine if critical consciousness or conscientiation has developed in an individual (Assante & Momanu, 2020; Barrera et al., 2017; Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016; Jemal, 2017). Even though different assessment tools exist (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016), critical consciousness is unified under the banner of grasping the ethos of social change, and in this case, the volunteer teachers were able to show these varying complexities and depth in their responses. Furthermore, as the questions touch on the reality that the teachers
experience in immersing with the Lumad and teaching in the Lumad school, critical reflection, critical motivation, and critical action as constructs of critical consciousness are not hard to locate. But the ease of manifesting these responses might be attributed to familiarity with the questions, thus, the volunteer teachers might be committing a form of sloganeering (Freire, 2012) as a reflection of banking form of education. Thus, the value of the next section in making visible the ethical class positions of the volunteer teachers through thought experiments can address the notion of familiarity in their responses.

Decolonized critical bioethics education, thought experiments and liberating education through the lens of Lumad school volunteer teachers

The previous sections touched on the lived-realities of the volunteer teachers and provided an initial impression on the ethics the teachers hold in relation to their immersion with the Lumad, the issues faced by the Lumad and the Lumad schools, and their response to the government policies during the COVID-19 crisis, in short, within the context of their culture circles (Freire, 2012). In short, the previous sections revealed, at least partially, the ethics that the volunteer teachers hold when faced with a SSI like the COVID-19 pandemic and the associated responses to it. On the other hand, this section, centers on thought experiments or moral dilemmas that were used in this research are primarily abstract SSIs focused on helping others (drowning child), the climate change problem (environmentalism), ectopregnancy machine (technology), and international NGO poverty aid (unequal distribution of resources. Through their responses, will the volunteer teachers be able to show the same critical responses they provided in the previous sections when encountering abstract questions outside the confines of their culture circles? In evaluating the responses of the volunteer teachers, they have the shortest responses among the groups of participants, which possibly reflects their in-between existence as a group that are both immersed with the Lumad and part of the dominant culture (Diemer et al., 2016). But even in the short responses,
the participants still revealed their class position with respect to the bioethical dilemmas asked of them.

**Individual or collective action: The drowning child thought experiment**

The drowning child thought experiment described by Peter Singer (2009) centers on helping others even if they are not related to us or are in another part of the world, such as through aid giving in the form of charity. In his book *The Life You Can Save*, Peter Singer introduced and formulated the drowning child thought experiment through a scenario of helping a drowning child while you are on your way to work; this might result in your new clothes and shoes getting wet, even ruined and your getting late to work which might reveal how much you are willing to lose in order to help others. The full thought experiment is stated below:

> On your way to work, you pass a small pond. On hot days, children sometimes play in the pond, which is only about knee-deep. The weather’s cool today, though, and the hour is early, so you are surprised to see a child splashing about in the pond.

> As you get closer, you see that it is a very young child, just a toddler, who is flailing about, unable to stay upright or walk out of the pond. You look for the parents or babysitter, but there is no one else around. The child is unable to keep her head above the water for more than a few seconds at a time. If you don’t wade in and pull her out, she seems likely to drown. Wading in is easy and safe, but you will ruin the new shoes you bought only a few days ago, and get your suit wet and muddy. By the time you hand the child over to someone responsible for her, and change your clothes, you’ll be late for work. What should you do? (Singer, 2009, p. 3)
Ultimately, the thought experiment asks us about the value of material things or our own personal security (economic, social, etc.) and the dilemma of ruining these material things when helping others. Then, the thought experiment challenges the readers that if we can help others given this scenario, we should help others who might be geographically distant from us, thus, pushing for us to give to international aid agencies and charities. As a whole, the five volunteer teachers stated what was obvious for them, that they would help the drowning child even if their shoes would be ruined and their clothes require cleaning, an intuitive response to the thought experiment (Calsado et al., 2015). We have to be reminded that the volunteer teachers lack financial security; thus, the proposition of ruined shoes and being late to work has a considerable negative implication for them. Being volunteer teachers, they do not earn a regular salary; rather, they have an allowance for their day-to-day needs. Thus, for the volunteer teachers to forego these material things informs us about their priorities, such as in this response of teacher Bella:

I do not care about clothes; I will save the child. Because life is at stake, it is quite shallow if I will say the clothes and shoes; it is really a very shallow reason. And then, you can explain it to your boss, to your principal … it is up to them if they will accept your explanation. It is different if you can help. [translated]

This reflects the position of Singer, where he argued that the initial response of individuals is to help the drowning child and ignore their material possessions and possible negative effects for them in their work. The weight of saving a life trumps the value of any material thing in this response; this provides weight to the initial formulation of Singer on the reflex response of people in this thought experiment. This was reiterated by another teacher, teacher Maricel:

For me, the material things can still be earned, compared to a life. If I will not save the child, he/she will die; if my only issue is that my shoes will be ruined, or my clothes, it seems the reason is too shallow. It is just a material thing, I can
earn/buy it. If you are in a situation that you are about to go to your school/workplace, to teach, you can maybe go home [Lumad schools are boarding schools], change clothes after saving the child. [translated]

In both responses, the teachers are not able to go beyond the moral dilemma that the thought experiment proposed as initially formulated by Singer. In this case, critical consciousness in their answers seem to be lacking as their responses do not respond to the systemic problem posed by the thought experiment. There seems to be an acceptance of the condition of the abstract world of the thought experiment, which reflects a magical consciousness (Assante & Momanu, 2020; Freire, 1973, 2012; Jemal, 2017). They responded within the boundary of the thought experiment, responding to the question of helping or not helping the child without going beyond it. The same is also true for the three other volunteer teachers, their responses only addressed the intended question of the thought experiment. At this point, the complex responses that the volunteer teachers provided in the first section of the chapter seem only to represent critical consciousness if the questions are directly related to their everyday lives. A second reading of the response of teacher Roberto revealed a more nuanced response because he was able to relate his experience with the Lumad to the thought experiment:

... you can never bring back the life of the child; that is why we volunteer as teachers of the Lumad no matter how hard it is, no matter how many hinterlands we hike just to provide help to the Lumad youth ... even when we get tired of climbing mountains in order to help the youth. You will feel that your exhaustion will be gone, that is what it means; if you can save the child, it feels good to help even if you are just a simple teacher. [translated]

Here, teacher Roberto in some ways translated the help being provided in the thought experiment to saving a child who is drowning to the issue of the Lumad youth. His understanding is that as a volunteer teacher in the Lumad schools, he is already saving the life of a Lumad or of a drowning child. Even though this shows that teacher Roberto
is able to connect the thought experiment to his real-life situation, his response still lies within the boundary of the thought experiment. It can be argued that this reflects a naïve consciousness (Assante & Momanu, 2020; Freire, 1973, 2012; Jemal, 2017) as there is already an assessment of the systemic conditions that determine his reality with the Lumad in assessing the thought experiment.

Overall, the teachers required further prompting to elicit from them different readings of the thought experiment, on the symbolism that the pond represents, which is, poverty as a result of the current social structures. Failing to address this other facet of the thought experiment does not immediately represent the failure of the volunteer teachers to address the thought experiment beyond the original intention or formulation of the thought experiment. This possibly shows the narrow formulation and implication of thought experiments to their intended real-world participants. In this case, for those who are asked to help the drowning child, the real-world implication is simply to help the child without looking at poverty as a structural problem. This reflects our initial blindness to the structures that marginalize and oppress othered people or groups, such as the Lumad and their volunteer teachers. Furthermore, it also represents the worldview that the thought experiment is anchored within our individual role in helping others without addressing the structural character of the problem, such as poverty. The thought experiment also maintains an individualistic responsibility on solving issues of poverty rather than addressing its root cause. This is the ‘naming of the world’ that Freire puts forward in his critical pedagogy, that the way of ‘naming of the world’ by those in power perpetuates this kind of worldview, and thus fails to address the root cause of the problem. In this case, the bioethicists who have the capital to frame our ‘ought to dos’ influence the target of this thought experiment through a narrow ethical ‘naming of the world’, that the expression of a person’s response or action lies on a narrow formulation of ethical dilemmas or thought experiments.
Interestingly, when consciously and deliberately asked about what the pond represents or symbolizes, the teachers then provided a more nuanced response to the thought experiment, exemplified by this response from teacher Elvira:

Perhaps the first thing we should do is to remove what causes poverty, because no one will experience poverty if there is no one causing it. We will remove those who cause poverty, so that no one will experience it. [translated]

Another teacher, Bella, reflected a similar perspective:

Of course, the cause is poverty, because … Because they are the cause … in short, they have the capacity to manipulate. [translated]

Through the teachers’ responses, one is able to observe that when reformulated to expose the structural problem that is at the root of the thought experiment, teachers can respond to the deeper question and go beneath the surface of the narrow framing of the thought experiment. It might be argued that the conscious and deliberate prompt in asking what the pond symbolizes might have affected the responses of the volunteer teachers, thus providing a critical response (which might reflect a critical consciousness) where it would otherwise have been absent. This clarification is important because, as we shall see in Chapter 7, some of my former bioethics students still failed to provide more nuanced responses to the same thought experiments when provided with conscious and deliberate prompts. Freire’s thesis regarding those in power ‘naming the world’, determining how the world should be, was exposed in the phrase, “in short, they have the capacity to manipulate”; that is, those who oppress are the ones who cause hardships and have the capacity to construct a world for their own benefit. This position was also reflected by teacher Albert:
Perhaps the cause, because it is a repetitive cycle, that even if you leave that cycle there will still be more that will be affected that is why it is better... [to address] the cause of poverty. [translated]

Here, the teacher takes a position of breaking the cycle that causes hardship or poverty; this is beyond Singer’s formulation of helping even those who are far from us through charity, as by addressing the root cause of the problem the cycle will be broken. This is the first instance of the clearest manifestation of critical consciousness in the responses of the volunteer teachers. In his response, teacher Albert was able to show critical reflection (addressing the repetitive cycle of poverty), critical motivation (the commitment to break the cycle), and critical action (in addressing the cycle of poverty) (Diemer et al., 2016). It is not just through material or financial help as represented by charity in Singer’s formulation of help or aid-giving; the response addresses the root cause of the structural problem, akin to the problems the Lumad face every day.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, thought experiments can suffer from decontextualization, and this might be one of the reasons that the initial responses of the volunteer teachers only superficially address the thought experiment. When the thought experiment was reframed, the teachers were able to show the same criticality they manifested in responding to the set of questions in the first section of this chapter. The response below clearly shows the presence of critical consciousness when teacher Roberto shared the value of collective action to respond to the root cause of poverty in the thought experiment. Again, just like with the response of teacher Albert, teacher Roberto was able to show critical reflection, critical motivation, and critical action, albeit with a more in-depth response to the thought experiment. He shared below a collective solution to the problem, removing the formulation that ‘help’ is an individual responsibility:

You need to help in making changes, you need to help not just the poor but in addressing poverty to change our society. So, we really need to change it.
Because if you will say that we will only help the poor, that is not easy, it is too shallow; it is like if you are going to help the poor, then you are already OK with it? Just like that? So, you really need to confront [the cause of] poverty so that you are in solidarity … locking arms, it should be together, confront hardships in our life. If you are collectively working together, it is easier to address a problem.

[translated]

We are able to witness the position of the volunteer teacher when faced with a question or a dilemma about poverty, that the position the teacher takes is not that of an individual addressing a manifestation of poverty but a collective position of addressing the root cause of poverty, a manifestation of critical consciousness (Diemer et al., 2016; Freire, 1973; Jemal, 2017). In his response, teacher Roberto showed the presence of critical reflection by addressing poverty as a systemic problem, and manifested critical motivation on why there is a need not just to help the poor as there is also a need to confront poverty directly; to resolve poverty, collective action is needed, which shows critical action. Furthermore, he reflects not only on the problem but also a solution to the root cause of the problem by changing the society that we live in, a recognition of poverty as a structural problem and not just an inevitable reality. The response above touches on the critical consciousness that develops among teachers if education is liberating as Freire posits in his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. In different ways, the volunteer teachers, in responding to the root cause of the problem, showed that the response should be anchored in changing the current society.

The responses provide evidence of a developing critical consciousness among the teachers, as there is already a move to change the system and the problem is not accepted as an unbreakable truth; rather, it is a truth that needs to be changed collectively. This is the formulation of the critical consciousness Freire describes, the move towards changing our society through social action, informed by a theory anchored on liberating the oppressed. Even without a theoretical background on the work of Freire, volunteer teachers from the Lumad schools were able to address his
thesis on the false generosity of those in power, as reflected by the data generated through the drowning child thought experiment.

Through the responses of the volunteer teachers the limitations of thought experiments are exposed in that they fail to address the lived realities and conditions of individuals or groups who become part of an ethical transaction. The experiences of those individuals or groups become currencies of exchange for the thought experiments or moral dilemma, if during the ethical debate the participants fail to go beneath the surface value of the thought experiment. This mirrors the statement of hooks (1992, p. 31), when she stated, “The commodification of difference promotes paradigms of consumption wherein whatever difference the Other inhabits is eradicated, via exchange, by a consumer cannibalism that not only displaces the Other but denies the significance of that Other’s history through a process of decontextualization”. This is now reflected in the process of philosophically addressing a thought experiment or moral dilemma, as agents in the thought experiment or moral dilemma become mere actors in the process. They become currencies for the need to address the thought experiment or moral dilemma, without actually understanding or changing their conditions. The root cause and problem of poverty is decontextualized via a form of consumer cannibalism, through its formulation into a thought experiment or moral dilemma. Even allowing for its good intentions, the drowning child thought experiment suffers from an abstraction that fails to capture the material conditions of those who are suffering from the moral dilemma it is trying to address.

International NGO and aid-giving: Charity through the lens of those in power

The drowning child thought experiment demonstrated how thought experiments and moral dilemmas can be inherently limiting in addressing the lived realities of individuals or groups through an abstraction of reality. Thought experiments can decontextualize lived realities of othered groups, thus failing to address the root cause of the problem under discussion. The next thought experiment / moral dilemma looks at how
international NGOs use photographs of children in poverty or scenarios of poverty for fund-generation through charity or aid-giving from their target audience. Through the lens of charity groups, this is their material translation of Singer’s thought experiment in addressing poverty and helping the poor. Given that the drowning child thought experiment provided extra prompts for the volunteer teachers to reflect on the root cause of the thought experiment, it can be assumed that this could have acted as a primer for the volunteer teachers to reflect in depth on the implications of the other thought experiments.

In this problem, two photographs were used, one of a child together with adults (presumably mothers) who are lining up for food/aid and another of two children in a poor urban community in the Philippines. The first set of questions in this thought experiment (Appendix 3.8) is centered on drawing out how participants view the photographs presented to them and how they feel about the photograph as a representation of their current lived realities or having direct knowledge or experience of this reality. The responses of the volunteer teachers can be divided into two: 1) the literal description of the photographs and 2) the photographs as symbols or representations of something beyond them. In the literal description of the photographs, the volunteer teachers focused on the elements of the photograph such as women lining up for what seem to be food relief, the use of a rope as a barrier, what looks like a scenario from relief operations after a typhoon, or a crisis that resulted in shortages of food, explaining why there is a line of people. On the other hand, the volunteer teachers are as one in describing the plight of the urban poor when they saw the second photograph. They stated that this is the real poverty that the Philippines are experiencing; it is the situation of the whole community and not only of the children featured in the photograph, evidencing a lack of jobs, inadequate housing, and issues around land rights and social services. These issues are reflected in a statement made by teacher Elvira:
As a child, they need to have a conducive environment, a pleasant environment. If that [in the photograph] will be the environment of the child, they will get sick. And then most of the children in urban poor [communities], they already work, they did not experience … playing, reading, because there are children who instead of studying inside their homes … there are children who beg outside, they go to the streets. [translated]

Of the two photographs shown to the volunteer teachers, they were able to relate more to the second one. It seems that the first photograph might be more distant from their experience; even though they can relate to lining up for relief during calamities, they can connect more to the material conditions presented by the second photograph.

In more symbolic terms, one volunteer teacher related to the rope in the first photograph not just as a physical barrier but also as a symbolic barrier that divides those who are given help and those who are not. Then, other comments emerged regarding how the photographs are being used to extract donations from others, that this is not morally right as the child is being used in the process. Teacher Roberto commented that:

There is no right or wrong but it should really be given to the poor... the child has great use for them [referring to the funds collected by international NGOs], the more reason to give it to the community, wherever the child is from. The money should be given to that community or it should be really given to those in need. [translated]

This reasoning was reiterated several times, focusing on two aspects: the child being used by the charity and that the funds generated should really be given to the community. Also, one teacher commented that the child should not, as an interpretation of the photograph, be praised for working hard; rather, we should ask why the child is in such hardship and working at a young age in the first place. Again, these responses that question the current social arrangement reflects the presence of critical reflection,
just how they are reflected in the previous responses. Additionally, relating the second photograph to the first photograph, issues of scamming and charities being used for deception arose, where a teacher stated that:

There are people who use charities to deceive others; that is why there is a need to carefully assess them; there should be scientific research. [translated]

Furthermore, if a photograph evokes a worst-case scenario, charities may secure higher donations as worst-case scenario are the most evocative, though this does not necessarily translate to help in the communities, as commented on by another teacher. On the other hand, as one volunteer teacher states, they are also recipients of support from different charities and receive donations in their continuing struggle; charities can also be good if resources are actually directed towards the genuine recipients of these kinds of charity activities of resource generation. The statement shows that a separation of the notion of false charity or false generosity from genuine solidarity struggle activities that benefit national minority groups and other marginalized and oppressed groups can exist. We can observe the implication of the MMS curriculum that is being used in the Lumad schools, that science does not only reside in the concepts of biology, chemistry, physics, and other academic subjects. The more important application of science is through assessment, investigation, or evaluation of real-world problems that teachers and students face in their day-to-day lives, or in this specific case in evaluating charity organizations. Lastly, teacher Maricel went beyond the subject and asked where the funding would really go, relating the situation in the photograph to the current system and the plight of the Lumad:

Honestly for me, I am taking pity and at the same time feeling anger; first, I am angry because if we have a working government, it will not come to this or the lives of the children will not be like that [referring to the photograph]. In the second picture, it is like a picture of informal settlers … their lives will not be like that if they will be given social services because we all know that not only IPs are
deprived of social services, all people in the Philippines are also deprived.

[translated]

She continued, relating the photograph to the plight of the Lumad children who have to be away from their families and community just to continue their education. For Maricel, the plight of the Lumad youth reflects the plight of children in an urban community as their lives are both under the influence of the same system that marginalizes and oppresses them. We can observe the capacity of the volunteer teacher to connect the lived realities of those in poor urban communities to the lives of national minority groups, practically already using the language of a decolonized critical bioethics in viewing the world of oppressed and marginalized groups. The response above also demarcates the position of oppressed class and of those in power, that the current societal condition is a product of the ruling elite’s class position and the oppressed do not have to accept it and can be angry about it. Additionally, without asking further questions to elicit deeper responses from the research participants, they were able to discuss on their own the literal meaning of the photographs and their deeper symbolic meaning. One might deduce that their realities are intersecting or being represented by the photographs in a way which the drowning child failed to represent, as it is mainly constructed as an abstraction of the lived realities of those who need help in the poverty scenario.

This is represented by this response from teacher Bella, noting here also that among the teachers she is a little shy and hesitant in responding, stating that these kinds of photographs fail to fully capture the reason why poverty exists and saying:

The root cause of people’s hardship is Fascism, Imperialism; that is the root cause of poverty. There is a reason why we are poor. [translated]

This is the clearest manifestation of the language of Fanon’s postcoloniality, where the root cause of poverty is a systemic and structural problem relating to Fascism and
Imperialism, that poverty is not just a benign concept that exists in isolation, it is a product of a current system that is biased against marginalized and oppressed groups. Clearly, the drowning child thought experiment fails to address this reality or elicit this kind of response from the volunteer teachers which may be due to its abstract nature and the treatment of the pool as an existing aspect of reality that cannot be questioned.

In the end, the responses of the volunteer teachers in this thought experiment show that the language of a decolonized critical bioethics is not foreign to them; it might not be academically learned by them but there is evidence that demonstrates clearly that they can articulate these ideas. Possible reasons are their exposure to the MMS curriculum used in the Lumad schools, as a culture circle, as shared in their responses in using science in assessing societal problems, their continuing immersion that exposed them to the plight of the Lumad in strengthening their solidarity struggle with them, and the formulation of a thought experiment that represents their concrete conditions. Lastly, the statement below of teacher Albert represents the position and worldview of a volunteer teacher in a Lumad school with regard to the issue of poverty and charity:

Perhaps the highest essence of helping is to know what is happening to the child and live the life of the child. But the essence of helping is living the life of those who you want to help. So that you can understand their struggle and why they are in that position. [translated]

This relates to the experience of the volunteer teachers, where helping has a higher meaning when one immerses oneself in the lives of the marginalized and the oppressed, resulting in a transference, where the struggle of the othered and oppressed becomes your own struggle. Charities and donations fail in capturing this as they act as mere conduit and not as transformative force, as shared by teacher Maricel:
For me, before, I was not yet aware about those things [issues on charities]; if I see them, it’s OK. But when I lived with the Lumad, I can say that what I was doing before was wrong. [translated]

This is a representation of the critical consciousness for which Freire argues, where social action is anchored in a theory that aims to change not just the individual but a system. The respondents’ continued volunteer teaching in the Lumad Bakwit school and struggle with the Lumad is the clearest manifestation of an action to change the current system and is also anchored in a theoretical framework that benefits the marginalized and oppressed. Their responses are clear in its position, it does not reside on the vagueness of helping and the acceptance of the current world order and arrangement as the responses took a class position that those in power are responsible for the poverty of othered groups.

The climate crisis: Climate change, environmentalism, and ancestral lands

In this third thought experiment or moral dilemma, the aim is to understand the position that the volunteer teachers will take, in light of the fact that they are immersed in and are living with the Lumad community. In summary, this thought experiment is focused on addressing the climate crisis, or climate imperialism (Sison, 2021), through the use of resources from the ancestral lands of national minorities, which can result in damage to the ancestral lands and the lives of the communities or damage to the cities and lives of people living there. The research participants hold the position of the president or leader of the country, having the power to decide on the lives of the national minority groups in addressing the climate crisis through the enactment of policies and actions. The thought experiment is stated below (Appendix 3.6):

Every year your country is being devastated by strong typhoons/storms, which greatly affects the country’s capital. As the leader of this country, you can act on this perennial problem by building a green, resilient city. In order to do this, you
have to take resources from the ancestral land of a national minority’s community, displacing them in the process. If you do not take the resources from the community, as a result of stronger and stronger typhoons/storms that will devastate your country, there will not only be economic and political repercussions, but also hundreds to thousands of deaths in your city. What will you do as the leader of the country?

In summary, the volunteer teachers are biased toward the struggle of the national minorities in the defense of their ancestral land providing a nuanced approach in addressing the problem of those in the city and the problem that the national minorities will face if their resources are used as a solution to the urban problem. It has to be remembered, as in Chapter 7, that former bioethics students are not in unison in their position as indicated by their responses. This class position to the problem is shown in this response from teacher Bella:

“It is like this, the reason why we are hit by typhoons is because they are destroying the environment. If they will continue that project, they can take materials but they have to replace them. Another reason is that they cannot displace the Lumad, they cannot do that because that is what we are fighting for [referring to ancestral lands]. [translated]

In her response, “they” refers to those in power and “they” are juxtaposed to the interest of the Lumad, especially in the defense of their ancestral lands. As a whole, the response might be a little bit incoherent and a little bit scientifically unsound (“we are hit by typhoons because they are destroying the environment”) but it starts to provide the position of defending the land against some form of development aggression. Inherent to this response is the sustainable use of the land of national minority groups (“they can take materials but they have to replace them”), where they take resources from the environment but do not do so in a way that results in the destruction of the environment (Camacho et al., 2016; Sarma, 2016). Even when taking a position of not choosing
between the two options provided in the thought experiment, the research participant was still biased towards the protection of the rights of the national minority groups and their ancestral lands. Teacher Elsa addressed the dilemma posed by the problem as an issue of unequal benefits:

That question is really difficult as it is based on the safety of everyone or there will be those who will benefit more? [translated]

The response of teacher Elsa showed a recognition of unequal benefits posed by the thought experiment, which reflects on the experience of the Lumad of historically receiving the short end of the stick in such transactions. Lastly, when taking a balanced approach to using the natural resources of the ancestral land of the national minority groups, a volunteer teacher was clear on how it should be done – “if we take resources, we have to replace them with more resources” [translated]. Here, the respondent is reiterating that in terms of the issue of mining, there is no blanket approach of resistance to all mining, as they support small scale mining that does not destroy the environment. Also, the importance of consent was put forward as one of the major problems in the struggle of marginalized groups to reclaim and defend their ancestral land, as there has historically been a failure of communication regarding how resources will be used. For the teachers, one reason why displacement exists is the failure of discussions that address issues surrounding for whose benefit the resources in the ancestral lands will be used and how such activities will impact upon the lives of the national minority groups’ communities. This touches on balancing the transaction through genuine consent with the national minority groups themselves.

Then, teacher Albert takes another position outside of the two options given in the thought experiment, taking a position of the national minority groups through measures for the protection of the ancestral lands that addresses the problem of Capitalist ownership:
If they only want a Green City, then why not just improve the current situation of the Lumad and do it more environmentally, [in a way] that does not negatively affect the Lumad. Because they are the ones who really know, our national minorities, how to care for our environment. Why displace them? If we can improve and not replace with a Green City, the term city evokes a question of ownership of those in power, those who have the capacity can live in this area. So, we need to fight it because it is not for the majority. [translated]

The teacher clearly understands the plight of the national minority groups and their indigenous knowledge system in caring for and protecting the land. He shows that there is power associated with words or language, that is biased towards those who hold most power in a society. The Green City might evoke sustainability or environment protection, but the question emerges, ‘for whom is this kind of development?’ Teacher Albert was able to contemplate this associated politico-economic problem in addressing the power relationship inherent in the problem and the economic factors that also determine that political problem. If given a choice between those who have historically benefitted from the resources of national minority groups and the national minority groups that they learned to live with, the position they will hold is that of the national minority groups like the Lumad.

This last response again provided us with a glimpse of a developing or an existing critical consciousness in the volunteer teachers as the response, again, was able to check on critical reflection, critical motivation, and critical action. Furthermore, that evidence of critical consciousness is in the presence of a class position in responding to a given dilemma. The response is not just an abstract response, or even a response that evokes critical consciousness; it is clear in its position of responding to the question of ‘for whom?’. Teacher Albert is conscious of the current hierarchy of power in Philippine society; as such, our collective action should respond in addressing the exploitation that results from that social order and arrangement. His response reflects the analysis of Sison (2021) on the current climate crisis as climate imperialism, where
class analysis is central to our world’s current predicament. Lastly, as reflected in the responses, in different degrees, even when faced with the dilemma of choosing between the options that result in facing a wall of uncertainty or difficulty in responding to the dilemma, they still chose the position of the national minority groups in the end. And when they were forced to choose to use resources from the ancestral land, this decision is made in the context that the national minority groups will not be displaced and that the ancestral land will be protected.

Advancement in technology: A primitive or modern position?

Modernity is attributed to the dominant group, while primitivity is attributed to othered groups (Nandy, 1988). Thus, when we are presented with the concept of technology in relation to national minorities, we are tasked to look at technology, as a modern aspect of society, based on pre-conceived notions of national minorities as a backwards or primitive group. There is a common view that national minority groups are ‘allergic’ to the modernizing characteristics of technology and how it can influence and change the lives of the national minorities (Nandy, 1988). The goal of the final thought experiment is to draw out the responses of the volunteer teachers regarding technology and their attitudes towards it. This touches on the wisdom of repugnance or the ‘yuck factor’ proposed by Leon Kass (1997) or the perceived inherent harmful character of a thing (in this case, technology) as an intuitive feeling of disgust towards that thing. This thought experiment is an exploration of whether the participants hold this kind of position towards technology, a wisdom of repugnance that technology is intrinsically harmful due to their negative attitude towards it, or do they hold a positive position towards technology, through a more accepting attitude towards it? Also, if they hold a more nuanced position towards technology, what does it show?

To test their attitude towards technology, and in this case a potentially ‘repugnant’ technology, the research participants were asked what they felt about a particular technology upon watching the video of a developing lamb fetus in an ectowomb
apparatus (Appendix 3.7). The volunteer teachers’ various reactions and responses are: shock, amazement, not repulsive but amazing, praising the human capacity and intellect, and a question of who is the first human who will be tested, and is it acceptable to test it on humans? None of them find the technology repugnant. The responses provided by the teachers show their attitudes to be accepting of new technology, rather than reflective of an inclination to be wary of technology as inherently negative, or contrary to the way of life of national minority groups. They show that being indigenous or being part of that culture does not result in primitivity (Nandy, 1988). When such thoughts arise, such as weighing its value on the appropriateness or acceptability for the Lumad, it was not based on cultural appropriateness or acceptability but rather on the technology’s possible availability and access for everyone. As a Lumad herself, teacher Bella touched on why the technology is not appropriate for the Lumad because of their culture but also gave more weight to the issue of access to such technology:

If we will base it on the [culture of] Lumad, it seems like it is not appropriate, in my view it is not available for everyone because of lack of money and poverty. Whatever it is, the rich … those who can afford are the only ones who can afford to make use of such technologies. For me the Lumad have different beliefs that life … it seems they value it … it feels like it is not right to use … it is life and it should not be experimented. [translated]

This social and politico-economic valuation of the technology was juxtaposed with the belief of the Lumad, where the sanctity of life is of great significance. This is the response that shows a reaction closest to repugnance to the technology, though Bella shared she was shocked rather than repulsed by the technology. However, she demonstrated the position of a volunteer teacher, who is also a Lumad, that the problem technologies might present is not just weighed on the context of cultural value but also pertains to the power relationships and economic implications of such technologies. While there was no immediate and outright condemnation of the technology, she contextualized how it might not be appropriate but also shared how access to such
technologies is also an issue. Additionally, the technology was acceptable because of the positive value it can provide in addressing the needs of premature babies, as teacher Roberto commented:

[It] also depends if we need the technology, why not, we will not use it? If not, we will just discard it or we will not use it? It is better to use it because premature babies are pitiful, they are the ones who really experience discrimination [difficulties in development], right? It is better because the premature babies will develop, they can better grow and develop. But if there are useless, what is useless [refers to technology]? ... There are lots of technologies that are beneficial to us and those others that we do not need or are not needed in our society; let us not invent them. [translated]

This provides evidence of a position that coalesces with the belief on the value or sanctity of life and how to protect it, that there is no contradiction between the use of technology and the development of a technology that primarily functions for the nurture of life. Furthermore, when evaluating the value of technology more deeply, the teachers presented the advantage and disadvantage of technology.

Lastly, teacher Albert shared a nuanced analysis of the thought experiment which also touched on the same sentiment related by teachers Roberto, Elvira, and Maricel:

Since the profit from that research will only benefit a few elite individuals, especially if the masses do not own the research, it seems like it is only for the benefit of the few, the privileged will benefit again and again. Especially in this time, if you do not have the money, it is really difficult to address an illness. Right now, the issue of addressing normal [common] illness is difficult for the masses; how much [more] for those more advanced conditions or those kinds of advanced technologies? Technology is not bad if it is centered on the needs of people, of the masses; it will not become evil. But if the technology is only for the
few, for them to own, or to exploit more people, that is what is evil about technology. If it can save a lot of people, why not, right? But, currently, that is impossible, in the kind of society we have … Those in authority are taking a blind eye. [translated]

The teachers, especially teacher Albert, touched on a reality that the Lumad face every day, that current technology is not available to them, much less these kinds of more advanced technologies. The reality of not having access to basic teaching materials, basic social services, sanitation, are the immediate problems they face as a function of the social structures imposed on them by those in control, such as deaths among Lumad due to lack of health services (Borromeo, 2016). In this case, the teacher takes a position that is accepting of technology, though not of the profit-motive of the technology and the current reality of who owns certain technologies. The fact that the issue of making technologies work for people was stated and that ownership of technologies should not lie within the hands of the few gives weight to the pro-technology but anti-capitalist position the teacher holds.

The positions given by the teachers here are seldom accounted for in ethical discussions involving new technologies. Ethical discussions about new and old technologies involving humans usually center on the sanctity of life (which was covered by the teachers), on a happiness calculation (utilitarianism), duty (deontology), principles, or other philosophical frameworks. The teachers provided another ethical lens in addressing the problem posed by such technology, that sociocultural and politico-economic constructs are also factors that can be used to address an ethical problem. This is the language of a decolonized critical bioethics that this research wants to explore among the participants. The position of the teachers in addressing the thought experiment showed that to be indigenous is not to be primitive, and to be dominant is not to be modern (Nandy, 1983). This also breaks with the notion that the colonized are not capable of holding ethics or values (Fanon, 1991); rather, they hold
ethics and values that are different or an antithesis of the idealized values and ethics of the elite who currently hold power in our society.

Lastly, as an overview of this chapter, it showed that the othered or oppressed groups hold an ethics that is anchored on land and the liberation of the masses as it directly confronts the domination of those in power that also transcends current ethical valuations and transactions in our society. In some ways, the volunteer teachers showed in their responses evidence of this kind of ethics that counters the dominant ethics imposed by the ruling class. It was observed in their responses on the form and function of education to the colonized, on struggling with different basic sectors of society, on confronting Imperialism through issues of poverty, the environment, and access to technology. This ethics of resistance against the violent ethics of the ruling class that dominates and subjugates othered and oppressed groups is the possible way past the obstacles (ethics of ruling class) (Fairclough, 2010; O'Regan & Betzel, 2015) maintained by the ruling class. The responses of the volunteer teachers showed the existence of a developing critical consciousness that is aware of its class position in addressing the systemic problems the exploited class faces in our society. The ongoing volunteer teaching of the participants in the Lumad schools is already a reflection of critical consciousness, as they try to address the systemic problem of lack of education of national minorities, but more important is the clarity of their class position in their responses as a function of their immersion. They do not volunteer as a feel-good experience; rather, it is a concrete response to the historical oppression of the Lumad which is a class position, anchored on critical reflection and motivation that results in critical action against those who perpetuate such systemic oppression.
Chapter 6 The Lumad and the Lumad school: Liberating Education and Ethics of Resistance

*Land and Curriculum: The Lumad and their struggle for land and self-determination*

The colonialist bourgeoisie, when it realizes that it is impossible for it to maintain its domination over the colonial countries, decides to carry out a rearguard action with regard to culture, values, techniques, and so on … For a colonized people the most essential value, because the most concrete, is first and foremost the land: the land which will bring them bread and, above all, dignity. (Fanon, 1991, p. 44)

The statement above addresses two features of this study, education in the first sentence and land and land struggle in the second sentence. As mentioned in previous chapters, the Lumad school with its Nationalist, Scientific, and Mass-oriented Education (NSMOE) / Makabayan, Makamasa, at Siyentipikong Edukasyon (MMS) curriculum framework is the concrete manifestation of the Lumad’s struggle for land and their right to self-determination (Calsado, 2020; Montero-Ambray, n.d.; Sy, 2022a, 2022b, 2023). Land struggle and the right to self-determination are realized through education as the methods of teaching, assessments and evaluations, and lessons revolve around the issue of land (Sy, 2019). This section explores the narrative of the students in their experience in the Lumad school and in the Lumad Bakwit school, where one of the major reasons that students opt to be part of the Lumad school relates to the financial constraints that schooling entails, even when the public school system is ‘free’. As shared by one teacher in Chapter 5, additional costs of schooling come from projects, food, transport, uniform, and other fees that are often incurred by students as the public school system’s budget cannot keep up with the needs of the students (Magsambol, 2020b; Montemayor, 2019; Paris, 2019; Reysio-Cruz, 2020). Jose, one of the Lumad students, shared the same sentiment in this response:
I am studying in the Lumad school because I do not have the money to study in DepEd [regular public school], because in the Lumad schools everything is free. No fees and it is also a boarding high school. If you study in DepEd, you will have to pay for the costs of projects and other subjects, boarding house, and others. [translated]

This point was also made by three other students, that one of the main reasons they are enrolled in the Lumad school is the absence of out-of-pocket costs associated with their schooling. Meanwhile, the importance of the Lumad school being a boarding school should be reiterated as it addresses the arduous journey that the students and teachers have to make in order for them to attend a regular public school. Again, as shared by another teacher in Chapter 5, the distance that both teachers and students have to travel to school is a factor that lowers the face-to-face interaction for both in the conduct of their daily lessons. Addressing this primary problem makes education not just available for the Lumad students but, more importantly, realistically attainable. As another student shared, “Studying in the regular public school requires walking four kilometers. Going up, going down, there was even a river to cross” [translated]. As Lumads mostly belong to the peasant sector, the sector with the highest poverty incidence in the country (IBON Foundation, 2020; Mapa, 2020), the cost of education is financially challenging for the Lumad. Studying in the Lumad schools addressed all their needs, from food to toiletries, materials for projects, dormitories; thus, their parents do not need to spend anything on the cost of their children going to school. Addressing this initial hurdle has also allowed the students to focus on their studies, as Lorna shared:

I was consciously awakened in Lumad school. There is a higher appreciation of things in life, they became simpler, I was not like this before; I was ‘healed’ by the Lumad school. [translated]

Here, the student shared the larger contextual implication of studying in the Lumad school, not just in addressing the right to education for national minorities through the
delivery of education to the marginalized, but, more importantly, an education that addresses consciousness-raising, a vital component of Freire’s critical pedagogy (Diemer et al., 2016; Freebersyser, 2015; Freire, 1973, 2012; Freire et al., 2014). Being ‘healed’ here is in the context of an education that does not subscribe to the colonial, elitist, and market-oriented form and function of education. This sentiment on consciousness-raising in the Lumad school is shared by other students, for instance sharing that the diversity of the students from different tribes and of teachers did not result in feudal relationships; this represents the breaking of power relationships through dialogical learning, as understood through Freire’s critical pedagogy (Freire, 2012). Without any prompts, the students relayed features of critical pedagogy and its implication for consciousness-raising as Fe relayed that there is a series of exchanges in the learning process (dialogical learning); the teacher is not an authoritarian teacher in the classroom:

When I became part of the school, of course it is a little difficult as it is quite far from our community … But it is amazing as there are a lot of students, from different tribes, they are mixed together. Same with the teachers. I also experienced that the relationship of the teacher and student is not feudal. It seems like it is just an exchange of knowledge, it is not like if you are the teacher it is you … it is only the teacher that should be in authority; the relationship in the school (Lumad school) is not like that. [translated]

Then, Fe also shared the importance of the NSMOE/MMS curriculum of the Lumad school in addressing the needs of the Lumad, where agriculture, health and academic subjects (i.e., literacy, numeracy, and other conventional subjects) are the three legs or pillars of the curriculum that address their needs. These pillars address the basic social needs that are lacking in their communities: agriculture for food, health for basic health services, and academic subjects that address the centrality of land. I was personally able to observe this during previous field work in the Lumad schools in 2018, where subjects like mathematics included discussion of land issues through geometry, and the
issue of exploitation was examined through lessons on interest calculations (Calsado, 2020). Fe continued:

We are not boxed inside the four corners of the school, like in a day we will just study (theory); our class hours are divided for example for two hours for theory, after that we will go out of our classroom and translate to practice what we have learned. [translated]

This is one of the clearest manifestation of Freire’s critical pedagogy, where there is a dynamic relationship between theory and practice, or the spiral progression of theory and practice, as he puts it here:

By the same token, to negate theory for the sake of practice, as in the use of dialogue as conversation, is to run the risk of losing oneself in the disconnectedness of practice. It is for this reason that I never advocate either a theoretic elitism or a practice ungrounded in theory, but the unity between theory and practice. (Freire, 2012, p. 19)

This interaction is an enriching process rather than a process that diminishes one because of the other, as manifested by the statement of Fe’s experience in the Lumad school. Another student, Lina, reflected upon the financial burden posed by accessing education, commenting that if this initial hurdle is addressed, it can lead to other favorable outcomes:

Maybe in the first instance, my mother cannot pay for my education. That was my initial reason, after a while I felt that was not only the value of the Lumad school ... it does not only help my family to save up on money. It is not only my family that the Lumad school helped but also the community, also myself, because in our subjects like values education, personal development ... we were able to improve ourselves through criticism and self-criticism. Also, in our school, we are
taught how to be pro-people, nationalist, and scientific, so, what is being taught is quite different. [translated]

The criticism and self-criticism that was mentioned here by the student is part of the dialogic learning in the Lumad school, where there is an openness for constructive criticism of teachers, fellow students, and oneself in pointing out strengths and weaknesses. As Lina further shared, this pedagogical tool of criticism and self-criticism is not found in regular public schools:

Because in Lumad school … if we will study in DepEd [public schools], what they are teaching to us is really different … We also did not encounter the word criticism and self-criticism, we never heard of it … [translated]

Addressing prejudice was also shared by a student in terms of what the Lumad schools teach to its students. Miguel shared that during his first time stepping into the Lumad school he saw the other students as quite different from him, that their skin was darker than his; this corroborates the results of previous studies on how critical pedagogy addresses racism (Freebersyser, 2015; Homer, 2011). This preconditioned Miguel to be biased against the other students and become a loner, but when he eventually interacted with them he stated:

But one day when I interacted with them, that changed me, because even if you are sad, they are the ones who give color to your life; they make jokes, they make you happy if you are sad. I learned that I should not be by myself only, I should share my problems, that’s how I learned to be with others and not be with myself. I learned not to be selfish; you have to care for others and not just think of yourself. [translated]

This clearly manifests the changes that the Lumad school brings to the students, not just in reading, writing, or numeracy but also in addressing personal development and
counteracting prejudice. Lastly, in sharing how the Lumad school, with its NSMOE/MMS curriculum framework, addresses the needs of the Lumad and other marginalized sectors and resulted in changes in the individual, this student’s narrative is a good representation of the value of the school to the Lumad. Below, the statement of RonRon encapsulates the possible development of critical consciousness in an individual brought about by an education that is conscious of the people’s land struggle and self-determination, a manifestation of the melding of Freire’s and Fanon’s thesis:

Before, my actions and habits are different from what I am now. Before, I went through a phase where I drink, I was a heavy drinker, because I lost my way before … When I entered the Lumad school, I can say that is when I completely changed; because of the education I received I learned how to become more humane and to help others and the environment. Before, I did not like planting, I did not like farm work. So, when I entered Lumad school that is when I learned the importance of going back to the land. Cultivate the land for the community. That is where I learned the value of studying agriculture. Because of what the teachers taught us, that is when I changed; I changed how I view myself, like before I am fine if I have a cigarette, I do not care about what is happening in my surroundings. Before, if my friends are there, going out somewhere, I am already fine with that. I did not have the concept of how to care for others, how to care for myself, my community. I did not have a concept of that before. Unlike in the Lumad school, that is where I learned how important and valuable it is to study and go back to your community. Unlike before, I thought that if you graduate, this is the course I should take. My course before, I wanted to be an engineer. When I entered Lumad school my dream in life changed, I wanted to become an agriculturist, I want to become a real agriculturist, I want to become a teacher. To go back to the community where I will practice what I learned in school.

[translated]
The above statement is the clearest statement of the changes that the Lumad school developed in a student, from a pathless life to a life that aims to address the needs of the community through education. His statement shows that education can cleanse itself of its abstract nature if its curriculum framework is inherently anchored in land and land struggle, as argued by Freire (2012). This is also the clearest manifestation of Fanon’s statement about land being the ‘most concrete’ issue for the colonized, that when one understands and realizes the value of the land it results in the concretization of the value of education for how it can be practiced to address the needs of a community that relies on the produce of the land. This is what this research is looking for, how critical pedagogy and the issue of land (postcoloniality) will be manifested by the participants without any deliberate prompts. Furthermore, the student narrated how education can be a driving force for change if it is first anchored on land and secondly aims to develop critical consciousness among students, in this case through a system of education aimed at social change (Freire, 2012). In his response, RonRon showed critical reflection, critical motivation, and critical action (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016), which can be argued to be a manifestation of the presence of critical consciousness. He reflected on the value of land and how the Lumad school helps the Lumad in their struggle, his motivation to go back and serve the community, and the action he is taking in serving the community.

For the Lumad, access to education was the first hurdle in accessing basic social services in their community; the cost of education is the clearest manifestation of the marginalization that they experience. However, when education is accessible for the Lumad because it is free, another form of threat becomes known to them. As shared by Lina, studying in the Lumad school made her aware of how militarization limits their access to basic social services. In sharing her experience, the military presence in their community was initially not felt as limiting, such as when she is able to access a basic social service, for instance her basic right in the form of education. Studying in the Lumad school, she experienced first-hand how she was deprived of her right to education, and self-determination, that pushed her to continue to be part of the Lumad
school. This statement shows that education can help students to understand their reality, from a manifestation of magical consciousness (military presence was not felt as limiting) to a form of critical consciousness (being aware of militarization as a threat to their community) (Camba, 2015; Freire, 2012). This corresponds to the experience of another student who shared that they [the Lumad community] need to evacuate or become part of a Lumad Bakwit school because of the paramilitary and government authorities who are behind the forced closure of their schools. Yet another student shared that theirs was the first school to be forcibly closed by the military, and since the evacuation they were forced to stop their education. Furthermore, the series of killings of their leaders and classmates such as Obilio Bay-ao, and volunteer teachers such as Chad Booc, as mentioned in Chapter 2, led to their current state of displacement.

This is the other side of their narrative in their struggle to access and their right to basic social services such as education. There are cases in which individuals only learned of their reality once they had access to education, even if the threats were already present in their communities. This becomes a question of whether the student became aware of the threat of militarization in the community through their education or did the militarization only become an active threat when the student started having access to this education? Alternatively, it may not be a chicken-and-egg question; both realities exist dialectically that ultimately function in limiting the Lumad in understanding their state of marginalization and oppression due to the resources found in their ancestral lands. What is clear is that the Lumad students understand the violence of militarization in the context of their land struggle which became clearer when education was anchored on this condition in raising critical consciousness among them (Sy, 2022a, 2022b, 2023; Sy, 2019).

These threats, neither perceived through nor based on a popular narrative, are rather based on the lived experiences of the students which is clearly an influential factor in their development, a part of their sociohistorical background as argued through different lenses by Vygotsky (1978) on psychology, Freire (2012) on education, and Fanon
(1991) on decolonization. The next question is how the students act or react to these conditions knowing that threats are real and their ongoing struggle in reclaiming and defending their ancestral land and their right to self-determination is a matter of life and death. An awakening of consciousness, whether it is political or critical consciousness or both can be argued, among students is one of the reasons that the students gave for why they continue being part of the Lumad schools. The next responses show a clearer manifestation of critical consciousness (Diemer et al., 2016; Freire, 1973, 2012; Freire et al., 2014) among students, especially, through a decolonizing lens where there is particular attention paid to land struggle (Fanon, 1967, 1991, 2018).

One student shared that being part of the Lumad school opened his eyes to the truth and the rightness of their struggle, even though a number of teachers and students had been killed. This is the decolonization that Fanon (1991) portrays, in which decolonization is a violent process, in which the direct impact on those still struggling for their freedom can be death. To continue with this struggle, knowing that the possible outcome is death, but still continuing to fight for their rights is the clearest manifestation of critical consciousness (Diemer et al., 2016; Freire, 2012; Jemal, 2017; Lodge, 2021). This reiterates that the students were not coerced to be part of the struggle and that they have gone beyond sloganeering, which is the peril of some who are committed to human rights (Freire, 2012); rather, the truth is that they continue to challenge themselves to struggle and fight for their rights. Furthermore, another student simply asked “why should I leave them [those in her community]?” As the student feels anger, it is anchored on the critical awareness of the extent of their lived reality, arguing that if they themselves do not continue the struggle then no one will expose those realities in Mindanao. Again, these responses showed that the students have developed critical consciousness if questions pertain to their lived realities; they understand and act on the violent condition they are in and it is not something that they do not understand (magical consciousness) nor, if they do understand, are they resigned to accepting this reality (naïve consciousness) (Freire, 2012; Homer, 2011).
Relating their struggles to other sectors, groups, and individuals, another student argued that even if you are a Lumad or not there will always be a threat in your life; those risks will exist in your lifetime. Furthermore, being part of the Lumad school had made the student realize that looking at the future is not just a consideration of the future of the Lumad but also the future of the next generation. Miguel shared the excerpt below:

Even though I know that the life I lived is difficult, I do not want the next generation to experience this, I only want to look for a future that addresses the needs of the many of the masses. That is one of our dreams, not to be an individualist, because as a human being we want the many to experience their freedom. Like their individual rights, right to education, health, to live in peace, and defend the ancestral land. And to have our schools back, because our education is one of the liberating forms of education, because what we want is not to be drowned in bourgeois culture in the Philippines. We want our minds to be liberated, that sees everyone as equals. [translated]

This was further reiterated by Aubrey, who stated that:

… because this is the truth and what should be learned, this is the kind of education that children should have, of the youth, of students, not the kind of bourgeois education that will teach you how to serve those big bourgeois compradors and landlords. That should not be the kind of education that is taught to students; it should be mass-oriented, nationalist, and scientific education, where the students will be taught the value of land, how important it is to serve your community, how beautiful the world is. It is different in bourgeois, in DepEd, because they do not teach the need to defend the ancestral land, this is how the peasant class is exploited, also the workers, to the people. They do not teach that, these became heroes in the lessons … I cannot forget when I was in grade 6, the teacher taught us in social studies that heroes, the reason we became
independent from the hands of the Japanese are the Americans. That’s what the teacher said. But I was taught by my mother that it is not the truth, because when I go home, I ask what is the truth. What my mother said is that it is not true. So, it is different from the Lumad school, they teach what serves the interest of the masses. Despite the threats and killings we see the rightness of what we are doing. This is the kind of education that we should have, because despite all the threats, they are more afraid. They are the ones more afraid if we become conscious/aware of what is really happening, they are more afraid if we fight back. It seems that fear is not important, our ancestral lands are more important … we think that it is more important in the fear we are feeling. It is normal to be afraid because everyone can feel fear, what is not normal is if we cannot rise above it. We rise as a collective, so, I stay in Bakwit school because it is needed; I want to. It is practicing what we learned in school on how we can change our society in different ways. [translated]

The statements above are some of the clearest manifestations of the humanizing education that a liberating education, as argued by Freire (2012), can lead to in the development of those who take part in this form of education. Furthermore, the class positions in the two responses are the clearest among the different responses previously given; this addresses the research question without directly asking it to the participants. The response breaks the individualist character of the current dominant education and develops among learners a worldview and practice that help the many, especially in fighting for their rights, which are ultimately anchored on land (Fanon, 1967, 1991; Fanon, 2018). This naming of the world is not selfish, it is liberating. True education, education that is not bourgeois, does not serve the class interest of the elite; rather, it serves in the liberation of the othered or oppressed, people like the Lumad (Fanon, 1967, 1991; Fanon, 2018; Freire, 1973, 2012; Lumbera et al., 2007; Sison, 1987). The second quotation has been included in its long form; cutting it would be a disservice to the fullness of the counter-story narrative (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) being provided by the student, who shows that those who might be viewed by some as
the ‘primitive other’ (Nandy, 1988) are equally capable if not more capable of naming the world, of understanding the world and knowing what is needed to change it (Freire, 2012).

Adding to the different manifestations of a critical consciousness among the Lumad students is this powerful quote from Aida on the value of access to education to in defending and reclaiming their right to their ancestral lands and their right to self-determination:

"We have to continue what we have started, because injustice is already knocking on your side. You are witnessing the reality, how impunity and fascism are being used in the society you are living in. Something has to be done. They say, it is OK to feel fear, but for me, it is not right to be afraid if you are not doing something. [translated]"

If there was a tickbox as to whether critical consciousness was manifested, she clearly ticked all the boxes for critical reflection, critical motivation, and critical action (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016). Here, the student manifested the call to action on their current reality. That when you are already awakened or conscious of your reality, the only just thing to do is to act on it. The other students shared the importance of the value of their education, on how it should be used to help others and serve the community. The latter statement manifests the urgency of the need to act on it, that there is an acceptance of the threatening reality that can make you feel afraid but you have to act on that fear (Fanon, 1991; Fanon, 2018). A liberating education is an education that moves learners to act on that liberation. Furthermore, the simple question of why to continue with their education was succinctly answered by a student who was previously lacking in direction but had seen the value of education that is anchored on land, RonRon stated:
Why do I continue [being part of Lumad school]? Because I became conscious of the reality and simple experiences in life that we should not stay silent in one corner of where we are based. For me I need to continue the struggle because this is not only for us, this generation, but our struggle is for the next generation. Because our struggle is not only rooted on the Lumad schools, but is rooted on our ancestral land where, when exploited by large mining corporations, nothing will be left for the next generations. This is the reason why we, why I, this is the reason why my perspective in life changed and to our society. That is why I want to continue what I started, as what I said earlier, this is not only for us, but this is also for the next generation. If nothing is left of the ancestral lands, we will lose the land we can cultivate; the next generation will not have anything to use. They do not have land to cultivate. The environment is destroyed. That is the reason that makes me stronger to continue and I do not intimate to myself the fear of harassment, in other words, I use it as a strong foundation to continue the struggle. [translated]

Land. Education. Struggle. For the next generation. These terms encapsulate the move to liberate or change the society for the betterment not only of the individual but of the generations to come. That when education is anchored on the struggle for reclaiming and defending the Lumad’s ancestral land, the liberating character of education is concretized and does not reside only in the realm of the abstract. Education is as concrete as the land. Land is as concrete as the education that is liberating. This is the value of the Makabayan, Makamasa, at Siyentipikong edukasyon (MMS) or nationalist, mass-oriented, and scientific education (NSMOE) of the Lumad schools in liberating students (and teachers) from the current dominant form and function of bourgeois education. Their education is not separate from their struggle. Their defense for their ancestral land starts with their struggle and education is just part of the different forms of collective action that contribute to achieving that objective. As shared by Aubrey, it is their education that arms them with the tools for their struggle to read and write, for the defense of their ancestral land and their environment:
Of course, the MMS can help contribute to the struggle of the Lumad as this gives the arms, not the arms that explode [literal weapons], arms so that we will not … we will know how to read, we will know how to defend (ancestral land) as that is the most essential, we are taught how to defend our ancestral land, defend the environment. This is the most important lesson that MMS brought to the Lumad that you will not just study to be rich, will not just study to … study to be civilized … will not go abroad but instead will protect the environment for the future. [translated]

One of the most striking features of the response of Aubrey is in her qualifying that her education is not solely focused on the civilizing function of education, or the Western conception of being civilized (Lenin, 1970; Nandy, 1988; Sison, 1987). In reformulating her response, the civilizing function of the MMS/NSMOE curriculum framework is not being remolded in the current dominant conception of the bourgeois society; rather, the claim is that to be civilized is to defend their ancestral lands and their right to self-determination for the benefit of future generations (Alamon, 2017; Freire, 1973, 2012; Sy, 2022a, 2022b). Lorna also added to this conception of Aubrey on the value of the Lumad schools, that it helps in the development of a progressive society:

In academics [literacy, numeracy, and other subjects], we need academics so that we can learn the basics – English, for example, we need to learn English for our alliance and interaction with other countries. [translated]

The statement shows how to negate the perils of some forms of decolonization in education (Tuck & Yang, 2012): it should not reside on the wholesale rejection or negation of a ‘Western’ or ‘colonizing idea’ or tool that when used by an othered community will itself be colonized and dilute their struggle. For Aubrey, there is still value in the English language in their struggle but, first, one should know its value to
forward their calls against their further oppression, marginalization, and exploitation. She further added:

The Lumad school and MMS are connected; the reason why we learn and embrace the continuing life of struggle is because … as it clears out bourgeois ideologies, ideologies that should not be followed, the MMS addresses that mindset. The ideology that is being pushed in our society and state is not to struggle, but the MMS is like a doorway that if you open will allow you to free yourself from a bourgeois mindset and you will not be imprisoned by the exploitation of the state; you will not be part of the machinery who will just follow and serve them. [translated]

This response of Lorna is one of the clearest manifestations of the impact of the transformative education that the MMS/NSMOE curriculum framework brought to the students (Alamon, 2017; Freire, 1973, 2012; Montero-Ambray, n.d.; Sy, 2022a, 2022b). Her response is not just a regurgitation of slogans of activists against the perils of a bourgeois society as she was able to process the value of their struggle in her own words. More important, she was able to address such concepts as limit-situation, dehumanization, banking vs dialogic education and the violence of the ruling elite against those who struggle for decolonization. Lastly, the statements of Fe and RonRon below further show the value of the MMS/NSMOE curriculum or a curriculum that is anchored on land and land struggle.

Fe states that:

For us, diplomas are not important, because our society is dominantly bourgeois, semifeudal and semicolonial, which makes us need a diploma so that we can work. But if we will analyze it, for us, it is not important because it is more important where you will practice or if you will practice those theories you learned. The MMS curriculum framework contributes to the Lumad struggle
because, for example, it makes the people conscious that the land is really ours and it is not owned by big landowners, and this is the reason why it should be defended. [translated]

RonRon touches on similar but subtly different ideas, stating that:

Because we analyze, if it [ancestral land] gets destroyed, our ancestral lands will be gone, it is not only the culture of the Lumad [that will be lost] but the entire community. It will be lost in history; it is not that the Lumad will be gone from history, but the IP will be removed from the our reality or the Lumad will be gone, will be removed from their communities. That is the reason why the MMS curriculum framework becomes our weapons in the continuing defense of our ancestral lands. [translated]

Where Fe argues for the development of a more progressive culture, RonRon added that culture is part of their being as a community which is tied to their ancestral lands (Freire, 2012; Homer, 2011; Lodge, 2021; Vygotsky, 1962; Vygotsky, 1978). Circling back to the statement of Fanon at the start of this section, the responses of the Lumad students showed how the concreteness of a people’s struggle anchored on land that is also manifested in a curriculum framework can resist dominating bourgeois education and ethics. The responses showed the class position that the Lumad students hold, and that position directly confronts the violence of the ruling elite against them. The ethics that they hold is clearly based on a class-based ethics, which addresses the liberation of othered groups as it directly confronts the violent ethics of the ruling elite. In this context, given the responses in this section, a question for the next sections is how these responses will be translated to their answers to the thought experiments or whether due to their familiarity with the questions in this section, similar insight may not be carried over into the thought experiments. Or will the students reflect the same response that the volunteer teachers manifested when responding to thought experiments compared to questions that address their lived realities?
Drowning child thought experiment

‘I will save the child’; this is the chorus of responses from the students involved in the interviews. The difference lies within how they associate the thought experiments with their current lived realities, especially with land struggle. The responses of the students can be grouped into three categories: 1) responses that connect the thought experiment to their struggles without my asking any supplementary questions; 2) responses that connect the thought experiment to their struggles once I posed supplementary questions; and 3) responses that fail to connect the thought experiment to their struggles even with supplementary questions. Take for example the response of Marikit to the drowning child thought experiment; her response is an example that falls under group 1; she, like the others, without any hesitation responded by ‘saving the child’. But in her response, there is an emphasis on the implications of saving the drowning child for her own schooling,

It does not matter if I fail in school; it does not matter if I cannot go to class … just to save the child. [translated]

Her response did not end with the implication of saving the drowning child upon her schooling; she was also able to connect this to her current predicament, where she relayed that she is going to connect the thought experiment in her aims to protect her ancestral lands. She shared that:

A lot of people have been murdered, imprisoned; that is why I will really defend our ancestral lands. Just as for the child, it does not matter that I cannot go to school as long as I can save the child. It is the state that [sic] to us, to our ancestral lands. I will really defend our ancestral lands or schools. [translated]
This is the response of a student who has been branded as incapable of learning or understanding complex lessons because of how she was viewed, oppressed, marginalized, and exploited as a member of an othered group (Fanon, 1967; Freire, 2012; Nandy, 1988). Her response to the thought experiment shows the capacity of a national minority to respond to this abstract thought experiment if they are given the platform to engage and relate their lived experiences to these kinds of questions. Marikit seems to be a shy student, but given the space usually only afforded to the ruling class, she is able to respond beyond what is expected from those who answer the drowning child thought experiment, a case of a ‘yes’ or a ‘no’ (a crude ethical dichotomy), with a complex response anchored on her community’s struggle, without any nudging. In short, her response manifests critical consciousness as she was able to respond to an abstract thought experiment by discussing how to change current societal problems, a response that also showed a class-based ethics (the state as the perpetrator of violence against national minorities), or the manifestation of a decolonized critical bioethics in responding to a thought experiment.

Then there were RonRon, Thalia, and Lorna, who, like Marikit, were able to respond to the thought experiments without any nudging or supplementary questions for them to critically address the question and connect it to their material conditions. As was shared in the first sections of this chapter, RonRon is not an ‘ideal’ student, one who is initially studious or a stickler for rules, but later, because of the Lumad school, education had become an important way for him to better his life and his community. This was also reflected in his response to the drowning child thought experiment where he started discussing the value of saving the child vis-à-vis the value of material things that can be replaced. He then immediately related the consequence of the thought experiment to our society, that is based on basic economic needs:

If I will relate it to our society, if I am in a better position in my life without any pressure because my basic economic needs are taken care of and I see the Lumad child drowning because of too much oppression; for me I will not, I do not
have to think that I need to save them because my life is good, I do not care about them. [translated]

RonRon is trying to take the position of the ruling class, which he thinks do not care about the lives of those who experience oppression, marginalization, and exploitation (Fanon, 1991; Fanon, 2018; Sison, 1987). There is no pressure to save the lives of the poor as it does not impact his economic conditions. That which he feels he ought to do here, which is the ethical thing to do in the situation, is in dialectical relationship with the material conditions that are also related to a person’s economic conditions (Marx, 2010; Marx & Engels, 2015). However, he then added the following statement, influenced by his reality, as someone who has not addressed his basic economic needs:

I will save the drowning child. The cause of the hardships of Lumad children is the state and the Imperialist plunder of our ancestral lands because we are rich in terms of agriculture. The Lumad community can sustain itself in term of its economic needs; it does not depend on the government. It is the government itself that is the cause of the hardship of the Lumad children and the plunder caused by big corporations. The use of force of the government on our communities. [translated]

Here, RonRon shared how he sees the State as an agent that is allied to the interest of big corporations that are responsible for the direct plunder of their ancestral lands (Alamon, 2017; Camba, 2015; Fanon, 1967, 1991; Fanon, 2018). The state and the big corporations and other agents who have economic and political interest in the ancestral lands of the Lumad do not have a benign or passive relationship. For RonRon, there is a firm relationship among these agents who systematically and actively plunder their ancestral lands, which results in their displacement, marginalization, oppression, and exploitation. This is the decolonization that Fanon talks about, not in the abstract or ideal sense, rather in actuality with respect to how colonization and decolonization act as mechanisms of two competing and contradictory classes for their own survival.
Lorna also reflected this capacity for critical analysis or the possible development of
critical consciousness by Marikit and RonRon when they responded to the drowning
child thought experiment. For Lorna, the causes of suffering or hardship among those
people represented by the drowning child are Imperialism, Feudalism, and Bureaucrat-
Capitalism. Lorna argued that if we can remove these three -isms then we can change
our society, then there will be no one who will suffer from any form of hardship. A
challenge in the analysis of this statement is if Lorna is able to go beyond the slogan-
like character of the calls against these three -isms, as argued by Freire (2012). She
further argued that helping the poor or those who are suffering will just result in the
status quo; the poor are still poor because the roots of their suffering and hardships are
still present. She further made a detailed account of those who benefit from their
ancestral lands through exploitation, for instance by logging, or though the commercial
cultivation of cash crops like rubber, pineapples or bananas, which she argued destroy
the environment and do not benefit their communities as these industries export their
products:

It is not for us, it is being exported, it does not benefit us … we should not say it
is only for the Lumad … the Filipino people do not benefit. Other countries benefit
more compared to us. The mining, it does not only destroy the environment;
those who benefit from our raw materials and resources are other countries. This
does not lead to the development of our country, only to their own [refers to
Imperialist countries]. [translated]

The responses above show that without any supplemental questions to nudge the
students to respond to the deeper meaning of the question, the students have the
capacity to explore the meaning of the thought experiments as a function of their
material conditions: struggles for land and education. Compared to the volunteer
teachers, who were not able to respond to the other possibilities of the thought
experiment, these students are able to go deeper than the surface level question posed
by the thought experiment. This might be possible due to the lived experiences of the students as an insider to the struggles of an othered group, a life that asks them what oppression, exploitation, and marginalization looks like and how to address the root causes of these problems. Again, based on the responses of the three students, they are the ones who exhibited critical consciousness and a class-based ethics without any prompting.

Meanwhile, students Jose, Audrey, Fe, Aida, and Miguel, just like the others, responded to the drowning child thought experiment by committing to saving the drowning child; the differences lie in their abilities to connect the thought experiment to their struggle. Through analysis of these responses, we are able to observe the capacity of the Lumad students to address the thought experiment beyond its initial formulation with the aid of supplementary questions. This can be observed in the response of Aida, by expressing her response to the thought experiment with a detailed and objective solution to the root cause of poverty. She shared that a dichotomy currently exists between those who are marginalized, oppressed, and exploited and those who are the cause of others’ marginalization, oppression, and exploitation:

In the case of the peasant class, isn’t it that they are being exploited by the ruling class, the 1% on top of the [class] triangle. If you will move it upside down, it is hard to move the triangle upside down, but if we are united, we can move it. [translated]

In here, we are able to observe the capacity of the student to relate what she has learned in the school, in terms of class analysis and its application, to a scenario that is abstract in nature but has real world implications. In short, this response breaks the notion of formulated responses from the students whenever they are asked what the MMS/NSMOE curriculum framework imparted to them. This can be viewed as evidence of a changed worldview, different from those who have studied their education under
the regular neoliberal schools of the public school system, that is able to apply class analysis to a complex problem or situation, in this case a thought experiment.

While Aida relates the importance of addressing the current structural problems of our society that dictate the problems of othered and oppressed people, Aubrey, on the other hand, maintained that the system involves key actors in its maintenance and she identified the Imperialists as agents of injustice in our society:

We will fight those … those who cause injustices should be addressed first because if you will just help the poor … give them money … give them food … the system is still there, those who are causing injustice. That is why we need to destroy those who perpetrate injustice, so that in the future, there will be no one oppressed because there are no oppressors. [translated]

Aida and Aubrey both pointed out who are the oppressor class in Filipino society; the difference lies on the concreteness on their responses. Aida’s response is more theoretical, where she states the need to change the current status quo of our society (symbolized by a pyramid), while Aubrey took a more pragmatic approach of directly fighting those who perpetrate injustices in the society.

Then there was Fe, who elaborated on the value of the Lumad schools in responding to these kinds of questions. She argued that in the Lumad school, teachers are more open to dialogue and, as a consequence, Lumad students have the opportunity to explain what happened if the student opted to save the child. She also contrasted it to what she calls a ‘burgis’ or bourgeois teacher, who might be less inclined to accept an explanation to numerous times of being late to class. Then, she further argued that there is a deeper reason why there is a need to sacrifice, where she drew an example from the different forms of attacks to their Lumad schools:
... because you are in a good situation or you are blinded from the real situation... if you will not immerse yourself there [Lumad schools] you will not be able to see or realize what is really happening. The real root cause of the struggles of the Lumad is militarization, stealing our ancestral lands, the closure of schools, there are many. [translated]

She further argued:

In a society, it is the system that needs to be changed. We need to overthrow the ruling class. We can compare it to saving the child; we have to see it through the lens of those exploiting the people ... it seems antagonistic. We can compare it to the cause of the hardship of the child, we need to repair the potholed road while saving the child, we have to do it at the same time. No matter who becomes president or who is in power, they are still part of the state of the ruling class; it is useless, right? [translated]

Fe’s response is an elaboration of the response of Aida and Aubrey, where she tried to make connections to her understanding of the relationship of different classes in our society and how they impact those who are under the power of the minority elite ruling class. She acknowledges that there is an antagonistic relationship between those in power and those who are under the power of the ruling class (Fanon, 1967, 1991; Fanon, 2018; Freire, 2012; Marx & Engels, 2015; Sison, 1987). She is aware that helping the child in the situation does not actually create a better situation for the child, as the system that is in place favors those who are in power (Freebersyser, 2015; Homer, 2011; Lodge, 2021). In saving the child, we need also to repair the road that she thinks symbolized the system that marginalizes, oppresses, and exploits those who are represented by the drowning child. She is not speaking in the abstract anymore as she concretizes the potholed road as the system that keeps on failing those who are drowning. She also adds that there is a reason why there is a pothole in the road; there is not just an abstract reason why it suddenly appears in threatening the life of a
drowning child. It is a system that is ruled by the few, the elite ruling class, and if we fail to address this root of the problem then the problem will continue to exist. There is an argument to be made that this is evidence of a student’s critical consciousness as argued by Freire (2012) that should be developed in a true liberating education. The consciousness of Fe to argue that the current problem in our society is the system that is in place, that there is a need to change it, shows that she does not accept this reality as unchangeable and sees herself as having agency in making the changes.

Lina, on the other hand, just like the other students, responded with an affirmative on saving the drowning child as the value of life is more important than the material value of shoes and other clothing represent. All material things are replaceable, unlike the life of the drowning child. She further expounded on this, stating the value of understanding the root cause of the problem:

[address] the root cause of the problem, like militarization. I will first observe why it is the cause of people’s hardships; after that, after seeing it for myself, if I observed the root cause of the problem then that is where I will address the root cause of the problem. [translated]

Carefully reading this response, we can also observe, even if they are just traces, the capacity of the student to relate the deeper implications or meaning of the thought experiment to her worldview. However, compared to the other students, Lina did not elaborate on her own struggle or the bigger struggle of the community and the connection to the root cause of the systemic problem that the other students shared. There is just the brief mention of militarization, which is based on her experience of militarization of her school, but there was no further elaboration on it. Is this a product of consciousness influenced by sloganeering that Freire (2012) was careful to point out when othered groups are helped by activists and other allies?
The response given by Lina showed that there are also students who are able to reflect on other possible implications of thought experiments, with the guidance of supplemental questions, but are not able to further elaborate on these compared to the other students. Rather than viewing this as a failure of transformative education for students, such responses should be seen as a material condition on the influence of education to students. The above responses are representative of individuals who are transitioning from their magical or naïve consciousness to critical consciousness. This is reflective of the argument on the change of consciousness related to Freire’s critical consciousness, that it is a process of change, which is expected to have different effects on different individuals (Freebersyser, 2015; Jemal, 2017; Shudak & Avoseh, 2015).

What is important to note in these responses are the students’ different capacities to reflect on the drowning child thought experiments, from an unguided response through guided responses to thought experiments that are starting to scratch the surface of critical consciousness. Lastly, what is not lost in their responses is the class position that they take, which addresses the question of what ethical class position will the Lumad students take in addressing the thought experiments.

*Climate crisis thought experiment*

‘Protect the ancestral land.’ This is the collective response of the students to the thought experiment centered on the protection of their ancestral land that also results in the protection of other communities that contribute to the safeguarding of our environment in achieving climate justice. The collective response of the research participants is a testament to their struggle for the defense of their ancestral lands and right to self-determination that is also connected to the right of other sectors of society for climate justice (Sison, 2021).

Take the short and succinct response of Jose; he argued that if the communities are removed from their ancestral lands, then it is almost akin to everyone’s demise. Jose further elaborated that moving the Lumad into the city would present another problem:
what would they do in a city? They do not have work and they do not have land they can till in a city (Fanon, 1991). So, we see how the lives of the Lumad are anchored on their struggle for their ancestral lands and self-determination as Jose touched on with his comment about the value of land and what it means to be a Lumad. Additionally, even without further elaboration, he commented on the relationships of the Lumad to other communities, that they are more directly connected than it seems. Thalia and Raymond expounded on the response of Jose, again addressing the need to address holistically the thought experiment by protecting the ancestral lands and the communities with which they also shared the value of the environment and the resources found in it, such as trees and water sources. Raymond added that it is the environment or their ancestral lands in this case that will protect those in the patag [city-dwellers]. He argued that if their ancestral lands are destroyed then this will result in flooding to the city below their communities. He articulated the direct relationships of the communities here:

It will flood, there will be more floods; of course, the city will be flooded, everyone will be affected if the environment [ancestral lands] is destroyed. [translated]

Marikit and Lorna centered their response on the implication of the use of resources from their ancestral lands, that they will be displaced and will need to evacuate. This reflects their current experience and condition as a result of militarization that is directly connected to mining, logging, and other destructive activities that extract resources from their ancestral lands (Alamon, 2017; Camba, 2015), as discussed in Chapter 2. They also relate their experience of evacuating while others do not need to evacuate given that they have the resources in the first place that should have provided and protected them from such weather phenomena and the risks associated with these climatic events:
I want it to be just. I do not want it for them … that they can build their house or anything else … where will we go? We will evacuate again, and we do not want to always be in evacuation. [translated]

Lorna added that even if she, as the governor or leader of the land, would build a Green City, it would just be destroyed because there would be nothing to protect the city anymore. For her, there should be a plan that will not only serve the interest of one group; rather, it should serve the different communities justly to avoid the displacement of one community for the benefit of another. In these first five responses, compared to the drowning child thought experiment, the responses seem to settle on the experience of displacement of the Lumad and the rape of their ancestral land; what is missing is the presence of class analysis in their responses.

Fe elaborated on the impact of the environment as a shield to other communities and posed the question:

> Why is there a need to displace the IP communities from their ancestral lands, when it [their ancestral lands] and they themselves contribute a lot to the prevention of flooding? They act as the first line of defense in protecting people from the impacts of flooding unlike those Big Comprador Bourgeoisie and Capitalists who only act to serve their own class interest. This act to move national minorities to the city is not in the interest of the national minorities as the act of evacuating and adjusting to that new, temporary environment are extremely difficult. [translated]

This is the first instance that class analysis was manifested in the response to the thought experiment. As displacement has been ingrained in their material condition and the full manifestation of its implication are greatly felt, Fe critically questions the value of moving their communities to the city. Based on her experience, this is just another form
of displacement and evacuation that will not serve their interest but will only serve the interest of others:

For example, if we take the resources of a community that we will displace … the IPs … their ancestral land, it is not only their identity that will be lost. It is also their culture that will be lost, right? Of course, even if we will talk to them, make them understand that there is really a need to build the Green City, there is a need to use the resources, there is a need for them to move out from their ancestral lands, they will not agree; why will they agree, right? In exchange a lot of people will die, in the city; it is the ancestral land that will defend the city against flooding – there will be no flooding. [translated]

Aida echoed the response of Fe, in terms of the relationship between the protection of their ancestral land and the impact of typhoons and flooding. Her matter-of-fact response was that the Philippines is geographically mountainous, and therefore it is naturally protected from these kinds of environmental problems; then, she asks why is there a need to destroy the mountains? She then added the question “Why is there a need to destroy a natural shield or defense?” if the thought experiment revolves around the protection of people from natural environmental concerns. Though she is able to relate the value of the ancestral land and the environment in protecting the people from the impacts of typhoons and flooding, she also connected the formation of typhoons to acts of illegal loggers. In the context of her responses, we are able to observe that there is still space for scientific literacy, as even though the student knows the value of their ancestral land and the environment to the people, she committed an error in correlating typhoon formation to illegal logging. Maybe it was an issue of language as she might mean that typhoon ‘strength’ is correlated to environmental degradation, or it is just an error on her part. There is still a need to further develop science literacy among the students in order to better relate their lived experiences to the impacts of natural phenomena.
RonRon immediately answered the thought experiment with this logical statement: if we will not destroy the environment then the city will not be flooded and a city like the planned Green City is not an answer to stop typhoons and storms. He shared his response, as the root cause of the problem and how to solve the problem:

The answer to address the effects of typhoons is to strengthen your environment; you should not destroy it. Because if you destroy your environment, it is the environment itself that will dictate the eventual flooding of your area. [translated]

He also applies a logic statement and material objective condition to the thought experiment:

I can compare it to our society, to the state of our society. That those who dictate the extraction of resources can be compared to the Imperialists themselves. They are the ones who dictate, control those in authority on how to address the impacts of typhoons. The typhoon is the hunger that happens to us, the problem in the thought experiment is not the literal typhoon, but the hunger, the crisis in our society. [translated]

Lastly, as a solution to the root cause of the problem, he proposes that:

In order to address the problem, those in authority now have to take all the resources; that is why if they follow all the dictates [of others in power], like the president right now, who follows [the dictates of] Imperialist countries, then we will really lose all our resources. And we lose our resources, the government does not know that if a place loses all of its resources it will result in a worsening hunger or crisis in the society. [translated]

Among the responses of the Lumad students, RonRon’s is the most developed in that it manifests critical consciousness in an individual and an ethical class position, as he
views the climate crisis as an issue of climate imperialism (Sison, 2021). In dissecting the thought experiment into three parts, RonRon was able to show the wide extent of his capacity to critically address the problem and its real-world implication and in turn showed his critical consciousness in imparting social change. In the need to first address the scientific facts of the thought experiment, unlike Aida who commented that the actions of loggers cause typhoons [which might mean exacerbate the impacts of typhoon], RonRon was able to provide the scientific connection between the effect of anthropogenic environmental degradation to worsening impacts of typhoons, flooding, and other environmental phenomena.

This scientific literacy provides a stable foundation for addressing the complex relationship between a SSI and related factors, such as the role of Imperialist countries who collaborate with local authorities in implementing public policies that are not anchored on people’s material conditions. The response of RonRon to the thought experiment showed that, given the educational needs that will address a community’s struggle, students like RonRon will have the knowledge at their disposal in addressing complex issues, such as an environmental concern that directly impacts one’s being, through an education that centers their struggle in the curriculum. Like the other participants who address the dilemma through the protection of their ancestral land that will inevitably protect everyone, RonRon elevated this position by dissecting the socioscientific roots of the problem, the logical relationship of the root cause of the problem to the implication of the thought experiment to real-world issues, and the solution through an objective analysis of the thought experiment. In other words, RonRon showed that when one fully grasps one’s struggle, such as in the case of the Lumad, there can be a seamless melding of the language of one’s people’s struggle and one’s position on SSIs.

Given all the answers detailed above, there were two participants who had difficulty in answering the thought experiments: Lina and Aubrey. Lina tried balancing the implications of the thought experiments to the two groups while thinking of protecting
the environment but still had difficulty sharing her thoughts, whereas Aubrey only argued that she just does not want to build the Green City because it will harm the environment without further elaborating on her answer. Again, this just shows the spectrum of positions and readiness of the students in addressing the complexity of a given thought experiment in terms of the students’ consciousness (Barrera et al., 2017; Freebersyser, 2015; Shudak & Avoseh, 2015).

Technology thought experiment

The goal of this third thought experiment is to observe among the research participants the ‘yuck factor’ or the wisdom of repugnance as formulated by Kass (1997) when confronted with new technology. The emotions shared by students ranged from stating the technology was different and not normal, being afraid because the fetus might die, shock, like my stomach is being tickled but did not feel repugnance, difficulty in explaining, to shock and amazement, touched, curious, and felt nothing much that it was OK. The reaction that might be nearest to repugnance is shock, but when these reactions are further analyzed in respect to their subsequent statements, the response is not of repugnance but of wonder. For example, Marikit responded that she was shocked because of how the lamb had become so big [developed], Thalia whose shock was rooted in caring as she wanted to know why the lamb was so small, then that of Aubrey who was afraid that the fetus might die, and Lina who was shocked at how much progress we have attained in terms of technology. Later on, through these responses, one will be able to observe the position of the students, especially of Lumad students, who have taken a curriculum framework that is anchored in nationalism, being scientific, and having a pro-people position.

Among the students, Miguel gave a greatly different response to the thought experiment compared to the other students. His response was centered on the value of the life of a possible human fetus if the same technology will be used on humans, almost mirroring the response of teacher Bella with regard to the value of human life to the Lumad.
Without sounding off and taking an antitechnology position, Miguel voiced his concern over the technology. His response was centered on the possible harm that the technology might bring to the child:

If this will be done to a person, then there is a tendency that the person will not be healthy. Because a normal development of a person [also arguing of being a person] is really from the womb of the mother. [translated]

This response shows how we can start to understand the initial and final position of Miguel with regard to the thought experiment but not to technology in general. He further argued that that is not how life should be developed because it is not normal; he felt pity towards the developing embryo. He then added that it will not be good to the developing embryo and possibly to a human embryo because it is abnormal, and he felt that the embryo would not have a good resistance or immunity. When asked theoretically if the technology is completely safe should the technology be used, he argued that there are those who are already poor who are not able to provide for their needs, how much more in accessing such technology to address their needs. He then mentioned other forms of technology that are already in use that can actually help, such as incubators, and then added that such technology (artificial womb) releases radiation.

Now, we can observe a more nuanced response on why Miguel is wary of new technologies because of their possible harms but does not hold an antitechnology stance; he is not completely averse to new technologies. His response to the thought experiment is mostly anchored on what is natural, which in this case is the central focus of this kind of thought experiment that uses the wisdom of repugnance. Even if he did not completely show his repugnance or revulsion to the technology, he takes a precautionary position even if the question was reformulated as the technology is theoretically safe. In his final statement, he argues that technologies have advantages and disadvantages, and that we cannot do away with technology as it is important in the advantages it provides to our lives.
Miguel, among the research participants, held the hardest stance against the artificial womb technology. Of the remaining participants, Lina and Aida gave responses in between the position of Miguel towards the technology and the other remaining research participants. Lina took a position that was in some ways similar to the position of Miguel towards such technology, namely that it should not be used. They had the same position towards the technology, yet where they differed was in their view of the technology, compared to Miguel; Lina had her opposition towards the technology because of possible harm it can bring to the poor due to issues around ownership and access:

For me, we should not create it because only a few will benefit and we also still do not know if it can cause harm to our body … if it will not cause any harm to our body but if it is … used for profit, we should not create it then as how about those people who cannot afford these things … [translated]

Both, even when the technology was qualified as safe for human use, strongly gave their opposition; whereas Miguel was opposed because of its health outcomes, Lina was opposed on the grounds of health outcomes but also ownership of the technology; Aida added to this position by arguing that we have to center our focus on health standards, that even with the development of such technologies, there will still be the presence of illness. She argued that we should not be absolutely reliant on technology, as there are other health issues that should be accounted for when we develop these kinds of technologies. This echoes the response of the Duterte regime to the COVID response where the only and primary response to the pandemic is through vaccine inoculation, a technology that can only address a portion of the problem. Contextually, in Aida’s response we see that even if there is some opposition towards technology, her position is against the absolute use of and reliance on technology without understanding its perils. The responses mostly reflect ethical class positions through issues of access, ownership, and profit, which shows that responses to the thought experiments can be without the characteristics of critical consciousness.
Meanwhile, the other students, as if reflecting their position from the drowning child thought experiment, argued that the technology is beneficial for human use but we should be wary of the ownership of such technologies. They put forward the position that our current problem with technology is not because technology is bad for us and for national minorities but because of the current issues that arise with its ownership. The problem of ownership for the students is rooted in the use of this technology to exploit the masses who need access to such technologies but are unable to obtain such access because of the exorbitant cost. It is, therefore, clear that the national minorities or the othered groups that the students represent are not anti-technology; rather, their position given the education they are engaged with is against the use of technology for the exploitation of the masses. As shared by Aubrey:

Those who have the money are the only ones who can use and the poor cannot use it. If the government made it … it is for privilege only, only those who have money, it will be exploitative. It is good if it is used for the good and benefit of everyone. But if only a few can use it, it is not good. If technology is used for the wrong things, like for the destruction of the environment, that is bad use of technology. But … we can say that something is good if it is used for the progress of everyone. [translated]

The political and economic nature of technology was discussed by Aubrey through her arguments on its ownership and access in relation to the cost that the technology will entail to those who do not have the financial capacity for its access. This position was also explored by Raymond in his argument that technology is good if it is used for the benefit of the many, such as is the case with farm tools and other agricultural technology, but it is bad if it is used for destructive use, such as for enriching the few, for instance through destructive mining that causes the hardship facing national minorities and others that are negatively affected. He further added:
… it is only for the self-interest of those who want to get rich. Of course, that kind of technology is destructive. [translated]

We see that the position of a Lumad student is not that of the primitive backward other (Fanon, 1967; Nandy, 1988); rather, through their education they are able to critically analyze a given problem that relates to SSI's inherent in technology. Students like Aubrey and Raymond, and even the three other students, were able to go beyond sloganeering against technology as they were able to relate it to their material conditions: the impact of new technology to their community and their struggle. The ethics on the use of technology is related to the power relationships related to the use and ownership of technology, which, as they argued, is rooted in politics and economics, a position which was further strengthened by the comment of Lorna:

Of course, sir, it [technology] is good; this is the reason why we are pushing for national industrialization for us to have modern technologies, example for agriculture and others. It [technology] is not bad; that is what I am saying, it is who controls and because those who control the technology become powerful.
[translated]

Then there were RonRon and Fe who gave a more nuanced answer during the thought experiment, and who at this point seem to have developed in themselves critical consciousness, based on their responses. RonRon asked about the impact of such technology on the health of the developing fetus later in its life but also addressed the nature of ownership of technology, while Fe, on the other hand, connected it to the other thought experiments, especially to the drowning child thought experiment. They did not address the thought experiment only as an issue of health and safety, but also in terms of its wider political and economic implications to the different groups of people – the owner of the technology and those who will access the technology. For RonRon the value of technology should be viewed through this lens:
It [technology] becomes right if it addresses the need, because in our current system if you do not have the money you will not receive any services. If you do not have the money you will not have access to this kind of technology. If that is the kind of technology that will be developed by us or in our world and it will not benefit the poor as those who can afford will have access to it. Those who can afford its services will be the ones who can use the technology. If the mindset of the creator is to benefit those who need it, then it will not be privatized, that will result in only a few using it, then it is right to create that technology. In terms of technology, it is not bad as technology develops in parallel with the development of society. It is not evil if it is for everyone. It only becomes evil if technology is used for plunder and when technology is used to trample on everyone’s human rights. If you are using technology not only for personal class interest but for everyone’s interest, then it is right to use technology. [translated]

The response of RonRon shows that the position towards such technology not only falls under the category of biological health and safety, but can also be argued in the context of politics and economics that touch on the issue of class interest (Lumbera et al., 2007; Marx & Engels, 2015; Sison, 1987). In his use of the word ‘plunder’, he differentiates the use of technologies from extractive industries that benefit the people and those that benefit only a few. It is plunder if technology is used to take away resources from their communities without benefitting them and, in turn, destroying their environment and their way of life. This response explores a deeper discussion that can go beyond the wisdom of repugnance that not only talks about the moral rightness and/or wrongness of the use of technology through the lens of biology but of a more complex socioscientific understanding of the problem. The students’ exposure to these kinds of discussion and interrelationships through their curriculum framework equipped them with a moral language that can connect to systemic issues that our society currently faces. The moral rightness and/or wrongness of technologies does not only rely on their possible positive or negative implications on an individual; it can take a collective form
that can address interrelated political, social, and economic parameters that show its direct relationship to ethics.

That was the position of Fe, who argued that we can use such technology if it can help a premature baby but then argued that what needs to be addressed is the context of the environment where such problems exist – the world the premature babies are born in. At first, it seems like she is arguing for unrelated issues as she contextualized the problem with environment, climate change, and capitalism’s impact upon climate change, but when she recalled the systemic problem with the drowning child thought experiment, it became clear that her position is not a position of sloganeering. Fe’s position is not a regurgitation of these ‘slogans’ on climate change and its doomsday scenarios; rather, her position is a complex progressive response to the deeper root of the problem. She argues that such technology is needed because of the current state of our environment, a position she takes naturally as it is anchored on her and her community’s historical struggle in safeguarding their environment. She sees the problem as a larger problem caused by a system that degrades the environment and its impacts can affect us negatively, such as in the case of a developing fetus that needs support technology that is controlled by the elite:

If there is no money, then, it will be really hard. It is the capitalist that owns those machines, right? So, it seems really hard … we really need to change the society so that everyone can access, so that the technology will be more advanced, like that. It will be for the good of all if it does not exploit, what exists right now, the technology that comes out today are owned by capitalists. So, if it is not owned by capitalists or by a few, if everyone can access it then it can be more beneficial. Technology can be beneficial because the society we are creating will create a more advanced technology especially technology for agriculture, for predicting typhoons … it is good if it helps in the development of society. If it is owned by people … if it is for everyone … but if it is owned by capitalists, they will be the only ones who will prosper. The experiments … are for the
advancement of personal interest. It is not useful if it is owned … we are not absolute, so it can be more useful if it is owned [by the majority], if everyone benefits from it. [translated]

Her class position, together with all the material conditions she experienced, was the foundation upon which her response stood. She sees the thought experiment not as an individual moral or ethical problem; rather, it is rooted in bigger systemic issues that are anchored on a system that is controlled by the elite few that exploit the many. Her position on technology clearly shows that if education is anchored on the primary struggle of the people, this will result in the development of a nationalist, scientific, and pro-people position among learners. The notion that national minorities like her are anti-technology is contradicted by her response to the thought experiment, in which she embraced the value of technology in terms of how we should use it, further pushing for the development and progress of our society. Fe’s response showed us that naming the world in their own terms, as Freire argued, is possible given an education that is anchored on their primary struggle and not through a colonizing education that relegates their history as a story for discussion. Their rich history is not only a backdrop of them being an object of ethical dilemmas; rather, it is a material condition that enriches their position on different issues. RonRon and Fe, at this point, seem to show the presence of critical consciousness that seamlessly melds ethical class positions in evaluating moral dilemmas, a reflection of the decolonized critical bioethics objective of this research.

Poverty, charity, and aid-giving thought experiment

The Lumad students’ responses vary from literal description of the photographs without further analysis to a more nuanced and critical analysis of the photographs used in this thought experiment. For the first photograph, two common responses emerged from the students: first, that the use of the photograph is wrong as it uses the child to elicit funds; and the second is that the use of the photograph is right as there is a need to secure
funding to help those who are struggling. The first response argues the moral wrongness of the act if it is used to exploit those in the photograph and the second response argues the moral rightness of the act if those in the photograph are not exploited but are rather assisted as a result of the use of the photograph. Most of the answers are focused on why is there a need to use the photograph of the child to raise funding for children in poorer countries. Also, a question emerged around whether the funds raised actually reach those who appear in the photographs or those for whom they are intended, mirroring the response of the volunteer teachers in the previous chapter.

Based on these responses on the first photograph, the responses of Thalia, Lorna, and Fe opened a different lens on how to view the photograph. For Thalia, she views the moral rightness of using the photograph in terms of how other people, especially with financial and material means, can support those who are suffering. She argues this position based on her experience of financial support from individuals and groups who are in solidarity with their struggle. The moral rightness of the act is not viewed through the lens of those who might exploit the fundraising activity, but rather on the act of truthfully serving the marginalized, oppressed, and exploited. Lorna added to this position when she argued that the act is wrong if it is used for individuals or groups to earn from donations but also added their experience of raising funds for their needs in their bakwit [evacuation]:

For us, it seems like the same case in the use of our pictures voluntarily; it is disseminated for fund raising but we directly receive it. But if it is like this, sir, if there are cases that uses the children, it is like … if it will really go to the children or for the benefit of the children because the children are the ones really affected by these situations. [translated]

Based on the position of Lorna on why such an act can be right, for her they are not exploited in the process and in the act of raising funds because they know how the
funds are being used in their campaigns while they are in the Bakwit school. On the other hand, Fe, who is trying to address the thought experiment through a move away from idealism or the abstract nature of the question, provided this argument:

The situation of the child was not really shown in the picture, as it was only able to show people who are lining up for rice. [translated]

She added that she cannot completely comprehend the situation:

It seems I cannot fully understand why is there a need to ask for help if they do not show … how will the people help if they do not show the real condition of the child? [translated]

The response of Fe shows the value of the material conditions in the lives of the othered, that even if thought experiments try to capture the essence of the material conditions of the agents in the thought experiment there is still a need for, or value in, its materiality. On one level, the thought experiment seems to be incomprehensible to Fe as it fails to show the material condition of those that are being portrayed in the photograph. The language that the students used in this thought experiment is based on their experience that is related to the use of the photograph for fundraising. As a result, they do not immediately discredit the act as they are also active participants in raising funds for their day-to-day needs in their Bakwit school; their responses qualified the need for such an activity and they do not say that it is completely wrong. This is important to note, as some of the former bioethics students in the next chapter manifest different responses compared to the Lumad students.

For the second photograph, when asked if it represents the plight or condition of the Filipino child, this position emerged: Yes, the photograph represents the Filipino child, a child born into poverty, as this is the Lumad youth’s own experience such as it relates to their evacuation and their marginalization as a national minority. What the students saw
in the photograph is how it reflects their current condition; for instance, Jose related the photograph to how they had been displaced from their communities that resulted in their relocation to urban city centers. Thalia agreed in this assessment, as she argued that they are not the only ones who are suffering in the city centers but a lot of youth that are not able to go to school suffer the same conditions. Raymond, on the other hand, added the root cause of the problem, the system that forces not only the youth out of school, the parents who cannot farm their land, but also the ‘petib’ or middle class who cannot continue with their work. These responses, at the minimum, show a naïve consciousness as they indicate that the students understand the reason behind their current predicament (Freire, 1973, 2012; Homer, 2011; Lodge, 2021). Another position was relayed by Lorna, Fe, RonRon, and Aida that adds to the response of Raymond, namely that the systemic problem is caused by those in power in the Philippine government and an Imperialist country like Australia. For their part, Lorna and Fe asked: Why does Australia want to help a country like the Philippines, specifically its youth, when it might also be facing the same problems with the conditions of its own youth? Lorna stated:

The condition in Australia and the Philippines are the same. Just like for us, the youth there are also suffering; perhaps that is what the youth around the world is experiencing. Everything is connected. [translated]

And this response provided by Fe, is presented unshortened to do justice to the breadth of the position she is making:

Australia is an Imperialist country, right? Australia, has a lot of money, right? Example, in the ‘help children in the Philippines’ it seems you can observe the situation of the youth here, and then there are things that are written. So, it seems like … for example the children, it is … it is right that all children should be able to experience, they should experience being children as there are a lot who do not enjoy their youth. But then how will they respond to this [Australia], right?
How will they, ‘help children in the Philippines?’ How? Will they just help, like make them experience being children? How about the next generation; will it be the same like this? Will they call for help again? Will it be like this that the cycle is like this? Because Australia is also one of those that cause our struggle, right? So, it seems that it is very ironic. I thought of the child in our community, in other communities, and in our own communities, and those children whom we see on the sidewalks, the homeless, when we are part of a rally. It seems quite heavy, painful; why is the condition of the children like that? They should not experience that, right? No one should be sleeping on the sidewalks, everyone should have a house, right? In the … the children in the picture … they should not be lining up to beg for rice. I got more agit [agitated]; we really need to change the society, there is still need to struggle for the next, the next generations should not experience this. Then the countries like Australia, they will become more responsible in addressing the needs of the youth, not just through those funding activities … Yes, this reflects the state of the youth, but also the people do not see … the Philippines is poor, right? The Philippines is a third world country, we are part of third world countries. It also reflects the contradiction in our society, we are rich in resources, but the people are in poverty; the Philippines is rich but its people are struggling. It also shows how useless the state is in addressing the needs of the children in providing their basic rights. Because if the state properly addresses the needs of the children, why is there a need to call for help? Why do those propaganda exist? It is because of the complete failure of the state to address the needs of the children that those things exist. That is why we should not just change what is shown in the pictures, but the system, the society.

[translated]

We can add the statement of RonRon, who has taken almost the same critique to the current system but directed his response at those in power in the Philippines:
Why don’t they, why does the government fail to address the [needs] of the children, as the government itself should address how to make its youth productive? This should be the concept; the youth should not be disregarded which will be the source of the next generation of the country, the youth. Those in power now will die anyway; who will be next in line? The youth. If you do not equip the youth with the necessary knowledge in our society or the necessary knowledge in the world, then they will not be productive. That is why the Lumad school provided … it taught the Lumad youth their value in this society. Their value in the future. We were taught that there is a need for us to actively participate in what is happening in our society. This government is negligent towards its youth; it has not done anything except to steal, plunder the country’s coffers. That instead of giving it to the youth that needs education the most, instead it gave … it funded the AFP [Armed Forces of the Philippines] whose only purpose is to cause harm to the Lumad youth. There, instead of funding in this time of the pandemic, instead of addressing this kind of crisis, this is not being addressed, it tries to address this so-called terrorism. But this should be prioritized, this current problem [COVID pandemic]. [translated]

In these last two responses, we are able to observe how the students are able to connect different cases to the same problem that the thought experiment is trying to address. They did not stay within the issue of how they can relate to the photograph representing the plight of the Filipino child; rather, they also started asking critical questions on why the child is in that condition. For Fe, she is trying to look to the future when she asked the question regarding for whom the help in intended and if this addresses the current problem of the youth in terms of experiencing their childhood, and importantly: Will this be the same for the next generation? Again, her response is a critique of a system that might not be able to address the needs of the people as they stay within the superficial boundaries of responding to the problem. The same can be said of the response of RonRon, when he argued how schools like the Lumad schools showed and made Lumad youth grasp their value in our society. He reiterated how the
government failed the youth through their plunder of the country’s coffers and corruption, that, instead of investing in the education of the youth, the government channeled these resources to the armed forces that militarize the community of the Lumad youth. These show, again, that there are students who have the capacity to respond to the thought experiment even beyond the initial intention of the thought experiment. They are able to relate it to their experience and to the interconnectedness of our world and how this contribute to the poverty and other conditions that the youth are experiencing. In this case, the students show their ability to respond beyond the limit-situation of the thought experiment and showed how they will name the world, in their own terms, in making the society address the basic democratic rights of the youth.

RonRon also added this position, that, if the photograph was intended to represent his situation, for him it does not represent his condition or situation:

We do not ask, we actively fight for it. Because if you say you are only asking and if you are not doing anything but only to ask, the government will not give your needs. You have to struggle for it. It is like a quote given by an old philosopher, “You will not wait for your needs to be given to you; you have to struggle for it first, you just do not have to ask for it you have to act on it”. Asking for your needs will not address the needs of your community in your society.

[translation]

For the last question of the thought experiment on what is the meaning of charity or helping, from the different explanations of the students it can be summarized through the words ‘struggle’ or ‘collective action’. There is commonality among their answers which centers on how people struggle in achieving their basic needs and rights through collective action. This collective struggle is not only intended for their own benefit as a marginalized, oppressed, and exploited group. For them, their struggle is also the struggle of other basic sectors of our society; as such, to act on their struggle is to act on the struggle of everyone. Their struggle for their right to education is a struggle for
the fight for everyone’s right to basic education. Fe added, *makiahum sa kahimtang*, which means to adapt to the prevailing conditions and stated:

You have to adapt to the prevailing conditions; how will you be able to help if you do not know the problem? Then you will not know how to address the issues. The word ‘helping’ is a great responsibility; we do not do it because it is only our responsibility, or it is the nature of man to help others. That you will not expect of something in exchange or anything. We will analyze the conditions on how we will be able to address it collectively. [translated]

In this thought experiment, the Lumad students showed their own conception of poverty, charity, and aid-giving. This is not just based on the dominant use of these words in current discourses but based on how they view them based on their experiences. In the case of charity and aid-giving, they do not necessarily subscribe to the dominant act of charity and aid-giving as they might be subjected to the acts of charity and aid-giving but they are wary of others who use these for unknown gain. They are very critical of institutions that ask and provide charity and aid, as this might be used for these institutions’ own gain. Also, the students even connected this act of charity to the Imperialist motive of other countries, that those people, such as children, are being used as a medium to extract different values for transactional exchanges that might become exploitative. By extension, this can be seen in their conception of helping, one that centers on the value of collective action or response which has become the general position of the different responses of the students to the different thought experiments.

Thus, this chapter explored the lens that the Lumad students are using in responding to the problems they encounter, whether the questions directly address their material condition or are abstract situations such as thought experiments or moral dilemmas. The Lumad students’ material conditions that are explored and addressed by the MMS/NSMOE curriculum framework further developed an inherent decolonized critical bioethical language that also helped in the development of a critical consciousness.
among the students. This critical consciousness is anchored in their struggle for the defense of their ancestral lands and right for self-determination. And Fanon’s conception of morality of the colonized through the responses of the Lumad students is contextualized below:

As far as the native is concerned, morality [ethics] is very concrete; it is to silence the settler’s defiance, to break his flaunting violence – in a word, to put him out of the picture. (Fanon, 1991, p. 44)

In the lens of this research, this is the ethics of resistance of the colonized against the dominating and subjugating violent ethics of the ruling class which will be further explored in the next chapter. The responses of the Lumad students showed that they hold an ethics that is different from the dominant group and this ethics resists the dominating and violent ethics of the ruling elite in their wars of extinction against the Lumad and other national minorities. Lastly, not all students were able to manifest critical consciousness and a class-based ethical position, either together or separately in their responses; this should not be seen as being to the detriment of a curriculum that touches on critical pedagogy and decolonization. Rather, it is important to note that even with the difficulties that the Lumad communities and the Lumad school faced, some students were still able to show very complex responses, when critical consciousness and ethical class positions were present, in responding to the different questions asked of them.
Chapter 7 Bioethics education, critical pedagogy, and postcoloniality in a special science high school in the Philippines

Reflection on a decolonized critical bioethics education in a Special Science High School science elective

This chapter examines the responses of my former bioethics students who had taken a bioethics elective framed as a decolonized critical bioethics course in its embryonic or early stages. At that point, the students were the second batch of students who had taken the elective; thus, some of the minor issues encountered in its inaugural implementation had already been addressed. Just like the responses of the Lumad school volunteer teachers (Chapter 5) and the Lumad students (Chapter 6), the class-based ethical positions of my former bioethics students were deduced from the students’ responses to theoretical bioethical issues through the different thought experiments that were posed. A question that can be posed is “why is there a need to include this third group of respondents in the study?”; the answer is to do with how I view the oppressor-oppressed dichotomy as a spectrum that is hierarchical (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Diemer et al., 2016; Gates, 2011; Stańczyk, 2021). The inclusion of these former bioethics students is not only because of their direct experience of the course and its framework; more importantly, it is because of the privilege appropriated by their class position, as argued by Diemer et al. (2016, p. 219):

… establishing CC [critical consciousness] as a construct among more privileged people may necessitate revising or expanding core tenets. Whether a more privileged person develops CC – or develops the capacity to act as an ally to more marginalized people – involves more than semantics. More privileged people would not develop CC about their own oppression (except when personal social identities that are more marginalized are involved), but rather about the oppression of others—and about how their own privilege is maintained through others’ oppression.
Privilege is a qualifier attached to those who inhabit the oppressor group (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Diemer et al., 2016; Freebersyser, 2015; Frueh, 2020; Gates, 2011) in critical pedagogy studies. I think this identifier also captures the position of the students in this chapter, especially, through the lens of the oppressor-oppressed dichotomy in critical pedagogy. Conveniently, in terms of postcoloniality, this position of privilege has implication for the consciousness of the students as a group that manifests a form of double-consciousness (hooks, 1990), living a dual-world (Rentmeester, 2012), or a hybridized (Young, 2003) existence, or an unhomeliness (Bhabha, 2004), as an in-between group in the hierarchy of oppression. As discussed in Chapter 2, this is the problem with the oppressor-oppressor dichotomy in the critical pedagogy of Freire as the vagueness of this dichotomy can lead to the sidestepping of blame (Frueh, 2020), which might be integral to critical pedagogy but unclear about whom are we blaming for the oppression. Alternatively, it can lead to a better clarification of the privilege identifier (Allen & Rossatto, 2009) but is still focused on the centrality of identity which does not resolve the issue of vagueness of the oppressed-oppressor dichotomy. A more nuanced analysis of this dichotomy is accepting that class plays a central role in oppression (Gates, 2011), as the distribution of labor and its exploitation is dependent on the order and structure of our society.

The vagueness of the oppressor-oppressed dichotomy is a product of “withdrawing from … issues of social classes in general and class struggle in particular from both public discourse in general and social studies discourse in particular” (Stańczyk, 2021, p. 6). Furthermore, Malott (2017) argues that anticommunism has entrenched itself in critical pedagogy as a function of imperialism’s counteroffensive against different communist movements which resulted in the shift away from class analysis and class struggle. As a result, critical pedagogy is powerless in its analysis when “faced [with] the problems of social stratification and omnipresent exploitation” (Stańczyk, 2021, p. 9). This research is not focused on resolving these critiques of critical pedagogy; rather, I accept these critiques and am conscious of the theoretical weakness of critical pedagogy in addressing the research questions of this research. This is the role that the
class-based analysis of postcoloniality of Fanon plays, especially in this chapter, as previous works on postcoloniality (Bhabha, 2004; hooks, 1990; Rentmeester, 2012; Young, 2003) could have been used to describe the world and the worldview of the students. The limitations of the oppressed-oppressor dichotomy can result in researchers sidestepping blame (Frueh, 2020), or when the value of class analysis is clear but the researcher still subscribes to the oppressed-oppressor dichotomy, they might push for solidarity among the oppressed but might commit the error of grouping middle-class and upper-class as oppressors (Allen & Rossatto, 2009). In short, critical pedagogy is important in the analysis of the existence of critical consciousness and whether this was influenced by the experiences of the students through the materiality of their class consciousness.

*Bioethics elective as a culture circle in developing critical consciousness*

To foster critical consciousness among Brazilian peasants, Freire used a pedagogical practice called the culture circle where “participants … identify and build awareness of the conditions and causes of social, cultural, and political inequality … [where participants] develop literacy skills while making them aware of sociocultural and sociopolitical marginalization and oppression – that is, to read the word while also reading the world” (Diemer et al., 2016, p. 218). In this case, the bioethics elective is a form of culture circle (Freebersyser, 2015; Freire, 2012; Homer, 2011; Stańczyk, 2021), which aimed at developing social, cultural, and political literacy among a group of privileged students, who benefit from the current order and structure in a semi-colonial and semifeudal society. The responses of the students below provide a snapshot of their ethical positions when they took the elective as a privileged group, or as members of the oppressor as loosely defined by different studies (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Diemer et al., 2016; Freebersyser, 2015; Frueh, 2020; Gates, 2011).
To illustrate whether critical reflection, motivation, and action (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016) were fostered among the students, the response of some of the students, such as Samuel, captured this when he shared that the elective was a stimulus to him to be political, what he termed “baby activism”. He was part of a localized protest that members of the class initiated against the burial of the late dictator in the country’s National Heroes Cemetery, as will be further discussed later. He added that the experience stuck with him especially in shaping how he thinks, feels about politics, and the world around him. He further shared the value of contextualizing the different ethical dilemmas in science to real world situations, especially on research involving humans that he sees has implications for him, coming from a Special Science High School which makes him a “scientist-in-training”. For him, the elective was instrumental in his political consciousness, which shows that he sees the intersection between ethics and politics as a product of the elective.

Kylie on the other hand remembers how the subject was instrumental in her developing her own code of ethics or morality as she shared how she now questions situations unlike before when she used to easily accept them. She also shared that it developed her critical thinking (Árnason, 2015) that when she is in a certain situation like, “OK I think this is it, because I feel it’s right” [translated] is not only solely based on her instincts. This is the kind of self-reflection and critical reflection (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016) that Freire argued is formed among learners when they start to develop their critical consciousness (Freire, 2012). Pedro also shared the development of critical thinking as a result of taking the elective, as exemplified by his very strong position against abortion when it was introduced in the class, even arguing against the whole class and not becoming part of the ‘bandwagon’ of accepting the merits of abortion in place of his personal moral position. For him, this was a result of developing in him his critical thinking skills, as he shared that:
You will always ask or look at different perspectives and dissect the good, the pros and the cons, not always like usually we deem right for the majority since we usually accept that. [translated]

He also differentiated the class from his other subjects like mathematics, where the number of practices to arrive at a specific answer can become instinctual (Pearse & Walton, 2011), unlike, in bioethics it developed in him a sense of reflexivity (Árnason, 2015; Hedgecoe, 2004; Parker, 1995). Categorically, these responses do not show that the students already developed in them critical consciousness in the sense that Freire (2012) formulates and differentiates it from naïve and magical consciousness. At best, the responses show a naïve consciousness (Freebersyser, 2015; Freire, 2012), where the students are able to identify and reflect on the cause of possible wrongs in societal problems but did not identify how to resolve such social problems.

Meanwhile, for Diane, she sees science and its value after taking the elective as not only for science’s sake and it is not about “Oh, I will do this because I will create results ...” [translated], and she sees the underlying issues as they have repercussions for human research participants. Just like the other students, she shared how the subject influenced her to develop critical thinking where before she never tried questioning existing material conditions (Stańczyk, 2021). She was able to apply this in questioning situations in her everyday life like why she experiences being trapped in heavy road traffic: “Why is it when there is heavy traffic there are a lot of cars; why are there a lot of cars in the first place?” [translated]. This capacity to see beyond the current status quo, which she correlated to her taking the bioethics elective, amazes her as this leads her to more questions that she tries to answer, which might signal the presence of a naïve consciousness. Lastly, for her the most important lesson she learned in class is its application in everyday situations such as in her way of thinking and way of communicating. She further commented on this as she discussed the value of language such as in Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino Psychology):
Sikolohiyang Pilipino [Filipino Psychology] should be a liberating form of psychology; it was developed in me … it was instilled in me the idea that the concepts you have right now, the prevailing like … it is not really appropriate for Philippine settings because they have things that they experience that are not experienced by others … there are phenomena that one cannot explain here … so it feels like we import their concepts; it overshadows and imprisons our culture and it is put aside. Every time we import Western psychology into our culture it further instills colonial mentality in us. It is good that we have started this movement on Sikolohiyang Pilipino but then it still has alignment to the Western psychology. [translated]

The above statement shows the depth of understanding on issues and the value of language from a student who has taken a decolonized critical bioethics class that is deliberate and conscious in its language and framework. The role of language in communicating liberation in terms of psychology and the appropriateness of the language that fails to capture the lived realities of the people in the Philippines was evident in her statement. This is the clearest manifestation of articulating the objective of the bioethics curriculum from a student and its intersection with the core objective of the general curriculum with regard to ethical understanding, global perspective, and scientific literacy (see Chapter 2).

We have seen this from the previous chapter; through their inherent language of ethics of resistance, the Lumad students were able to address the different thought experiments based on their lived reality that is informed by their historical struggle. Meanwhile, the responses of the former bioethics students on the development of critical thinking mirrors the responses of the volunteer teachers and Lumad students on the influence of the Lumad schools in raising their awareness and consciousness in analyzing their society. The responses on critical thinking shown by the former bioethics students respond to the points on critical bioethics by Árnason (2015) and their developing worldview on critical pedagogy by Carrillo (2007). The different responses of
the students, who are from a privileged position, can be argued to provide a snapshot of a developing consciousness from naïve to critical (Heberle et al., 2020; Jemal, 2017), as their responses showed critical reflection, motivation, and action (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016), but, like the other two group of participants, some students tend to revert to their class position in their response. Diane is one such example, as most of her responses stayed within the academic boundary of the questions that were asked of her. In a way, Diane is more privileged among the students as exemplified by her enrolment in New York University, which could have played a role in her social reality that influenced her consciousness. This is the point that Stańczyk (2021) made in his critique of critical pedagogy, that consciousness has to be anchored to materiality, and not only through abstract conditions from a liberal capitalist education.

Decolonized critical bioethics education through the lens of former bioethics students

The section above has shown evidence on the development of a decolonized critical bioethics among the former bioethics students. Clearest among its manifestation is the language of liberation shared by Diane that reflects on the domination of colonizing countries of the colonized through “culture, values, techniques” (Fanon, 1991, p. 44) through the dominance of their language in academia such as in psychology. The realization of Diane that Sikolohiyang Pilipino represents a move in the right direction in using its own language to define what Filipino psychology is is an act against the Imperialist or the oppressor’s naming of the world (Freire, 2012). This section will now explore more deeply if this language exists among the bioethics students and if it exists will they be able use it in analyzing and addressing the different thought experiments, introduced later in the chapter?

Whether sharing that their favorite thought experiment is the drowning child or any one of the trolley problems, or moral dilemmas which involve the discussion of euthanasia, abortion, or suicide, what was clear in what they shared was the importance of grounding these theoretical concepts in reality (Stańczyk, 2021). An instance is when
Samuel shared about what he liked about the drowning child thought experiment, namely that we should connect thought experiments to real life situations or look at them through the lens of societal issues and their roots. Kylie took the same line of thought in arguing for the drowning child thought experiment:

I do not know if empathy is the right word … because you are able to situate yourself in the situation, so it feels like you understand it better. Sometimes it is more confusing because you are dealing with your emotions, your own opinions … you cannot separate yourself because, you cannot separate yourself from your morals and ethics of the things. So, it seems helpful to study in that way where you are inserted in the situation that is not separate. Because I think I remember that we discussed that it is hard if you do not … if you are far from what you are studying … you are not … you are above it. You have to engage or ground yourself. [translated]

In this case empathy and grounding the self when it comes to discussing ethics or morals touches on the value of Freire’s (2012) critical pedagogy. And when Fanon (1991) talked about how the colonizers view the colonized as the manifestation of evil in his book *The Wretched of the Earth*, he argued that the colonists view the colonized as incapable of being moral agents. He stated:

As if to show the totalitarian character of colonial exploitation the settler paints the native as a sort of quintessence of evil. Native society is not simply described as a society lacking in values. It is not enough for the colonist to affirm that those values have disappeared from, or still better never existed in, the colonial world. The native is declared insensible to ethics; he (sic) represents not only the absence of values, but also the negation of values. He is, let us dare to admit, the enemy of values, and in this sense he is the absolute evil. (Fanon, 1991, p. 40)
In this case, Kylie agrees with Fanon, as the colonized is capable of ethics and this is reflected through her response on empathy and being grounded or being materially engaged as the language of ethics of the colonized. Furthermore, if applied in current bioethics education, this exists in the way that the Western language of bioethics erases the grounded or material language of ethics of the colonized (Barugahare, 2019; Shahvisi, 2019; Wong et al., 2021). This exists, as Kylie explained, perhaps somewhat indirectly, through the theoretical and abstract nature of thought experiments and moral dilemmas. Samuel agrees in this conception of lessons in bioethics that are dominated by Western thought in sharing this:

> If we are just talking about the philosophy, ethics, the theory it would be intellectual masturbation, something like that. Ethics is something often confusing and the readings have many, the language is flowery … [partially translated]

For him, the current formulation of ethics is very confusing because of the language, a colonial language, that is being used that sometimes only leads to intellectual or academic discussions that do not address the material conditions of those whose realities are being debated (Barugahare, 2019; Shahvisi, 2019; Wong et al., 2021). These realities become the currency for ethical debates, thus giving rise to the argument in this research that ethical discussions are commodified ethical transactions for the benefit of those who control those ethical transactions. Janice also agrees with Samuel’s argument, as she sees that ethical principles, philosophies and guidelines can be isolated from real life and that she can only think outside the boundary of the thought experiments if she puts herself in the problem itself (Jaycox, 2012). She also sees that some problems in the thought experiments themselves are the questions that are being asked, a function of the current narrowness of the language of bioethics or the discourse in the current dominant formulation of bioethics. This is again a manifestation of dissecting the impact of language in bioethics education, as thought experiments are dependent on the formulation of the questions being asked and the lens used by the
agent who formulated those questions (Barugahare, 2019; Jaycox, 2012). Building on this response, for Randolph:

So, it wasn't just questioning the motivations of a person to act but also what are the circumstances that lead to that situation. An individual still needs to decide, instead of preventing those situations. [partially translated]

That Randolph was able to include other factors or parameters to the questions of the thought experiment shows the student’s capacity to go beyond what was being asked. We can argue here that the students view the thought experiments as Freire’s (2012) limit-situation imposed by those in power, that the formulation of the questions are the boundaries or limit-situations that the colonized are made to answer. These limit-situations prevent them from naming their world and only allow them to exist through the lens of those who formulated the thought experiments. Jacob agrees in this assessment:

I think personally it is not enough that it is only through the thought experiment because our experiences do not happen in a vacuum. Thought experiments are also based on our experience, so it is good if we connect the thought experiments, if not real-life cases, perhaps in wider social issues, probably. Just to contextualize what is the use of thought experiment. [translated]

Based on his response above, he sees that the individual’s experiences that thought experiments try to capture do not exist in a vacuum. For him, thought experiments originated from a material condition such as real-life cases that are connected to wider social issues; thus, the need for contextualization of thought experiments.

Then there are other students who view the thought experiments in terms of structures that are created by a system that can lead to violence against the othered group, their marginalization, oppression, and exploitation (Fanon, 1967, 1991; Freire, 2012; hooks,
This bears similarity to what Diane shared, as she argued about the existence of the puddle of mud in the drowning child thought experiment. She asks the questions why those problems materialize in the first place, why are there structures that contribute to its existences and added the question, “What is the problem with the puddle but then you also have to question why is there a puddle in the first place?” [translated]. Indira shared these sentiments in evaluating other thought experiments like the trolley problems as she sees that any such formulation entails the oppression of an oppressed group by an oppressor group (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Freire, 2012; Gates, 2011). Kenneth added to this question in asking why the trolley exists in the first place: “Why does this whole system of like the trolley having to run over people, why does it even exist?” [translated]. As we can see, whether it is the drowning child or the trolley problems, the students are going beyond the boundaries or limit-situations that were set in these thought experiments, possibly providing evidence of development of individual critical consciousness (Carrillo, 2007; Freire, 2012) through critical reflection (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016). They are using words like majority versus minority, oppressed versus oppressor, oppressive system and structures that are not usually within the language of bioethics (Jaycox, 2012). Diane beautifully summed this up in this statement that at some point there is a need to start talking about topics that affect people, that are social issues. Thought experiments that are rooted in Western thought fail to address the material conditions of those who are the subject of the ethical debates within the thought experiment:

The material conditions in the theoretical thought experiment are so pristine and back up those thought experiments, but if you try to ground it in the social reality ... what will you do if it does not work, just disregard it? That is not how reality works; things in the world are very intersectional, that if you do not practice arguing in considering all these material conditions ... you will find it difficult to consider all of these things. [translated]
This statement of Diane, “material conditions in the theoretical thought experiment are so pristine and back up those thought experiments”, showed how detached thought experiments are and in saying “back up” she is arguing that thought experiments serve themselves. The questions in the thought experiments were formulated to support the thought experiments, and if these thought experiments are not able to go beyond their theoretical or Western nature, then they only serve the interests of the group that formulated those thought experiments (Barugahare, 2019; Dörr Zegers, 1989; Shahvisi, 2019). Thus, if it fails to address issues of oppression, systems, and structures that perpetuate the existing oppression, then it only serves the oppression of othered group by an oppressor group hiding behind the ‘pristine’ theoretical thought experiments.

She further added to this argument:

For example, if you tried to interview and create a solution for something but the practice was if this is the condition then this is what should happen, you will be shocked when you arrive at a reality that, “oh no! I did not expect that it has this, that … you will find it difficult to work”. So, for me, yes, it is important to differentiate the different kinds of thinking so that we can sharpen our critical thinking process but then we need to incorporate, or you have to start thinking about the material conditions of the people you are trying to get to know. It is not only pristine; just like the trolley (problem), the variables always change. [translated]

Through a different formulation, Diane tried to explain how current thought experiments or moral dilemmas try to lead us to arrive at a certain answer or solution. But as she argued, the thought experiments do not exist that way in reality as our material conditions create the different variables that contextualize these thought experiments. In a way, she is arguing that thought experiments and moral dilemmas are ethical boundaries or limit-situations created around a certain material condition to perpetuate a certain idea or thought. In this case, it tries to perpetuate a highly Western idea or
thought as current bioethics education is highly influenced by Western thoughts (Jarvis, 2017; Jaycox, 2012; Nie, Li, et al., 2018).

From the responses above we are able to observe the position and the language used by the students in responding to the interview question. Without directly stating it, the students are able to touch on issues such as oppression, vulnerable groups, hierarchical and violent structures, and boundaries or limit-situations. However, compared to the Lumad students and the volunteer teachers, the bioethics students did not contextualize the problems in education as a product of Capitalism, Imperialism, collaboration between local elites and their foreign counterparts, land struggle, and other related issues. The three groups of research respondents are able to touch on the same issues of social injustice in a colonized country like the Philippines but do not use the same language. Diane’s response, compared to the other bioethics students, is nearest in position to those of the Lumad students and volunteer teachers in seeing Western hegemony (Barugahare, 2019) as an influencing factor in the current formulation of education. Unlike the Lumad students and volunteer teachers, she touched on the issue of the hegemony of Western epistemology through a generalized statement about the influence of the discipline and the source of theoretical foundation of bioethics education. In contrast, for the Lumad students and volunteer teachers there is a clear qualification: the West, which can be understood as constituting Imperialist countries that bring with them the violent nature of colonization in different forms to other countries, dictates the current form of education and society the colonized are living in.

*From theory to praxis, translating classroom learning to critical action*

In the second section of this chapter, I mentioned that Samuel shared his first ‘taste’ of what he termed “baby activism” as a function of his enrolment to the elective. I will argue that the students exhibit critical action (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016; Freire, 2012) in different forms: from their activism, then in initiating a protest, those who
continued to be part of youth activist groups, to how they dissect the news and different issues they encounter, and embody their school’s mantra of ‘serve the people’.

In the case of Jacob, he shared the same sentiments as the other students in saying that he is able to see connections among issues where it superficially seems there are none. He shared how the class opened his eyes to activities that might seem innocuous, such as voluntourism, that in the first instance help the community financially, but then saw that it can lead to some form of human tours and tourist enterprise. On the other hand, Kenneth argued that it is his worldview that was influenced by bioethics, and in the case of Samuel, this worldview led him to “become like an activist or almost an activist” [translated] as he still does not consider himself an activist. In naming the world around them, they will then side with the group that they think an activist will be working with, noting here that the word activist in the Philippines is usually attributed to left-leaning activism.

Rene, on the other hand, who somewhat mirrors the response of Samuel in terms of being an activist, added to it through a more specific response by being part of a youth activist organization that is aligned to National Democratic Mass Organizations in his university. These organizations have a clear ideological line that is anchored in the material conditions which is dialectical to the Philippine social order and the ensuing class struggle (Gates, 2011; Harvey, 2007; Simbulan, 1965/2005; Sison, 1987; Stańczyk, 2021; Villegas, 2009). He represented this through how he sees the interplay of power dynamics in society, not just in the medical field:

Like in every relationship between, in every interaction between two or more people there will always be like power imbalance and in that class that I realized it, “huh right, it is not just in like medical settings like doctor-patient or researcher-subject, but literally like everything else”. The whole … working in society that … maybe that is where I started the path to becoming more socially aware about different issues in society. [translated]
Unlike the first few responses, Rene showed a greater command of the language in his response, showing how he understands the current dynamic in society that exists, the power relationships, and the ideological line that he takes in responding to those realities. Following Rene’s line of response, Randolph expounded more on this; below is his statement on how he thinks the elective influenced him and his classmates, then and now:

Before we had gone out of Grade 10 ... gone out of the bioethics class, we already wanted to apply what we learned. And it is not only limited to the content of the curriculum. I think it was important in the sense that it taught us to think critically because during that time I was more inclined ... teenagers who like to think of themselves cool, like real politics ... it feels like after bioethics I tend to ask if things ought to be like this? Is it ethical; is it right what is happening in the current situation? And if not, what are the things that can be changed and how can it be changed, if ever? I don’t think ... I don’t see doing the same things if I did not take bioethics in [former high school]. I might have not joined AY [Agham Youth], I might have not joined student council last year; if I have not taken bioethics, it is easier to ... instead of doing some critical thinking. Because if you do it, there is always the possibility that you are wrong; it was influential, certainly. [translated]

His response is quite rich in that he was able to show that one can go beyond the limits of a given situation such as in the case of the written curriculum (Kelly, 2004) of the bioethics class, that one is not imprisoned by an assumed reality just because it exists, addressing Freire’s conception of a limit-situation. The understanding of a complex world is anchored in issues of politics, ethics, social change, reflexivity, and positionality, being part of an organization with specific sets of ideologies and principles for the benefit of the Filipino masses, not just for sloganeering (Freire, 2012). His response and with the comment of Diane below expand on the responses of Samuel,
Rene, and Randolph and clearly show the influence of the bioethics class that is reflected within the language that Diane uses. In her lengthy response below, which I chose not to shorten, she shows her command and breadth of a decolonized critical bioethics language:

It is encouraging you to think more critically; it is not just we study science so you can have good grades, you start to like science because this is its real interpretations in the future, this is how you can use it. Like there are actually people who get affected by it. It is not just x controlled experiment that feels like you can control all the variables. I feel this is what was emphasized when we talked about the different experiment during the third quarter. Even though they wanted to get that data what was in exchange of it … I feel like it was my foundation on starting to speak up more about social issues. Even though it took me a while, about two years, before I became really vocal or more vocal compared to before, it was still an important milestone in my life to have taken the class. It taught me that it is OK, like right now you don’t know everything but that does not mean you cannot question other people’s point of view. That initially you are really curious about their line of thinking, that you can ask them about it without being rude; you can ask them, you can actually learn from their point of view from their perspective. You can add it to your repertoire of knowledge … for example, you have a conversation with this person or this person, it seems it was instilled in me, or I was encouraged to converse or to have discourse with people more. Maybe it is only now that it was politicized because it seems like you can have discourses … you can have conversations that you wouldn’t fear … they are not ad hominem attacks, they are evidence-based discourse. It is actually nice; it seems your discussions are thoughtful and not just running in circles. And then … that is the effect on me. Now, it seems the important question was why is it this is what is happening? Like why is there a puddle in the first place, will just go back to why is this … why is this our current material conditions? The important question to ask because it keeps you
interested in the current situation of our country and how did things become bad, how did we … every time I think that it is difficult to trace back how things got this bad … I find myself that, “Oh, there is an ED [Educational Discussion] about this” and “Oh, there are readings about this”. My curiosity … that is not just to accept things at face value … that if I read something that feels off about this. For me, it is important to have a wider … why is this the material conditions. And sometimes I feel sad if there is a thought experiment; my first impression is why is it like that … why did it reach this situation? Then they will say that it is the way it is; it seems like a pristine word. I get annoyed or I am not satisfied with that kind of answer that I can’t … I find it difficult to argue if you are not applying it to the real world, that if you think the world is so pure and just change one variable then everything will be OK; it is not like that … [partially translated]

In different instances Diane was able to use this language in explaining her position or how she thinks the elective influenced her. From how the elective developed her critical thinking, in seeing people as human agents, a lens that separates itself from the dehumanizing or subhumanizing view of the oppressors of oppressed groups, in finding her voice to name her world, to be in a dialogue with other people or groups of people, in becoming political, in going beyond the questions from thought experiments, reiterating the value of one’s material condition, and a move from naïve consciousness to critical consciousness. In the last part of her response, being discontented with the current conditions, her understanding that these are the current conditions and we cannot just accept it as “the world is not so pure” shows a consciousness that is aware of this reality and there are ways to change it (Carrillo, 2007; Freebersyser, 2015; Freire, 2012). It might seem that her response is made up of different parts that are not coherent, but on the issues that she touched upon, she was able to show a wide variety of arguments that can tick a number of items if there were a checklist for the language of a decolonized critical bioethics.
As some of them shared, it is the protest that their class initiated when the late dictator Ferdinand Marcos was buried in the Heroes’ Cemetery that they remembered the most. This act and the conditions that were realized in the language that the students used in reminiscing about the protest action can represent the realization and manifestation of their critical consciousness, manifesting critical reflection, motivation, and action (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016). This is not saying that the act of protesting originates from the abstract or their consciousness; rather, the amalgamation of different events, issues and situations materially mediated their social consciousness, that was then manifested materially through their act of protesting (Starczyczyk, 2021; Vygotsky, 1962; Vygotsky, 1978). For example, Samuel stated that the big influence of bioethics was to inspire them to take action, given all the stories and knowledge of how horrible Martial Law was during the time of the dictatorship in the 1970s. For him, the real impact of the class was to take action, translating theory to praxis. This shows the praxis, action for social change, together with the theoretical understanding of a societal issue that Freire is arguing in the development of a critical consciousness through critical pedagogy (Carrillo, 2007; Freebersyser, 2015; Freire, 2012). Kylie also added to this by stating that the class organized their thoughts and applied them in the context of current events:

I feel like if there is no bioethics, we can still think to do it but not like … not exactly like that as we might find it hard to have each other, find each other. We will have difficulty in voicing out what we will say because honestly it seems like around bioethics time that I was able to properly express my opinions about things. So, even though it seems I agree with other people it is only during class that I was able to explain physically what I feel about it. This is what I want to do. So, it feels like, it was helpful for us. [translated]

Without directly stating what language bioethics influenced them to use on how they act on social issues, we see in the response of Kylie the influence of bioethics in helping them voice their opinions. If this will be triangulated with the protest, as the realization of
their thoughts, we can surmise that this language is a language against oppression, tyranny, injustices, and the oppressors in general. Also, viewed through the lens of privilege (class analysis), there is no need to sidestep (Frueh, 2020) the benefits of the privilege their class position entails, as the materiality of social conditions (Gates, 2011; Stańczyk, 2021) can push them to be in solidarity (Allen & Rossatto, 2009) with the oppressed.

Jacob on the other hand, not just raising theoretical discussions of issues and protest as an application of what they learned in class, gave this insight: “They [other classmates] have a huge influence in embracing social action as a legitimate response to issues” [translated]. Identifying protests as a legitimate response to injustice is a clear example of a language that counters the dominant narrative of the oppressor, of the legitimate and illegitimate (Fanon, 1967, 1991; Nandy, 1988). There is a conception of an act that is legitimate; then there are acts that can be considered illegitimate in our society, especially in a (neo)colonized society (Fanon, 1991). This an example of what Randolph argues to be the elective class as a site of their development and the development of the way they can articulate their thoughts. The articulation of those thoughts might be in collision with the dominant language of the ruling class or the oppressor group. Also, this articulation of their thoughts is anchored in an exchange of ideas, evidence of dialogic learning for which Freire is advocating in critical pedagogy (Alexander, 2008). In contradistinction to any tendency to ascribe what they did or how they created a domino effect for the protests in the school during that time, Indira shared that her joining the protest is a personal decision:

I just wanna say that for all those protests, personally I did not join them just because the class, the whole class was joining protests. I joined them because I internally believed in the calls of those protests like, oh my god, why are they burying a dictator? So, I wouldn’t say that the class feels like a bandwagon. [translated]
To add to this, and without the knowledge of Freire’s generative themes or epoch times (Freire, 2012), Kenneth reflected this theme in this response:

> Because it feels like it just happened during that time where there were a lot of developments in the political climate in the Philippines. And we’re learning all these things, and all of these are happening, so it is simply an application of what we learned, eh. And it would be a disservice to the course to the things we learned if we don’t act on it. It’s simply an application of critical pedagogy of all that. [partially translated]

This statement clearly reflects the conception of generative themes of Freire, where he said that an epoch “is characterized by a complex of ideas, concepts, hopes, doubts, values and challenges in dialectical interaction with their opposites striving towards their fulfilment” (Freire, 2012, p. 101). Without direct knowledge of Freire’s generative themes, where epoch times is subsumed, Kenneth was able to articulate this, clear evidence that he had grasped the language of the elective. Also, from a point of view of naïve consciousness transitioning to critical consciousness in the development of praxis, the matter-of-fact response of Kenneth of simply applying what he learned indicates his grasp of melding theory and practice for social change, a key concept of critical pedagogy.

Building on this position of the other students, the response from Diane below shows her grasp of the language of decolonized critical bioethics:

> It seems once you get started to become aware of even the smallest part of a social issue your curiosity will start bothering you like it is just a matter of how much your privilege controls you and keeps you blind, not blind but, keeps you apathetic or apolitical. Even if it bugs you, it seems you can still, “All right, I will just do my requirements as this is so stressful”. It is just a matter of time of how privilege you are before you start not being contented with just setting it aside or
sweeping it under the rug, because it cannot affect you. These things, they do not directly happen to me, but whenever I hear about it, at first, it would be easier to like, “Oh, maybe I’ll just do my requirements” that seems it is more important. But as time passed by it bothers me why I am doing my requirements when there are these things happening. That it is why it is slowly becoming part of my current way of thinking and way of life that whenever I will do something I have to think how does this contribute? … I do not know, that otherwise, it would be pointless or why am I even doing it. Why will I waste time if it is not for this or for helping other people? So, that is the answer to the question; it is not a one-time thing; it seems like a cumulative effect over the years. It started with the culture when I took bioethics, getting to know others who are also vocal people. [partially translated]

In closing this section, the responses above show the value of the material conditions to individuals in responding to societal issues (Fanon, 1967, 1991; Stańczyk, 2021); the fullness of the material conditions can substitute for the requirement of Tuck and Yang (2012) on the primacy of land struggle when we talk about decolonization.

What the bioethics students’ responses reflect is not in full contradiction of my critique of the work of Tuck and Yang (2012) in Chapter 6; rather, for me this is a more nuanced approach as to how to use their work in decolonizing education – critical pedagogy can be exorcised of its abstract nature if it is anchored in land struggle as shown through the impacts of the Lumad school (Stańczyk, 2021). The difference between the language of the response of the Lumad students and volunteer teachers lies in their material experience of defending and understanding a struggle anchored on the defense of land. The former bioethics students did not have the same experience of or language for neoliberal education, bourgeois education, Capitalism, Imperialist plunder, Bureaucrat Capitalism and other relevant, specific terms as the Lumad students and volunteer teachers clearly showed. But when, given the chance to express their understanding of a complex societal issue, such as the burial of a dictator in the Heroes’ Cemetery, they
sometimes used the same words but used some of the more general statements on othering, injustice, and hierarchy of power relationships and structure. Maybe, the reason behind this is that these concepts start from a theoretical foundation which the bioethics students tried to apply to their own material conditions. And as can be assumed in what Diane suggested, their material condition is one of privilege as they do not live a life of struggle in defending their land or their rights. Furthermore, their material conditions only allow them to understand issues of oppression, marginalization, hierarchy of power, and others in a form they can conceptualize as dictated by their environment. Even though this is their material reality, occupying a privileged position with the social, cultural, and political bias the class position entails, they can be an ally of the oppressed, which is far from the oppressor status they were argued to be in (Allen & Rossatto, 2009). In the next section, I will explore more deeply their responses to the different bioethics thought experiments and moral dilemmas, to ascertain whether they demonstrated the realization of their praxis as influenced by their bioethics elective.

The drowning child thought experiment: A response to an abstract moral dilemma

The basis of analysis for the bioethics students’ responses to the drowning child thought experiment is not only their answers to the thought experiment but also their other responses during their interview. Some of the students mentioned the drowning child thought experiment throughout the interview, some of them mentioned it as their favorite thought experiment, while others mentioned it in passing. Five of the ten students very much remembered it or considered it to be their favorite thought experiment – Janice, Samuel, Kylie, Diane, and Randolph. Seven of the ten students mentioned the drowning child thought experiment in one of the interview questions, the above five together with Pedro and Indira. Based on this, there should be a higher expectation from the former bioethics students with regard to their response to the thought experiment, specifically to other questions or (an) underlying fundamental issue/s that the thought experiments do
not directly address or ask, and their responses compared to those given by volunteer teachers and Lumad students.

One of the most interesting responses to the thought experiment came from Janice, who initially shared in the first part of the interview that it was her favorite thought experiment and also said, “I can think outside the boundary of the thought experiments”, but also showed in her responses that she has a tendency to stay within the academic boundaries of the questions asked of her. She also shared the value of thought experiments as, “it was a way to put myself in the shoes of like the actor in the experiment” and “why is there like a pool and a child drowning?”. With that in mind, once asked to respond to the thought experiment she only gave this response:

I think I am not thinking about it enough. I would save the child because I feel like it is the right thing to do and compared to the money and inconvenience of ruining my shoes and being late to class … if I can save the child, it is worth it…

Even when prodded several times if she wanted to add something, knowing that she already shared in previous questions the existence of the pond, but in here she failed to mention it. This shows the possible weakness of a thought experiment, that when individuals are asked to respond to it, there is a possibility that they fail to respond deeply to the underlying questions not directly asked. Alternatively, this can be the weakness of critical pedagogy (Starćzyk, 2021; Tuck & Yang, 2012) as it inherently puts the emphasis on developing consciousness without the materiality of society. In considering that the elective was conscious of the value of material conditions, Janice’s response can then be attributed to her colonizing gaze (Fanon, 1967, 1991; Fanon, 2018; hooks, 1992; Nandy, 1988; Rentmeester, 2012; Said, 1979), as a function of the privilege (Frueh, 2020) of her class position (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Gates, 2011). Meanwhile, the Lumad students who gave the shortest response to this thought experiment (Jose, Lina, and Raymond) together with the volunteer teachers (Albert, Bella, and Elvira) still managed to address the root cause of the problem as a function of their land struggle (Fanon, 1967, 1991;
Fanon, 2018). There are many factors that can be considered to have contributed to why Janice failed to respond deeply to the question, such as being unprepared, fear of giving an ‘incorrect’ response, and other personal matters.

But to analyze this dialectically and relationally, we also need to view this in the context of the form and function of a neoliberal education that she has been exposed to compared to the MMS curriculum framework of the Lumad schools. Even though she is equipped to provide a deeper and richer response to the thought experiment based on her response to the other interview questions, she is not able to share this when given the chance, unlike the Lumad students and volunteer teachers. This also reflects that the responses of the Lumad students and teachers are not necessarily regurgitation of activist ‘slogans’ on the societal critique that it is usually assumed are being fed to them (Freire, 2012). There is a certain nuancing in applying these ‘slogans’ to a complex problem posed by a thought experiment in that if it is freely interspersed in a response without deep thought one can just as easily detect how it is being used without the speaker’s complete understanding of the question. Janice’s response in terms of its content is not an outlier; rather, it is the shortness of her response that seems to be an outlier given the possible response she can still give based on her earlier response to the interview questions. This response falls under one of the three categories found in the responses of the volunteer teachers and Lumad students: 1) response within the boundary of the thought experiment, 2) response that starts to question the boundary of the thought experiment, and 3) response that goes beyond the boundary of the thought experiment.

For the first category, Janice and Indira’s responses did not go beyond the problem posted by the thought experiment. Where Janice only gave a short response (‘save the child’), Indira shared that she knows that the thought experiment was formulated to question our capacity to give to charity; even if there are possible charities that are corrupt, there might still be some trickle-down effect to the target beneficiary. She also shared this response which encapsulates her position of participating in saving the child within the boundary of the thought experiment:
I had maybe it’s like this, super simple mentality but I always think I still have the ... like how I will solve the problem but not through a simple thought experiment for it’s unsolvable, but I will just keep ... continue wading in no matter what happens because saving a life is more important to me. So, no matter what the situation, I will be smart about it; for example, if organizations are there, I would be giving to the more legit ones but if I have the means I would always be helping. That’s my two cents anyway. [partially translated]

As we can see here, even knowing the possible problem with giving to charities that will lead to the perpetuation of an evil, corruption of aid, she has not gone beyond this reality and still stayed within the boundary of helping others. This is not an identity problem as posited by Allen and Rossatto (2009) that plagues those that belong to the oppressor class; this is the double-consciousness (hooks, 1990), the dual-world (Rentmeester, 2012), or the hybridized existence (Young, 2003) that is abstractly used by other postcolonial works to define the existence of the colonized like Indira. To concretize these abstract concepts is to revert back to class analysis (Sąńczyk, 2021), as the false charity and false empathy that Indira exhibited is a function of the class interest of the ruling elite instilled in her through education, culture, and other forms of the superstructure (Harvey, 2007). This analysis is important as it positions the likes of Indira as someone who inhabits a position of influence as a result of her class, as a key player in the maintenance of the current social order.

Within the second category fall the responses of Diane, Samuel, Kylie, Pedro, and Randolph, wherein it seems that they do understand that there is a problem deeper than the intended question of the thought experiment with the given situation but were not able to respond beyond its imposed boundaries. Take for example Diane; in most of the responses in the previous sections, it seems that she fully grasps the language of postcoloniality and Freire’s critical pedagogy where her responses seem to touch on the development of a critical consciousness. Contrary to this, when posed the drowning
child thought experiment, which she stated as her favorite thought experiment, she was able to point out the problem of the existence of the pond. Instead of building on this to develop her critique of the thought experiment, which can represent her development of a critical consciousness, she stayed within the acceptance of that reality. In her final statement she shared this:

Right now, the situation is that if that happens to me I know what I will do first is to work because I am running late, but ideally, I will be thinking about why those things happen so that they will … drown. [translated]

It seems that even though an individual can hold a certain position based on her initial statements, when asked a question with limit-situations, that individual can still be trapped or revert back to responding to the requisites or boundaries of the thought experiment. As a researcher, there was a high expectation that was impressed on me by the earlier responses of Diane, but then given her response to the thought experiment it becomes clear that the academic introduction of the language of a decolonized critical bioethics through an elective might not be enough to influence a student’s worldview. The same could be said of the response of Samuel, which almost touches on the underlying issues when he stated:

Definitely it is easier to save the child compared to doing something about the pond I don’t have anything on me to patch up the hole or cordon off the hole … they don’t even consider it as a hazard and the real problem is what to do about the hole. [translated]

It seems he is building on a response to concretely address the puddle/hole where the child is drowning, but then stopped directly addressing it and just accepts the difficulty of addressing the hole. A clear manifestation of a naïve consciousness, where one understands the problem that exists in our society but still fails to concretely address it (Freebersyser, 2015; Freire, 2012).
Meanwhile, Kylie acknowledges the problem, responding within the boundaries of the problem as she thinks that charities are viable options to help other people but that this is not sustainable if “you join in everything”. This is also in the context of all the donation drives that were being initiated during the lockdown imposed in the Philippines to address the COVID pandemic; that is why she is arguing that it is also important to join these relief drives. She also shared this statement:

If there is food and housing in the world but you still think that people shouldn’t get it because they did not work hard enough for it, then you are wrong.
[translated]

Her response might be more similar to the responses of Indira and Janice and not in the second category, but her questioning of the viability of charities separates her response from the responses of the other two. She is starting to think beyond the problem and sees the issue with charities, but then she goes back to accepting them instead of addressing the root cause of the problem. Lastly, among the students in this category, the response of Randolph almost went beyond the limit-situation imposed by the thought experiment:

I can remember that, in our discussion before that someone said: Why is there a random pond there? Why not fill-in the pond? I do not know if it is somewhat reaching, you know that if you started using environmental ethics it can create disruption in that local area. I cannot just say to remove it that way. So, the easiest answer that is justifiable for me is to wade in the pond and save the child.
[translated]

Randolph’s statement acknowledged the presence of the pond as the problem but also failed to address it because of its possible natural existence. If we will translate that response with the pond as poverty, or a root cause of poverty, then his response can be
translated to that of ‘we cannot address poverty by removing it because it exists naturally’. In short, poverty is as natural as the natural social order in our society that results in othering, oppression, and other social injustice. Randolph, in a similar way to Diane, seems to show in his responses the possible development of critical consciousness, though this does seem to revert to its naïve form when they are asked a question with a clear boundary.

Interestingly, as Randolph sees the pond as part of the natural landscape and that addressing it may also lead to possible problems for those living in that area, Jacob contradicts this position. For Jacob, he questions the existence of the pond or the environment as:

… a natural phenomenon that should be accepted, which is not necessarily true. [partially translated]

This dialectically responds to the comment of Randolph, that even though there are things, structures, and systems in place that might seem to exist naturally in the world, they should not just be accepted without critical analysis. He further developed this response through this statement:

Why is there an opportunity to drown in the first place? In this specific thought experiment the way it is constructed it seems that it is really difficult if there is a pond, because ponds occur naturally, but if those are analogous situations in real life a good question is why is this the context or the environment you are in is in such a way that people are quote-unquote drowning and need help. [translated]

Compared to the responses above, the statement of Jacob is a clear manifestation of moving beyond the limits of the boundary of the thought experiment. That even though he also sees that the existence of a pond can be natural, this ‘naturalness’ can still be questioned. This indicates a possible manifestation of a critical consciousness in a
student who addresses a perceived natural problem through critical reflection (Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016; Jemal, 2017). Kenneth also added in this position of questioning the ‘naturalness’ of a problem but qualified that what is ‘natural’ will not always be good:

The bottom line could also be why would the pond exist in the first place, like that. It's like questioning why like the child is being harmed in the first place. Like if we replaced the pond with say a sexual predator, like you would, start to question why would this harm the child? It is kind of hard to explain, but that is how I understand it. [translated]

And similarly with Rene:

And also, why is the child drowning in the first place? Why are there no safeguards to prevent the child from drowning in that pool in the first place? The pool should not even be there; also, the child should be able to go somewhere while he or she can be doing something better than playing around in a pool in the first place. And playing in a pool that should not even be there in the first place. A pool that poses like hazards to children who could be around. [translated]

All three questioned the existence of a pool that poses a risk of harm or to the child. They elaborate that even though it could be natural, or that it is already there before the child, it can still be questioned and that reforming it is not the right response to prevent further harm to the child. Also, interestingly, none of Kenneth, Jacob, and Rene mention the drowning child thought experiment in any of their responses in the first part of the interview. It can be argued that, even though in the first part of the interview they were not pre-conditioned to respond to the thought experiment, they were still able to give a response outside the limit-situations of the problem in the thought experiment.
One might argue that the bioethics students were not further asked what the pond represents in the thought experiment, but we should recall that the first seven students already shared the underlying problem with the thought experiment in the second section of this chapter. And the last three students who did not mention the drowning child thought experiment were the ones who pointed out the problem with the thought experiment. As argued in the latter part of the previous section, it seems there are instances where the students manifest their understanding and capacity to grasp the language of a decolonized critical bioethics. It is still true in the responses of the students here, that there are different levels to the development of consciousness and how it is reflected in the language they use in their responses. This is a dialectical reflection of development among individuals, that we do not develop at the same time and our progress is dependent on our internal readiness to respond to external material factors (Vygotsky, 1962; Vygotsky, 1978). It is not their inability to connect the deeper issue in the thought experiment to Neoliberalism, Imperialism, land plunder, and other oppressive systems that are being manifested. Rather, it is the material conditions that are reflected in the language they use in their responses; dominant public education does not center its teaching on the issues of colonization, Imperialism, Neoliberalism, oppression, and other such issues. The manifestation of critical consciousness in the responses of the bioethics students is the embryonic development of a consciousness that is starting to grasp the reality of these conditions.

*Climate Crisis thought experiment: An abstract moral dilemma anchored in ‘othered’ groups’ material conditions*

This thought experiment can be viewed as a litmus test for the ethical position that individuals hold in relation to their understanding of an issue anchored in land struggle, in contrast with the abstract nature of the first thought experiment. Among the three groups, the Lumad students demonstrated the most concrete historical understanding of this issue, the volunteer teachers relate different levels of experience on this issue as some are Lumad and some are non-Lumad volunteers who have been exposed first-
hand to the struggles anchored in land, and the bioethics students based their understanding of the moral dilemma on an academic (theoretical) basis of the issue.

Looking at the responses of the bioethics students, the majority try to address the preservation of the culture and identity of the national minorities that are tied to their ancestral lands, the value of gaining their informed consent, in addressing the need of one group for the act to be just, and mostly the difficulty of addressing the moral dilemma. The centrality of identity might be a function of the removal of discussion of class struggle in liberal education (Stańczyk, 2021), and how it is used as an alternate identifier of oppression (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Frueh, 2020). Take, for example, the response of Samuel; he thinks that his response is “probably a cop-out” based on this response:

… to strengthen the infrastructures of the would-be resilient city which in turn will lead to the displacement of the national minorities. [translated]

Given this answer, he also sees the moral dilemma as a political issue, the first time that a response to an ethical problem is connected to a political issue by a former bioethics student. He then added that the response should also look into who are affected and why they are affected in the first place. Also, he tried to reformulate the problem by addressing it through a disaster-readiness response against infrastructure-centered responses that aim to build structures like the green, resilient city. There was an attempt here to go beyond the boundary of the thought experiment, but in doing so, he failed to address the fundamental problem in the thought experiment, the issue of protecting the national minorities’ ancestral land.

Meanwhile, the response of Kylie tries to address the thought experiment through her own code of conduct of ‘human lives before anything else’, which results in her acting to save the lives of the national minorities but will result in their displacement. For her, as long as she can save their lives given that they have consented to the use of their
ancestral lands, it does not harm them, preserves their culture and identity; even if it might partially destroy their ancestral land, it is ethically acceptable. This response clearly shows the lack of understanding of someone coming from the dominant society of the lives of the colonized, like the national minorities (Fanon, 1967; Freire, 2012; Nandy, 1988). Kylie represents those coming from the dominant group in our society who see the culture, identity, and the ancestral lands of national minorities as separate and independent categories that form their being (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Frueh, 2020; Gates, 2011). This is the problem that the centrality of identity carries; it is blinded from the primacy of oppression through the lens of economic exploitation (Fanon, 1967; Gates, 2011). Going back to Fanon’s argument on the value of land to the colonized as having the most value as it is the most concrete also ties to their being and its destruction is also a destruction of their identity, primarily through its class character. This lack of understanding of the plight of the othered group was also reflected in the response of Janice. She tried at first to develop a response anchored on justice where she argued that progress is different among different groups due to the lens through which they view progress. But then she then took a utilitarian approach of saving the greatest number of lives at the expense of the destruction of the ancestral lands of the national minorities. Janice seems to revert to the lens of the dominant group when she finds it difficult to respond to a complex problem; thus, even though she has the necessary language (e.g., progress is not the same for everyone) to address the problem through the lens of the othered group, she still reverts to the use of the language of the dominant group.

Indira and Diane gave the same views as Kylie and Janice in seeing the impact of the need to displace the national minorities in order to save lives, but this is within the context of respect through their consent and preservation of identities and culture. Indira argues that she understands the struggles of the national minorities and said, “these ancestral lands I get are part of their culture and I respect that”. But she also stated that if she is not given a choice, so that the resources of the national minorities have to be used:
I want to make sure that they are well fed their whole lives and that their earth is untouched as much as possible because it is not our right to disrupt anything; that's their way of life. [translated]

She also qualified her argument with this statement:

I wouldn’t do anything without their consent, and I would try to make a deal like what do you need in exchange. [translated]

She closed her response by stating that if displacing them is not possible then she will just move the people in the city to another place. At the end of her response, it seems that she sided with the national minorities but this should be viewed in the context of her toying first with the idea of moving the national minorities from their ancestral land. She tries to construct herself as an ally of the national minorities, when she stated that she understands their struggle, but still if given the option that they can be displaced for the benefit of the dominant group she will side with the dominant group (Delgado, 1996; Nandy, 1988). This response of understanding the struggles of the othered group was also shared by Diane, that if displacing them is the last option [but still an option she considers] she will consider it as there might be other solutions [going beyond the limits of the thought experiment] and their displacement is inhumane. But in the end, her response still led her to the displacement of the national minorities, again, given the caveat of preserving their identities and culture together with their ancestral land. The promised preservation of their culture and identities in saving their lives is just a reformulation of other promises given to these groups in ‘civilizing’ them, in extracting their resources for their own ‘progress’, and many other misrepresentations of exploitative practices.

The responses above showed the capacity of the bioethics students to manifest their understanding of thought experiments to be limited by the boundary due to its formulation. There is also a response that clearly address this limitation; Kenneth argues:
... it feels like a false dichotomy to me to choose between the indigenous community and building a green city. Why not include the indigenous community in your plans? Why not learn from those who have been in the land for so long? There’s this thing … one of the advocacies of the urban poor now is on-site development. Basically, including them who are also part of that land in the development. [translated]

He touches on the problem of the formulation of thought experiments while also providing a possible response to the thought experiment that does not harm the national minorities. This expectation of inclusion is also as problematic as the responses above of respecting and preserving the identities and culture of the national minorities as it does not account for the historical injustices done to them. As shared by the Lumad students, they have been historically coerced, cheated, or fooled in transactions that seem to help them but in the end lead to the plunder of their ancestral lands. The response might be one of the clearest responses that addresses the needs of the national minorities but the lack of clarity of language can also lead to their marginalization, oppression, and exploitation. This pulls us back to the position of this research, on the value of language on ethical transactions (hooks, 1992), that the students are able to show them at times but seem also to fall short when responding to a thought experiment.

The next responses seem to show a better grasp of the objective of this research in addressing thought experiments that involve ethical transactions. One such example emerges in the response of Pedro, which almost mirrors the response of Kenneth but qualifies the knowledge system of the national minorities not only for his class’s benefit but for everyone’s benefit. In a sense, Pedro is almost sharing the position of the Lumad students in their response that centers on the protection of the ancestral lands, together with their culture, identities, and knowledge systems that will lead to the protection of everyone:
We might even be able to solve the problems that we have if we learned [their] practices because they have a lot of green practices, like composting and in their schools teach those kinds of things and they till the earth where they are living not as something that they utilize for their benefit but take care of it and it takes care of them. Maybe we wouldn’t be having, in the moral dilemma, a problem of our cities being dead if we change the way we live. [translated]

This response is different from the response of Kenneth in that it was clear in its position, comparable to the Lumad students, that the use of the knowledge system of the national minorities is not only for his own class benefit or the co-opting of knowledge, rather, an act for the mutual benefit of the collective. This response can be qualified to what Freire argues that the liberation of the oppressed will also lead to the liberation of the oppressor (Freire, 2012), as Pedro qualified the use of the knowledge system to change to the way the dominant group lives.

Combing through the responses it can also be observed that there are those who question the formulation of the thought experiment, as its limit-situation, such as in the response of Jacob who questions the root cause of the problem of the thought experiment that is anchored on consumption which is also being addressed through consumption. He further stated that:

… there is a need to find a better solution or third course of action because we should not let the environment protection collide with the needs of the indigenous people because in the end they are also part of the population of the country; they are persons who need livelihood and housing. [translated]

The displacement of national minorities is seen by Jacob as a problem in itself that should be addressed not independent of the protection of lives and way of living of the two groups. Randolph’s response agrees with Jacob’s arguments as he elaborates that:
... it seems that certain actions cannot be justified, such as the extraction of resources from the ancestral lands, if your prior actions are those that lead to climate crisis of a country. [translated]

Randolph addresses the root cause of the problem, that if addressed through the lens of the dominant group will not prevent the problems that will be caused by the climate crisis. He also added, “And there will be other ways to fight whatever is facing my country, without having to displace national minorities” [translated]. This is a clear departure from the position of the other bioethics students, that the possible response to the problems involves the necessary displacement of the national minorities. Randolph’s response shows that we can depart from the dominant narrative that the othered group should be assimilated to the dominant group for their survival and can mirror the position of those who directly experience displacement such as the Lumad students.

The last response from Rene can be qualified to mirror the position of the Lumad students with regard to the thought experiment. He shared, similarly, that the root cause of the problem of the climate crisis is related to factors such as the destruction of the ancestral lands of the national minorities through conversion to agricultural lands, deforestation because of mining, lumber industry, etc. He also added other actions by large corporations which he thinks:

... kind of sit under the radar because everyone is just like, oh do your own part in saving the climate (environment) that is to say use bamboo straws, don’t use plastics, don’t use single-used plastics, etc., etc., etc. [translated]

For him this is just a drop in a bucket compared to the carbon emissions of these large companies that is also anchored on the exploitation of cheap labor, adding this wonderful statement:
You don’t solve the climate crisis by building greener resilient cities, rather by tackling it at the root which is who emits the largest carbon emissions and who causes the ... who is the greatest factor in accelerating or causing climate change in the first place. [translated]

Rene did not just depart from the limit-situation imposed by the thought experiment, but he was able to carefully dissect the problem without falling into the trap of false equality, of saving the two groups through the further marginalization, oppression, and exploitation of a historically marginalized, oppressed, and exploited group. He showed his full command of the language that he is using, that it is not the language of the oppressor, that another reality is possible if we will not use or subscribe to the limiting language of the oppressor, especially in the final analysis of an ethical transaction. As described in the previous sections, Rene is a member of a youth activist group and the fullness of his response that captures the essence of the language of a decolonized critical bioethics can be attributed to the social and political education that he experienced and their application as a function of his activism. Among the students, his response touches on the issue of climate imperialism (Sison, 2021) which was central to the responses of the Lumad. His response, compared to the other students, showed a clear indication of class analysis in responding to a bioethical thought experiment.

**Artificial womb thought experiment: A possible material future for all**

In the previous two chapters, the Lumad students and volunteer teachers shared their politico-economic analysis on the third thought experiment, arguing the profit-oriented, accessibility issue, and ownership problem of the technology as their core analysis of its value to society. In terms of these views, among the ten former bioethics students only three (Randolph, Jacob, and Rene) directly and complexly developed their response in mentioning issues of ownership, accessibility, and profit in relation to the ethicality of the use and development of the technology, compared to all the Lumad students who talked about these issues in varying degrees.
For example, Janice tried to wrap her brain around the problem but had a hard time developing her response to the moral dilemma. Her response was a mishmash of thoughts that tried to address the problem through the lens of profit, accessibility and control. Viewing the thought experiment through the lens of economics, she tried relating the problem with big pharma and how it controls government access to drugs and create a condition that results in overpriced drugs like insulin. She then added that she finds it difficult to find fault at not developing such technology just because a big company is making profit from it, a stark contrast from the majority of the responses of the Lumad students. She then commented that it is easier for her to understand such relationships in terms of a worldview under Capitalism, that such transactions are acceptable and that this is “very natural for me” and with a matter-of-fact response, “of course the company that does the research tries to profit off it as much as possible” [translated]. This is the clearest manifestation of class privilege that was exhibited by a former bioethics student as a function of her class position.

This reality seems to be the natural order of things and its ‘naturalness’ makes it acceptable or palatable in this case. She further added that we can address this problem in the future, which seems to be a response leaning to an acceptance of the current unjust transactions with regard to technology access, control, and profit and only addresses this problem later on. The oppressor has the benefit of time while the oppressed do not. Meanwhile, Diane’s response rests on the inherent ‘goodness’ that such technology starts with, that its goals are initially for good but once the results are reached it is twisted into “something bad, it is somewhat manipulated”. For her it was “a good experiment and looked helpful granted that it will be used for the good” [translated]. However, like Janice, she still has a problem envisioning the value of the technology on “how it will … how it will be translated politically, economically, socially” [translated]. Again, a student who has taken a decolonized critical bioethics class and from a Special Science High School still has difficulty developing her response on the possible implications of the technology on issues concerning its political, economic, and/or social aspect/s. This stands in contrast with the Lumad students who anchor their responses in the issue of land in the different
thought experiments in relation to the political, economic, and social factors. Again, this indicates a possible manifestation of the weakness of critical pedagogy if it is not anchored on land struggle or material conditions.

Randolph, Jacob, and Rene, who seem to be able to go beyond the bioethical principles, frameworks, philosophies, and guidelines, again gave a more nuanced response compared to their fellow bioethics students. Randolph, for instance, provided this as his response:

And if they are not given proper care then they won’t be able to live a healthy life. But taking into account its accessibility after it’s made and the potential for profit because there are quite a few things that is said to be stronger than a parent’s love, if you can squeeze that love of a parent from a premature fetus. As much as possible if you have a profit-motive in mind leading to ... it will become ethically questionable. Because we do not have a guarantee that it will be beneficial for everyone in terms of care accessibility. We cannot disregard in any discussion the profit motive because it is has a huge … we are working with human lives … especially, the issue of justice is a big factor and how it is defined within a situation … profit and accessibility. [translated]

The statement above shows a position that clearly distinguishes how ethics and economics, in terms of profit, are related. Unlike Western ethics that is heavily anchored on philosophical principles, theories, and laws (Jarvis, 2017; Jaycox, 2012), Randolph showed a dialectical relationship of ethics with economics, that can be stretched to politics as he mentioned its control through accessibility. Ethical relationships or transactions are tied to economics and politics as he showed the ethicality of the use of such technologies is not only anchored on utilitarian, deontological or other Western ethical approaches (Jarvis, 2017; Jaycox, 2012; Nie, Li, et al., 2018), as it can also be influenced by the dominant economic and political system that favors those who profit from it and control its access. Jacob agrees with the argument posited by Randolph as he argued that
advancement in technology and the healthcare industry “is dominated by money … it is always the rich over the poor who will have access to it” [translated]. He further added that the impact of such advancement in technology can lead to further injustice and inequality between social classes but was careful to state that technology is not the root of the problem; rather, it acts as a ‘multiplier’ and then questioned the ethicality of that transaction. For him it is the structure in our society around such technologies that creates the unethical issues in its use and further added that we should not view the ethical transaction in a vacuum:

So, the question is … it is not … not necessarily about if the implications of a specific technology is why/what is the background that makes/gives those implications to … because if you will view it in a vacuum, if it is just only technology for technology’s sake, it has prerequisite capability that is needed, it has possible benefits that can provide us … the implications only become part of the whole transaction if you put the technology in a world that has certain structures of power; the question that may arise there: why is our healthcare system garbage? It is not the artificial womb that is the enemy, it is just part of a larger question that is more important. [translated]

Also, based on the core theme of his response, that the larger question is the structure that perpetuates and amplifies inequality in our society, that is the root of the unethical transactions that permeate into issues such as the technology shown in the thought experiment. Rene agrees that if we view the artificial womb technology as part of our healthcare system’s standard of care, and most healthcare systems are still for profit, it will not be “ethical on that level”. Given this position, he also reflected on a question pertaining to accessibility and ethicality:

… but I am not sure if ethicality is equal to accessibility to everyone; I’m pretty sure it might, but I am not entirely sure. [translated]
This reflective questioning of the ethicality of the response to a thought experiment seems to be present among the answers of the bioethics students, especially when they relate ethicality of the transactions to political, economic, and social aspects of the problem. It seems this is how they differ from the Lumad students; whereas the Lumad students can be seen as instinctually and reflectively relating the ethicality of the transactions in the thought experiments to politics, economics, and social problems, the bioethics students when they arrive at that response seem to reflect on its ‘possibility’, rather than it being the core foundation of their response. Even though Rene seems to question this line he still added that, “based on economics and state of healthcare all over the world, I don’t think it would be ethical” and “I think social class is bound to economic issues; so, obviously, the poor will not be able to afford it” [translated]. That problem of access for him makes it unethical. And lastly, he added this:

It is politically problematic if it is not accessible, and it is prevented by politics of a place of its use; might as well not have it if no one is going to have it. Definitely, we should use this kind of technology but, like, can you assure me that everyone can have this kind of treatment equally, that it will be part of healthcare for all? If ‘yes’, by all means, if ‘no’, no thanks. But strive towards it … [translated]

Clearly, responses were connected to the ethical issues that permeate the advancement in technology, such as in the artificial womb, which is an ethical issue that is connected to politics [control], economics [profit], and social [accessibility] issues. There are other lenses that can be used to analyze a thought experiment as shown by the Lumad students who have not taken a bioethics class and by former bioethics students who have taken a decolonized critical bioethics class. The former bioethics students might not have shown a common response like the Lumad students, but it is important to note that the few bioethics students who were able to relate the thought experiment to political, economic, and social issues provide us with evidence that the use of an additional language and framework in teaching bioethics can break the dominant language of Western bioethics.
Charity and aid-giving: From abstract to concrete moral dilemma

The former bioethics students mostly belong to middleclass families, compared to the volunteer teachers and Lumad students who mostly belong to peasant/working class. Where most responses from the Lumad volunteer teachers and Lumad students situated themselves as the object of the photographs and the beneficiary of the funding activity, the bioethics students viewed themselves to be among the third person audiences or target giver to the ethical transaction in the thought experiment. Based on their responses, they are not direct subjects of the activity, whether as objects or as beneficiaries of the charity work, and when they see themselves as such it is viewed as a generalizing lens created to portray them to be in need of financial aid as someone living in a developing country like the Philippines, such as in the case of Kylie:

It does not paint my reality, the people whose photo were taken, it seems that they generalize them painting them as two-dimensional people … this is all they are. [translated]

On the other hand, Randolph gave this same sentiment with a recognition of his social class:

Most likely there are people who live that reality; it does not represent my reality, because I come from a different social class which made my life more comfortable since I was born. [translated]

These statements provide a clear indication of the difference between the former bioethics students and the volunteer teachers and Lumad students in terms of how they situate themselves with regard to this particular thought experiment. This position dialectical to their response to the thought experiment, which centers on their view of how such international charities or NGOs use these kinds of photographs to gain
sympathy from their target audience. To extract sympathy and financial help from the intended audience, the bioethics students believe that international charities and NGOs consciously portray their subjects from developing countries as poor, downtrodden, marginalized, and in need of help.

There is a sense that it becomes a form of advertisement for the charities and NGOs so that they can use those in the photographs as a form of “poster child to pull on the hearts of the population”, as Kylie said. This argument about advertisement might not be very far from the truth as if we look at the market for charity and NGOs; even during the time of COVID, there is expected to be an increase in their funding. From businesswire.com, “The global NGOs and charitable organizations market is expected to grow from $279.81 billion in 2020 to $285.5 billion in 2021 at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 2%” (Businesswire.com, 2021). It might seem to be counterintuitive that during the time of COVID-19, when the global economy is down or experiencing more unstable growth (Jones et al., 2021; OECD, 2020; World Bank, 2022), charity organizations are projected to have higher funding than in previous years. As mentioned in the same businesswire.com article, this is due to the rearrangement of resources and recovery. In short, there is a market for poverty as a result of a global decline in economy; thus, charity and aid-giving is expected to be funded more in the coming years.

Further contextualizing this aid-giving, as was discussed in Chapter 2, the US budget on aids toward the ‘development’ of other countries is mainly geared towards military and educational development of its target countries. Contextually, it seems that even though the US, UK, China and other wealthy countries gained most from vaccines through the number of their new billionaires and increases in the wealth of their billionaires (OXFAM International, 2021), it is the poorest countries who were hit the hardest (Nishio, 2021). This reality only shows that the current political, economic, and social setup of the world ensures that charity and NGOs focused on international developmental work will always have the market to ply their trade. And this trade is anchored in a structure where
poverty is maintained, and this poverty is marketed to the rich to ensure that they are living an ethical life. From Kenneth:

> Centuries of impoverishment, years of colonization, and the continuing incompetence of government, which comes from the infrastructures given by colonizers, so, that's it, since if we look at this kind of charity/NGO not in terms of them trying to help, instead in terms of them using like those problems to get money, get tax breaks. [translated]

The response above is a dialectical manifestation of the understanding of one’s history that is in dynamic interaction with the sociopolitical and economic conditions that influenced the conditions that an ethical transaction can transpire. Without directly stating it, Kenneth situated his response to the backdrop of the Philippines as a semifeudal and semicolonial country, whose structures are designed by its colonizers and that ensures inequality, inequity, and injustices that perpetuate the space for the ruling class to determine what is ethical and how to conduct it.

In general, bioethics students’ responses address the point that the drowning child thought experiment fails to address, that we should not just give to charity because it is morally right or because it will eventually reach those who need it. To give to charity organizations in spite of the reality that it can perpetuate the root cause of poverty is a problem that the former bioethics students see in this context but which most were unable to verbalize in the drowning child thought experiment. The abstractness of the thought experiment blurred, in most of them, their understanding of the implication of the thought experiment, but in clearer terms, anchoring a thought experiment, such as this last thought experiment, on a material condition clarifies their position with regards to the problem (Stańczyk, 2021). The concreteness of the thought experiment is qualified through the concreteness of the exploitation created by the neoliberal free market economy in terms of how it sells poverty. For Rene, it is through making poverty aesthetically marketable; he argued:
It seems it was ‘aestheticized’ or it seems you are presenting what feels like that … the good part of or aesthetically pleasing part only of that situation instead of presenting the whole that the reason they are in that situation because of this, this, this … [translated]

The “whole” to which he refers is the historical context of colonization that maintains a system that is oppressive to the people and doubly oppresses them by becoming objects of the aid and charity transactions as a requirement of the ethical transaction.

Where the same implication was not clear in the drowning child thought experiment, this time the chorus of responses zoning in on issues of advertisement, profiteering, voluntourism, corporate social responsibility, and fund allocation was clear. The abstractness of poverty and charity was translated to a material condition through photographs that the participants can relate to and associate with their material experience. For the students, they feel they are more critical now of such transactions as they become wary of charities as they seem to embody the white man’s savior complex.

From Janice:

But with charities it seems like, I don't know why I have grown more cautious, which seems like such charities that ... I am reading a lot about like .... how white people feel like they have to save everyone. [translated]

And Indira:

Because I very much hate voluntourism as a concept, like so much, there is so many detrimental ... it has promise like almost white savior complex, that it does not even address the systemic issues, it is just like it is there ... you temporarily
give a solution and people in power feel good about themselves. [partially translated]

There is also the context of colonialism from Kylie’s response where she touches on a Western bioethical principle of paternalism but views this as the language of the colonizer and interspersing a postcolonial language argued by Fanon, that colonizers see themselves as the owner of knowledge and resources:

It seems like I can connect/remember actually, like what we discuss in bioethics, if that is how the image of the people you want to help is framed it seems you make them super helpless, super detached, our word in colonialism … paternalistic … they are the gods who have the knowledge, who have the resources … we are the poor who needed to be helped. [translated]

Randolph added to this colonial context on how the colonizers view the colonized in the context of the charity or aid-giving, dialectically responding to the thought experiment through the context of a semifeudal and semicolonial society and also responding to the view of Fanon (1991) on colonization and ethics:

I do not know if how I view it is right, but it is a very colonial way of thinking that we are viewed to live like savages [and] that is why we need material aid from the West, from people outside the Global South. It seems to create, even unintentionally, it seems to create a condition that they are the benchmark of civilization and that we can only become civilized if we can dress, speak, and become like them … [translated]

Also, Imperialism is now literally mentioned by a former bioethics student, which is the common language used by the Lumad students in their responses to the different thought experiments, as shared by Jacob:
It seems like a minor superficial help that is really largely marketed, but again it does not address the root causes of why the situations is like this. So, for example, a large reason for the poverty of Indians, of Filipinos is based on centuries of colonialism and continuing history of Imperialism. [translated]

In contrast with the other three thought experiments, the former bioethics students provided a richer response here that shows the interconnectedness of ethics, politics, economics, and other contexts that are not usually consciously used in ethical discourses. Whereas the drowning child is purely abstract, the climate crisis is far from the lived realities of the bioethics students, and the artificial womb is a technology still far into the future for human use, the bioethics students seem to connect to this thought experiment because of their lived experience. The students are able to assess and dissect poverty as a historical problem borne from a history of colonization and how it is maintained by Imperialism, as mentioned directly or indirectly. In some of the responses, it was added that charity organizations do not exist if poverty does not exist and the existence of poverty is a product of the current structures in the world. This thought experiment also showed how the language of a decolonized critical bioethics can also work with the current language of bioethics in the final analysis of a thought experiment. This can be observed in the responses of the students who were able to organically use both languages in responding to the thought experiment. In one response, Kylie used the words “framing”, “colonialism”, “paternalism”, “gods with resources”, and “the poor who need help”. Rene also reflected on the value of these issues:

So, I don’t think it is ethical because it is not ... it represents a reality, not mine, someone else’s, yes, but not even the whole reality. It is just like playing on a specific part to get a specific reaction, even if it is yes, for the good. But we should always ... as what they say, informed consent, it should be fully understood. [translated]
Rene in three sentences succinctly and naturally showed how the language of Western bioethics (informed consent) can enrich a response anchored on the other’s reality. This might be the best example of a response that represents the argument of this thesis, that class analysis exposes the incompleteness of the current language of bioethics education, and class-based analysis can be used to better respond to ethical transactions. The main point in the use of this language, as it is the language of the oppressed, marginalized, and exploited, is that it is able to extract a more nuanced context of an ethical dilemma in a thought experiment.

There seems to be a natural tendency for the bioethics students to use the dominant language of bioethics together with the language of a decolonized critical bioethics. Where humanizing/dehumanizing/subhumanizing language is not common in the analysis of ethical dilemmas in the first three thought experiments, it was mentioned naturally by the bioethics students in response to this thought experiment. Kylie for instance, argued that:

If you want to help then it should not be dehumanizing; the lens you are using for the people should not be exploitative. [translated]

This was expressed in relation to the whole discourse she is trying to make with regard to poverty and ethically responding to it – dehumanization as a language of critical pedagogy, exploitative as a function of class analysis. The discourse on the naturalness of poverty and the related charity or aid-giving to it is a response to the order of things constructed by the ruling class – again, instances of class analysis. Also, in the case of Randolph it is important for us to note his response to the drowning child thought experiment, where he argues against the removal of a naturally occurring structure but also stated this response in this thought experiment:
Is there at least an acknowledgment as to why there are children in those conditions in the first place? Because it is not, it is not natural for the poor to exist. [translated]

Clearly, this response is a 180 degree turn from his response to the drowning child thought experiment, which asked the same contextual question, but based on a real life condition his acceptance of structures from an abstract question becomes a critical response. It shows that one can hold a different view if presented with a moral dilemma abstractly compared to when asked the same moral dilemma anchored on a material condition through a different thought experiment (Stańczyk, 2021). Where one can hold a naïve consciousness, such as the naturalness of the general ‘poverty condition’, it becomes critical when anchored on a material condition that subscribes to the worldview of the individual. Lastly, this statement of Kenneth sums up the lens used by the bioethics students and the possibility of a richer language being used when analyzing an ethical dilemma or thought experiment:

It's like a selected snapshot of the country but it doesn’t show the bigger picture that you know what they say, *mayaman ang Pilipinas pero naghihirap ang sambayanang Pilipino* [the Philippines is rich, but its people are poverty-stricken]. I think that it is also curated in a way. I just remembered what Freire said about like false generosity that is given by the oppressor. That they say they are working in charity, but that it is only that. It's like only a fraction of what they are, not totally submitting themselves to humanizing those ... the oppressed. [translated]

The above response showed that there is space for the language of a decolonized critical bioethics together with the current dominant language of bioethics education. It will only benefit us to become more ethical agents if language is richer and more responsive to the ethical dilemmas we encounter, academically, and in real-life situations.
Objectively, as shown in this chapter, the position of the bioethics students may differ from those of the volunteer teachers and Lumad students; however, a careful analysis of the responses of these groups shows that they agree on how charities and aid-giving are being framed in relation to poverty, recognizing that this is context-based, related to a history of colonization and current imperialism; charities exist because systemic poverty is maintained, and those in developing countries become objects of these ethical transactions. The groups showed how dialectically their lived material conditions influence their positions and their responses, where the volunteer teachers and Lumad students do not immediately see charity activities negatively as they are part of it and the bioethics students are generally skeptical about it, as for them it is a form of exploitative enterprise; in the end, the responses intersect with the possible exploitative nature of the ethical transaction. Ultimately, the research participants dialectically responded to the thought experiments, manifesting their social class and their lived realities through their responses. How the students responded to the questions should not be viewed as a failure to develop in them the language of a decolonized critical bioethics as it was only observed among a few students at the start of this chapter or in the majority of the students in the last thought experiment. What the students shared or how they addressed the questions should again be viewed as a dialectical and relational response to the thought experiments, that the students still manifest their social status but also showed evidence that if it touches their lived realities, evidence of a decolonized critical language of bioethics exists in them. Furthermore, critical consciousness might be less pronounced based on the responses of the students but it can still be developed among those who might be considered by others as part of the oppressors (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Frueh, 2020), as long as we do not shy away from anchoring education in the materiality of the world and the continuing class struggle in our society. The use of the economic reductionism critique ‘card’ in academic spaces has meant that “sensitivity to problems related to the concept of class struggle disappears, thus provoking the disappearance of the concept of class struggle itself which is mainly material” (Stańczyk, 2021, pp. 7-8). Critical pedagogy becomes material
through class analysis in recognition that class struggle is material in a world hierarchically structured for the benefit of the few through the exploitation of the many.
Chapter 8 A decolonized critical bioethics: A materialist ethics, an ethics of resistance against the violent ethics of the ruling class

Decolonized critical bioethics starts from class analysis

National liberation, national renaissance, the restoration of nationhood to the people, commonwealth: whatever may be the headings used or the new formulas introduced, decolonization is always a violent phenomenon. (Fanon, 1991, pp. 35-36)

“Bobombahin ko yan” [I will bomb them]. “Barilin sila sa kanilang puke” [Shoot them in their vagina]. “My orders are to the police together with the military, add the barangay that if there is trouble and if there is an occasion that they resist and your lives are put at stake, shoot them dead.” These statements taken from news articles and from the speeches of Duterte during his nightly talk at the height of the COVID pandemic are the manifestation of Duterte’s fascist rule in the Philippines. The ruling class is violent and espouses a violent ethics.

“We have to continue what we have started, because injustice is already knocking on your side. You are witnessing the reality, how impunity and fascism are being used in the society you are living in.” “It will be lost in history; it is not that the Lumad who will be gone from history, but the IP will be removed from our reality or the Lumad will be gone, will be removed from their communities. That is the reason why the MMS curriculum framework becomes our weapons in the continuing defense of our ancestral lands.” These statements are from the responses of the Lumad students in Chapter 6. The exploited class holds an ethics of resistance that is life preserving, which consequently manifests, through the lens of the ruling class, violence against the very existence of the exploited class, and maintains the system that the ruling class created.
This dichotomy of class struggle or opposing class interests occurs frequently in the chapters that discussed the ethical positions of the different classes studied in this research. The class interest of those in power was shown to benefit only them, resulting in the disproportionate oppression of the exploited class. This is manifest in the discussions in Chapters 2 and 4 about the killing of activists like Chad Booc, and the passing of laws that benefitted the ruling elite, like the tax reforms during the pandemic that benefitted the capitalists, while passing the Anti-Terror Law as a tool against critics. It is also seen as placing generations of Filipinos in debt during the pandemic but failing properly to compensate frontline workers. Other policies discussed in Chapter 4 placed the ruling class interest first before the interest of the many. At the other end of the pole, the research participants showed in varying degrees an ethics of resistance that aimed to benefit the majority of the Filipino people.

In Chapters 5 and 6, the participants sided with the jeepney drivers when they were forced out from plying the roads during the pandemic in an attempt of the regime to monopolize and privatize the current public transportation under an anti-people jeepney modernization program. The participants were also clear in their understanding of the mass testing campaign, testing the greatest number of individuals for identification of COVID-positive individuals, in contradiction to the regime’s conscious and deliberate demonization of the campaign as an unattainable and resource-intensive policy. And, as a whole, the militarized pandemic response of the regime was criticized as it failed to address the medical and social needs of the people. This is the objective of this research, that by re-centering my analysis to bioethical issues through class analysis it becomes clear that the ethics of the ruling class is different from that of the exploited class. On the other hand, taking the position of decolonization as a class struggle under which a decolonized critical bioethics is anchored, clarifies the material context of bioethics vis-à-vis its current abstract and ideal foundation. These are just a few examples of a decolonized critical bioethics through a class-based analysis of a concrete socioscientific issue (COVID-19), and abstract bioethical issues, such as the different thought experiments used.
The work of Tuck and Yang (2012) was important in this re-centering of the analysis of how the current path of decolonization works, that it is not a metaphor, but the lack of class analysis in their work also lead to a vagueness about class position which mirrors their critique of Freire’s work. In the context of this research, forwarding a position that decolonization is not a metaphor is a step in the right direction, as it clarifies that decolonization is not only an academic issue; rather, the lived experience of the colonized is violent in nature. But in their re-imagining of decolonization without class analysis, it suffers the same issues that some critical pedagogy works (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Diemer et al., 2014; Diemer et al., 2016; Freebersyser, 2015; Frueh, 2020; Gates, 2011; Jemal, 2017) faced, as they were unable to pinpoint the class enemy of the oppressed, or in other cases led to sidestepping blame (Frueh, 2020) which fails to achieve its objective.

Exposing the weakness of critical pedagogy as an abstract tool (Tuck & Yang, 2012), one that is incapable of bridging the material reality of people’s struggles and the abstract nature of critical consciousness, seems to render critical pedagogy as an inappropriate tool for decolonization work. This is true to some extent, as critical pedagogy still has value in the analysis of education for how it can become a tool for oppression or for liberation. Here lies the value of the critique of critical pedagogy by Stańczyk (2021), as he is aware of the weaknesses of critical pedagogy, especially how it became an imperialist tool to remove class analysis in academic spaces, but also its strengths for showing the value of education as a political tool, especially vis-à-vis the context of class analysis.

Here is where the works of Tuck and Yang (2012) and Stańczyk (2021) intersect, for if decolonization wants to be true in its objective to decolonize, then it should be anchored on the material condition: in land struggle (Tuck & Yang, 2012) and in class analysis (Stańczyk, 2021). Without these prerequisites, analysis of the Lumad’s lived realities, for example, will be based on an abstract qualification of oppression which will fail to describe adequately the systemic and systematic wars of extinction (Alamon, 2017).
against them. Land struggle becomes a free-for-all catch phrase for the benefit of everyone, when, in reality, the benefits of the land are exploited by the ruling elite and their foreign counterparts (Camba, 2015; National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017; Sison, 1987, 2021). Thus, without class analysis, bioethics suffers from the same myopic analysis that capitalist liberal education affords us – if ethics is based on moral rightness/wrongness, then it is through the lens that perpetuates the rightness of the current social order.

The argument that may be raised against the use of class analysis in an attempt to undermine its validity is to admit that class analysis is as valid as any other liberal tools under a capitalist system, but to ask why it should take primacy, or in some other way invalidate alternative ways of analyzing the world. However, this question will only be deemed valid if there is blindness as to how our current society is shaped, structured, and ordered to benefit the interest of a few ruling elite, just like the blindness that exists in dealing with identities as exposed by critical race theory (Delgado, 1996; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). To cure this class blindness, there is a need for us to revert to the analysis of our society through the dominant mode of production and relations of production (Fu, 1997; Guerrero, 1979; Kotz, 2002; Lenin, 1970; Marx, 2010; Marx & Engels, 1998; Marx & Engels, 2015) and its relation to society’s superstructure, maintained and worsened by neoliberalism (Benatar, 2011; Clarke, 2005; Harvey, 2007; Kotz, 2002; Limon, 2019). Harvey (2007) pointed out how neoliberalism is being used to protect the interest of the ruling class, regardless of how it is qualified in different countries, through the military and reinforced through education, ethics, and other components that make up the superstructure. This is present in the lived realities of the Lumad as discussed in Chapters 2, 5, and 6, through the murder of their tribal leaders, teachers, school administrators, and they themselves for the exploitation of their ancestral lands (Alamon, 2017; Camba, 2015; Montero-Ambray, n.d.).

Through class analysis, there is no need to suffer from the class blindness of academics (Paredes, 2018, 2022a, 2022b) who opt to center their analysis through the culture of
indigenous peoples but sidestep the issue of militarization and armed struggle outside the Lumad condition. This is in complete contrast to those who have taken class analysis as the central focus in their study of the Lumad condition (Alamon, 2017; Calsado, 2020; Montero-Ambray, n.d.; Sy, 2022a, 2022b, 2023; Sy, 2019) in exposing the marginalization of indigenous peoples, like the Lumad, as an imperialist project in collaboration with the local elite under the banner of ongoing colonialism. On the other hand, the centrality of class analysis should not lead to the devaluation of identities; rather, the interplay of class with other identities should lead to a more nuanced analysis of oppression, exploitation, and marginalization.

In a semicolonial and semifeudal society like the Philippines (Guerrero, 1979; National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017), the monopolization of power and capital is apparent which can be traced back to its history of colonization (McCoy, 1993; Simbulan, 1965/2005; Villegas, 2009). This supports the analysis of Harvey (2007), where neoliberalism is just another capitalist tool for the concentration of capital and power in the hands of the elites, that is used by imperialists in influencing and controlling their (neo)colonies (National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017; Pernia, 1976; Sackur, 2015). To further drive the point home, education has been used to influence those in the colonies, especially those in privileged positions, to carry out the class interest of the ruling elite as exposed in some of the responses of the former bioethics students. The middle class, or those who are educated by the elite, colonized, market-oriented education system (Constantino, 1970; Dichoso, 2021; Lumbera et al., 2007; San Juan, 2016), are instrumental in carrying out the class interest of the ruling elite in influencing the masses (Guerrero, 1979). In short, the interest of the ruling elite should be exposed not only in terms of capital but also in its different forms that are dialectical in their monopolization of power.

The accumulation of power and capital is partially anchored on the dominant ethics of the society as part of the superstructure that perpetuates it. This is evident in the free-riding of imperialist language (superstructure) in the world economy (base economic
structure) (O’Regan, 2021), which can support the dialectical relationship in maintaining the current class structure in our society through the dominant classist ethics. As long as we anchor our analysis through land and class struggle, as the material basis of our analysis, we will see that education, religion, philosophy, culture, politics, and other components of the superstructure are not benign elements of the system that we passively consume. In reality, they are used to maintain the current social order, and in the case of ethics, they are used to define what is morally right and morally wrong in our society. Policies that open indigenous people’s land for mining are morally right, while the struggle for ancestral land and right to self-determination becomes morally wrong. Red-tagging and murder of human rights defenders are morally right, while a call for justice is morally wrong. Bioethics through class-based analysis clarifies the ethicality of these dichotomies.

Returning to the introduction of this section, without class analysis, how will we view the opposing positions of the regime and the research participants? Will the threats of bombing, shooting, and the killings that were committed under a war of extinction policy be viewed as an isolated openly fascist position of a regime? Or, under the watchful lens of a class-based ethics, are these statements and policies that openly expose the ethics of the ruling class the moral rightness of a violent ethics that maintains their position in the society? The ethics of violence of the ruling class does not only exist in those openly fascist policies but also permeates invisibly violent policies such as in the militarization of the pandemic response, in consciously and deliberately miscommunicating the pandemic response, which includes interpretation of data to benefit the regime’s class interest, and in blaming critics for the regime’s own failed policies. Vaccinating uniformed personnel with untested vaccines, putting generations of Filipinos into debt, while contradictorily lowering the corporate tax of billionaires are not signs of incompetence, but further proof of acts justified by the moral rightness of their class ethics. As Fanon puts it:
To tell the truth, the proof of success lies in a whole social structure being changed from the bottom up. The extraordinary importance of this change is that it is willed, called for, demanded. The need for this change exists in its crude state, impetuous and compelling, in the consciousness and in the lives of the men and women who are colonized. But the possibility of this change is equally experienced in the form of a terrifying future in the consciousness of another "species" of men and women: the colonizers. (Fanon, 1991, pp. 35-36)

Within the consciousness of the colonized/exploited and the colonizers/ruling class are the ethics that either maintain the status quo or an ethics that aims to overhaul a violent and exploitative system for the benefit of the many.

*Whose ethics? The ethics of violence and ethics of resistance in the current status quo*

The native is declared insensible to ethics; he represents not only the absence of values, but also the negation of values. He is, let us dare to admit, the enemy of values, and in this sense he is the absolute evil. He is the corrosive element, destroying all that comes near him; he is the deforming element, disfiguring all that has to do with beauty or morality; he is the depository of maleficent powers, the unconscious and irretrievable instrument of blind forces. (Fanon, 1991, p. 41)

According to Fanon, the colonizers/ruling class view the colonized, the oppressed, the marginalized, or the exploited class as evil, as only the elite are capable of being moral agents, as they are the creator of ethics. Duterte, as the representative of the ruling elite in the Philippines, as a semifuedal and semicolonial society, showed in his speeches that the ethics he carries in responding to a socioscientific issue like the COVID-19 pandemic is anchored on his class interest for his own class benefit. From the analysis in Chapter 4, this was clear from the start of the response of the Philippine government to the pandemic, when the Secretary of Health dismissed the threat of the virus (Cepeda, 2020; Mercado, 2020), and was in agreement with Duterte on the economic
impact of a possible Chinese tourist ban ("Duque rejects ban on Chinese tourists, cites diplomatic, political repercussions," 2020), even using the racism card against Filipinos. The government argued against mass testing, or effectively testing the highest number of individuals for surveillance of the virus as suggested by progressive groups, as it did not view it as beneficial for the country, but contradictorily used untested vaccines for presidential security personnel in an attempt to protect the president. The Filipinos did not benefit when the regime amassed one of the highest COVID-related debts in the world (IBON Foundation, 2022; Lopez, 2020b; World Bank, 2022), while lingering at the bottom of COVID-19 response world rankings, even though the government and its agencies allowed for emergency authorization of vaccines. The number of approved and acquired vaccines did not translate into the number of vaccines used, as millions of doses were left unused and expired (Villanueva & Suerte Felipe, 2023), a clear indication of the Philippine's COVID response. Juxtaposing these actions and policies to its framing of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is clear for the Duterte regime who is to be blamed for the failed response to the pandemic; as shown in Figure 8.1, there was a systematic policy to put the blame on activists and other government critiques as agents that negatively impact vaccination.

In government propaganda (Figure 8.1), activists were deliberately placed at the leftmost side of the range of vaccine positions to show the most negative position, where they are blamed as being responsible for the low or negative uptake of vaccination during the rollout process of COVID-19 vaccines in the Philippines. Instead of addressing the failure of the regime to roll out its vaccination program to the population (Amit et al., 2022; "Philippines accused of being ‘anti-poor’ with public transport ban on Covid unvaccinated," 2022; WHO, 2021), the regime instead pointed at activists as the cause of the failure of the rollout. Furthermore, as a historical background, the regime has a violent relationship with activists, with high numbers of cases of human rights violations against activists in the past few years, which has resulted in an ICC investigation (Human Rights Watch, 2022; Reuters, 2022).
Figure 8.1. Range of vaccination positions formulated by the Philippine Department of Health.

Personally, I experienced this government rhetoric first-hand: 1) Figure 8.1 is from a presentation of the Department of Health when discussing COVID-19 in the school in which I teach; and 2) during a school science and math festival where an alumnus presented the same government position three years after COVID-19 hit the Philippines. In short, these examples, as discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, show that there is a connection between the class interest of the ruling class and their ethical positions with regards to socioscientific issues. There is a need to re-orient our analysis back to class analysis and class struggle, as their diminished or diminishing presence (Stańczyk, 2021) in academic spaces is a product of the whole neoliberal agenda (Harvey, 2007), especially, in a (neo)colonized country like the Philippines (Lumbera et al., 2007; San Juan, 2016; Sison, 1987). We live in a world where the ruling elites have amassed the greatest wealth in our history; thus, they are able to monopolize the ethics in our world that is found in every component of the superstructure of a dominant capitalist society. The range of vaccination positions constructed by the regime above is just one example of its ethical class position, where it does not hesitate to blame the exploited class for the problems it has created.
The ethical position of the ruling class which can be subsumed under the more dominant language of bioethics, such as paternalism, utilitarian calculation, duties and other constructs that result in the sidestepping of blame, can also be reinterpreted as class interest to expose how it leads to oppression of the exploited class for the benefit of the ruling class. Chapter 4 exposes the ethical position of the ruling class when confronted with a socioscientific issue, and its violence cannot be overly stated. The following subsections show how the violent ethics of the ruling class hides behind more abstract notions of ethicality, which seems to be an innocuous academic abstract debate, but in reality surreptitiously permeates our material consciousness in accepting its moral rightness through abstract ethical philosophies, guidelines, frameworks, and other mechanisms.

Ethical Gatecrashing and Gatekeeping through Politico-Economic Monopolization

The analysis of Genetically Modified (GMO) products here is not centered on the ethicality of use of GMOs in our society (Beluch, 2005; Dizon et al., 2016; Sellwood, 2002; Weale, 2010); rather, is focused on GMOs as a vehicle or object that carries ethical considerations or transactions. At the start of trading of GMOs, “due to complex international dynamics and asynchronous release of GM food products, there is a lack of consistent regulation” (Xanat et al., 2018). This problem, in some ways, in terms of GM crops is addressed by the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) in navigating the “sharing of benefits” from plant genetic materials and its intersection with Farmers’ Rights (Esquinás-Alcázar, 2005). The treaty acknowledges the complex issue surrounding plant genetic materials and tries to address the competing rights of farmers, government policies, and profit-orientation of corporations. In relating the trade of GMOs to the dialectics of ethics and capital, there is a marked distinction between the participation of developed and developing countries, where the former lead in the trade networks while the latter are the site of the production of GMOs (Xanat et al., 2018). Thus, Xanat et al. (2018) argue that developing countries are or will be major players for the international trade of GM products, but this should be
viewed in the context of the colonization of land of these countries. This is not far from the realities faced by national minorities like the Lumad in (neo)colonized countries, where their struggle is impacted by the exploitative land interest of colonizing countries for their own superprofit. Furthermore, in the same article by Xanat et al. (2018), they cited the work of Johnston (2011), in which it is argued that the major players in the international trade of GM products are also among those who have known cases of tax evasion (China, France, Germany, Japan, and the US). Again, this reflects the same nature of business that international companies do in the land of the Lumad, such as mining companies that apply for tax breaks and tax holidays (Alamon, 2017; Camba, 2015). This unequal trade agreement is reflected below:

We can see two tendencies on the global trade policies: while the US and European countries favor bilateral and regional agreements that have long-term negative impacts mostly on Southern countries, Australia and East Asian countries favor multilateral and non-discriminatory trade systems. In the absence of GM-specific trade regulations, adopting a GM crop by developing countries is generally beneficial. (Xanat et al., 2018, p. 585)

Even if there is an argument that can be made for the existence of a power imbalance that relates to the trade of GMOs, others argue that the ITPGRFA does not conflict with other treaties such as the TRIPS Agreement (Gerstetter et al., 2007). Do these conflicting issues on the trade of GMOs result in a stalemate, where the issue of advantage and disadvantage is a matter of a flip of coin? Through a postcolonial analysis, Lawson (2015) argues that to achieve the aspirations of these treaties, there is a need to confront the reality that: (1) developed countries (genetically-poor countries) benefit more from developing countries (genetically-rich countries); and (2) there should be a mechanism to balance the unequal trade relations between developed and developing countries. On the other hand, the analysis of the current state of international trade of GMOs should be through the analysis of how a colonizing institution, such as the WTO, forces the economies of developing countries for the entry
and acceptance of GMOs. Alice Palmer’s (2006) report on The WTO GMO Dispute showed that developed (colonizing) countries used the power of an institution like the WTO and its legal framework to force their economic interests upon developing countries:

From the outset of this dispute, commentators speculated that the Complaining Parties’ real motivation for bringing the dispute was to send a message to developing country WTO Members wanting to regulate GM imports … They might now use the outcome in this dispute to put pressure on developing country WTO Members to open their markets to GM imports. (Palmer, 2006, p. 3)

The entry of GMOs to developing (colonized) countries does not only reflect the colonizing economic and political power of developed (colonizing) countries but also the ethics that the GMOs carry. As an object or vehicle for ethical considerations or transactions, the imposition of the entry of GMOs to economies of colonized countries is a signal of the entry of a colonizing ethics involving GMOs. Take for example the article of Weale (2010) on the ethical arguments involving GMOs, where the Nuffield Council on Bioethics (NCOB) argued that: (1) the ‘unnaturalness’ claim on GMOs is not sufficiently different compared to conventional breeding for it be morally objectionable; and (2) GMOs bring significant benefits for developing countries. These perceived benefits with which the GMOs will supposedly endow developing countries are in the context of “reduction of poverty, and improved food security and profitable agriculture” (Weale, 2010, p. 582). If this is the ethical obligation that the entry of GMOs to colonized countries brings, then we have to address why there is poverty in these countries in the first place, who and what are the major cause of food insecurity, why there is a backward and stunted rural development and lack of national industrialization in colonized countries. To argue the ethical basis for the entry of GMOs in colonized countries one should start with the questions: (1) for whose benefit; and (2) who created those conditions to ethically justify the opening of economies of colonized countries to GMOs in the first place? As this ethical consideration touches on a Western Imperialist
ethical ideal of utility, there is a need to take a view of how ethics is assimilated in a
community through the entry of technology (Komparic, 2015). Komparic (2015) further
added that:

It is valuable to embrace local moral theories as *at least* one of many tools in
determining relevant ethical considerations, and ultimately advocating for a
course of action. (Komparic, 2015, p. 612)

This is actually a challenge for colonized countries as even though communities have
their own local moral theories, these are still subject to the colonizing ethics of those in
power. And as this section tried to argue, the entry of GMOs into developing countries
and the ethics they carried is not only completed through international treaties,
conventions, trade agreements, and local policies but also justified through the
colonizing ethics of the ruling elite. The same condition is observed between the ethical
position of the ruling elite in Chapter 4 and the ethical positions of the exploited class in
Chapters 5, 6, and 7. Medical technologies are used as a vehicle 1) in accumulating
capital and power through financial and political debt and 2) in marking the line of moral
rightness and wrongness of acts. The regime’s ethical position in this case is the
morally right thing to do, while it acts to question whether this is a morally wrong
position to hold as exemplified by the vilification of critiques that lower the benefit of
vaccination. This is further from the truth as shown in the responses of the research
participants, especially those who exhibit critical consciousness, in raising questions of
safety, accessibility, ownership, profit, and exploitation when it comes to ethical
discussion of new technologies.

Ethical debates around new technologies should not only be centered around issues of
utility, paternalism, duty, beneficence and non-maleficence, and other such abstract
ethical constructs as shown by this research. The question of ‘who benefits?’ is
paramount, as this question is central for the structuring or re-structuring of our society.
When these ethical responses exist, 1) what is the root cause of poverty?, imperialism
is the reason why there are poor people, 2) we have to protect the ancestral lands to protect everyone, the current climate crisis is linked to climate imperialism, 3) the technology is amazing but who has access, will benefit and profit from it?, and 4) who benefits from international NGOs and charity?, then ethics is opened for wider understanding. Then it becomes clearer that ethics does not exist in a vacuum, the exploited are not incapable of ethics nor evil as the colonizers label them to be (Fanon, 1991); rather, the competing ethics of the ruling class and exploited class are tied to the current dominant mode of production which is used for their own ends.

**Developing World Bioethics: Colonizing or Colonized Ethics?**

This section focuses on the language of ethics used in *Developing World Bioethics*, a publication that is expected to address bioethical issues relevant to developing (colonized) countries, instead of perpetuating a dominant form and function of current bioethics. I reviewed *Developing World Bioethics* publications from the period between 2011 and 2021 to determine whether there are genuine critiques of the current formulation of bioethics? The articles represent the position of the ruling elite as the authors belong to the privileged group, who might not themselves be part of the ruling elite, but might still carry the class interest of the elites as shown by some of the former bioethics students when responding to bioethical issues.

The common issues or topics found in the articles center on the following: the ethical use of technology in developing countries, the impact of international frameworks in terms of acceptance and resistance, the value of community engagement in the uptake of bioethics and its guidelines, the influence of neoliberalism in bioethics, the curriculum of bioethics, the different social relations that can impact bioethics such as power relationships, and, finally, exploration of the question ‘whose ethics?’ Just like in the previous section, the articles seem to address the central position of this research on the narrowness of language of bioethics and bioethics education; that includes bioethics’ class character, as was revealed through the decolonization of bioethics.
A more nuanced and critical analysis of the different articles shows that even if the articles start with a critique of the current status of bioethics, they typically revert to current tools of analysis of bioethics that do not ethically benefit the oppressed groups, which reflects the responses of the former bioethics students. For example, Meghani (2011) includes class analysis in the bioethical dilemma created by medical tourism in countries like India whose economy is influenced by neoliberalism. However, in the end, the article failed to take a position and reverted to vagueness of language such as the value of a particularist ethics to address the ethical problem of medical tourism. Also, in dissecting the ethical intricacies of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) trials, in the context of HIV-AIDS, Haire (2011) takes into account the value of the reality of local communities but then, again, reverts to the dominant language of bioethics through the language of duty. In another article on neoliberalism and medical tourism, Smith (2012) seems to be limited in her analysis of the impact of neoliberalism and medical tourism in countries with wide social inequity. The article described the opening of the economies of such countries due to neoliberalism and its impact upon these countries through the lens of medical tourism, but the analysis suffered because of vagueness of its position in confronting the impact on the poor of the country and relied heavily on exploratory ethical questions in its concluding statements. These articles mirror the responses of the former bioethics students, in that when confronted with bioethical dilemmas, those who belong to a privileged group are prone to revert to the ethics of the ruling elite.

Juxtaposing this to the responses of the research participants, who have shown critical consciousness, in my study (especially using the artificial womb thought experiment) reveals that an ethical response should not be limited to working within the stated boundaries of the problem, such as in the case of neoliberalism and Western bioethics, as these issues can be directly confronted. The clearest response of the participants that can be related to neoliberalism is their critique on access, ownership, and profit in relation to technology and how this links with bioethics and capitalism. The research participants showed that that there is no need to justify the unequal relationship that
marginally positively impacts the life of the colonized through the exploitative acts of the ruling elite. For example, medical tourism can hardly be justified, while the ruling elite profits excessively from the current order of things and seems to provide access to the working class of richer nations; bioethicists cannot wear a myopic lens in this analysis. Access to private health care for working class individuals from richer nations is argued to be ‘ethically acceptable’ even though this is anchored in the oppression, marginalization, and exploitation of the exploited class in poorer countries which allow medical tourism. The responses of the participants of who controls access, who owns/controls the technology/process, and who profits from the transaction should be at the center of the critique of the problem. This response of Rene to the artificial womb thought experiment highlights the problem with that kind of transaction and ethical justification:

It is politically problematic if it is not accessible, and it is prevented by politics of a place of its use; might as well not have it if no one is going to have it. Definitely, we should use this kind of technology but, like, can you assure me or everyone can have this kind of treatment equally, that it will be part of healthcare for all? If ‘yes’, by all means; if ‘no’, no thanks. But strive towards it.

Rene considers the current problem with these kinds of transactions, but in the end qualified that we can strive for a system that allows access for all. Rene’s response was completely different from the articles reviewed above as it does not justify the current unequal relationship of the realities on the ground. This shows that there is another lens that can be used to analyze and critique the issue, that we cannot just be content with the few benefits that come from an inherently exploitative unequal relationship as there are better possibilities if we address them head on.

This represents the current problem with bioethics; critiques do not move the needle of ethicality, as they are content with addressing the issues through ethical concessions on the periphery. We can confront the center of the problem and we saw that from the
responses of the participants, especially of the Lumad school volunteer teachers and Lumad students. Because they grasp a reality at the negative receiving end of Imperialism, Feudalism and Bureaucrat Capitalism, together with the neoliberal project of the free market, their ethics resist the current dominant ethics of this system. This is a system that allows critiques as long as they do not address the inherent exploitative nature of the system, that the possibility of ethical transaction can still exist and be ethically acceptable even in a system that is anchored on exploitation. As we saw from the responses of the Lumad students, their matter-of-fact critique of the current prevailing system that exploits, marginalizes, and oppresses them can be bioethicists’ foundation for developing a decolonized critical epistemological response to the problem of colonizing language of current dominant bioethics.

As the different issues of *Developing World Bioethics* focused on different technologies and medical procedures, we can make the same argument offered above, namely that our analysis of the ethicality of these technologies and procedures in developing countries should not just be viewed in terms of cultural, social, economic, and political acceptability but also in terms of directly confronting the problems inherent in our current social order of a classist society. When we talk about access to such technologies it should also be in the context of ownership, profit and exploitation and the questions of: Who benefits the most? Technology for whom? And, who are the exploiter and exploited in those ethical transactions? Those at the margins of our society who directly experience the negative impacts of Imperialism do not speak of slogans in their responses to questions related to their lived realities, as shown by the research participants. Common to their responses in the four thought experiments is the root cause of the problem, the exploitative nature of the current social order. Furthermore, their collective response is not to marginally change the problematic situation, or respond within its frameworks, but to overhaul it. When some of the former bioethics students respond to the climate crisis thought experiment of using the ancestral lands of the national minorities, it was in stark contrast to the general response of the Lumad students that the protection of their ancestral lands will result in the protection of
everyone. The Lumad students did not resort to responses that would lead to their exploitation in order to protect the greatest number of people, a response found in a number of the bioethics’ students interview responses, which reflect the critiques found in the articles analyzed, being superficial and constrained despite being otherwise well-intentioned.

There were articles in the different issues of Developing World Bioethics that are less accepting of the current ethical realities and did not justify the current dominant system. A number of the articles that were analyzed focused on the current inherent problem of bioethical guidelines and moral frameworks which “can never be enough to solve a dilemma since guidelines only describe what to aim for and not how to interpret or use them” (Jarvis, 2017, p. 50) and how to move beyond the “current dominant bioethical paradigms” (Nie, Li, et al., 2018, p. 56). In articles that explore the impact of ethical guidelines and frameworks upon local communities there is much to be desired as, again, the articles mostly stayed within the limits of the current language of bioethics in their assessment. For example, while Kaur and Choy (2014) addressed the limitation of the language of the International Committee on Harmonization of Good Clinical Practice (ICH-GCP) guidelines and deemed them to be vague and imprecise, they limited their conclusions by constraining the analysis through the value of principles and duties.

This acknowledges the central argument of my research on the narrowness of the language of bioethics, as this is the ethics of the ruling class. Meanwhile, in another article, ‘vocabulary and structure’ (Hunt et al., 2014, p. 55), current ethical guidelines are addressed but the framework still lacks the class analysis component. Comparing the article of Hunt et al. (2014) to the work of Jaycox (2012), who acknowledges that current bioethical debate concerning the “global market for human organs is hindered by a lack of adequate bioethical language” and is dominated by a “culturally Western bioethical language” (p. 135), shows that the issue of capital (market) and the current domination of Western bioethics language can co-exist. Additionally, Jaycox’s analysis
is clear in taking the position of the exploited, especially by making the poor/exploited
the center of its analysis through exploring aspects of social, political, and economic
context, and in articulating the importance of sociopolitical action or praxis in the
liberation of oppressed peoples.

Jaycox (2012) separates itself from the other articles as it is clear in its position and the
language it is articulating without directly mentioning class analysis, but it uses the
language of the oppressed and praxis. The article encapsulates the position of this
thesis on the value of addressing the language of bioethics and taking the side of the
oppressed to make bioethics ethical. However, Jaycox’s (2012) publication is the only
article from the articles analyzed in Developing World Bioethics from 2011-2021 which I
think completely aligns with the objectives of this research; in my opinion there should
be more of this kind of article if the journal intends to promote bioethics through the lens
of the developing countries. Currently, it seems the articles are too focused on
promoting the lens of Western Bioethics to developing countries or, if a critique is made,
it is focused on addressing issues on the fringes of the discipline rather than the central
problem of bioethics. Also, if this is viewed together (not through a disjointed lens)
through the lens of ‘bioethical imperialism’ (Barugahare, 2019), the current movement
on decolonization in bioethics (Barugahare, 2019; 甘 Zhen-Rong Gan & 伊瑟利 Mark
Israel, 2020) and othering (Shahvisi, 2019), bioethics can become more competent in
addressing bioethical issues. For example, in the analysis of Barugahare (2019) on
bioethical imperialism, which in terms of the language of this research is the
manifestation of our current social order in bioethics, the research seems again to be
limited in its analysis by the tools of the current dominant form of the discipline.

In this case, bioethical imperialism was qualified by Barugahare (2019) in the context of
the WHO/CIOMS 10 guideline, which for him addresses the problem of Imperialism by
allowing “additional provisions, waivers, modifications, specific research context”
(Barugahare, 2019, p. 135) which removes its dominating or subjugating character in
relation to the local context of RECs (Research Ethics Councils). This analysis again
leaves us with a lot to be desired as the author already acknowledges the existence of bioethics in the context of Imperialism, but this was only viewed through the guidelines that limited its critique or analysis. The Imperialism that my research critiques is not only found in guidelines, frameworks, theories, and elsewhere but also in the language of how we construct those concepts. If left with only the current language of bioethics we will not be able to draw out a richer and more ethical discussion of the issue of poverty, a point emphasized through the responses to the drowning child thought experiment.

As observed among the former bioethics students, the dominant language of bioethics clearly influenced their responses vis-à-vis the responses of the Lumad school volunteer teachers and Lumad students. It was clear that the former bioethics students were limited in their analysis of the thought experiment because of the current dominant language in bioethics, as their responses were limited by the boundary of the thought experiment or reached the stage of questioning the boundary while staying within its limits, which I argue is a function of their privileged position. This represents the argument presented in the article of Barugahare (2019), that current critiques and analysis either stay within the limitation of the language of bioethics or, when there is a recognition of this boundary, authors seem to acknowledge it but still revert back to the limitation of their tools of analysis. Compare this to the general responses of the Lumad school volunteer teachers (Chapter 5) and Lumad students (Chapter 6) and some former bioethics students (Chapter 7) whose analysis centered on the critique of the current social order such as the presence of the ethical boundary as dictated by the ruling elite. I am not saying that the current published articles are inherently faulty; what I am saying is that there is still a lot to be desired in these articles and they could have had a more robust or complete toolkit for their analysis, one that employs the ethical language of the exploited class and not of the ruling class.

There is a stark difference when the Lumad school volunteer teachers and Lumad students responded to the drowning child thought experiment through a critical lens on Imperialism and in the use of bioethical imperialism by Barugahare (2019). The former
group responds to critique Imperialism as the root of the problem while the latter only acknowledges this but still works within this colonizing framework or guidelines. This is clearly manifested in the following text, where the author sees the provisions, modifications, and other such constructs as a “window [which] provides a way around potential ethical imperialism, at least with regard to requirements of informed consent” (Barugahare, 2019, p. 135), instead of clearly pointing out the problem with the existence of such conditions. Those former bioethics students who stayed within the limits of the thought experiments embody this current reality but there are possibilities beyond this reality as there were students, albeit only a few, who were able to go beyond the limitation of the tools of current dominant bioethical language.

As we can see, the point that this research is forwarding, such as the inadequate language of an Imperialist bioethics, is not new; even the lens of decolonization, dehumanization, othering, and other constructs are not new in the critiques found in the Developing World Bioethics articles. What has been lacking in previous research is the use of these constructs together; my analysis and critique of bioethics and bioethics education is not intended as a central universalizing framework or guideline in bioethics, but to enrich bioethics as currently formulated. By addressing the inadequate language of bioethics as manifested in different moral frameworks and bioethical guidelines we are addressing its class character. However, as was shown by the different articles, there is a tendency to explore the implication of these moral frameworks and bioethical guidelines in relation to social, political, and economic aspects of moral agents while simultaneously failing to identify that the language that is being used to address the problem is still the language of the ruling class (colonizer). If we can qualify that there is indeed a form of bioethical imperialism and that there is a need for the decolonization of bioethics, this research sees the value of addressing the inadequacy in the language of bioethics as a function of the language of the ruling class or of the oppressor. We see that if moral agents revert back to the dominant language of bioethics, they will be incapable of addressing the lived realities of the historically exploited, and will rather
maintain the currently accepted ethicality of ethical transactions, and perpetuate this reality further.

As noted, specifically from the responses of the former bioethics students (Chapter 7), when faced with a difficult bioethical dilemma they tend to revert to the dominant language of bioethics and thereby the language of the ruling class through the language of liberalism of classless analysis. Even with an understanding of the history of exploitation, marginalization, and oppression of different national minorities in the Philippines, a number of the former bioethics students chose in the climate crisis thought experiment to displace them in order to save the most individuals. For some, this might seem to be a weakness of the pedagogy of using critical pedagogy in the bioethics education of the students, as they seem to use a lifeline in responding to the thought experiment, that is the language of the ruling class in bioethics. However, we should also take into account that these former bioethics students only took the class as an elective for one school year and it might not be enough to completely develop in them critical consciousness in addressing the bioethical dilemmas in the thought experiment.

I think it is more important to note the possibilities that the formulation can offer, that there were students who are able to grasp the objective of a decolonized critical bioethics, as indicated in their responses, responses that take the position of the exploited class. Again, Jaycox (2012) clearly articulates this formulation through the lens of liberation theology in bioethics, marking a clear position to move away from the language of the ruling elite in bioethics, a stance which this thesis is also championing. Contextualizing this through the work of Fanon (1991) and his analysis that the ruling class (colonizing class) sees the exploited class (colonized class) as incapable of ethics, it only means that whatever moral framework or bioethical guidelines that we try to reformulate through the language of the ruling class is an ethics that lack ethics in the hands of the exploited class. This formulation creates this condition: the ruling class will only be the one capable of being a moral agent in whatever formulation of moral
frameworks and bioethical guidelines, and the exploited will be moral agents existing at the periphery of these frameworks and guidelines. The oppressed will exist as ethical agents in the margins of the ethics of the ruling class and this can be perpetrated through media that legitimize this reality such as in *Developing World Bioethics*, a publication that is exported by colonizers to the colonized. Lastly, this section showed that those who have the capital, such as bioethicists, will perpetuate the current colonizing ethics of the colonizers if they are not conscious of how ethics free rides on capital and how it is class that controls the circulation and accumulation of capital (and therefore ethics).

*The ethics of social beings in a class society*

"It is not consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness."

(Marx, 2010)

In relation to the analysis above, in addressing the second research question, concrete conditions or the environment mediate the development of individuals and groups (Vygotsky, 1962; Vygotsky, 1978), and one of the concrete conditions in the current social order is the existence of class, an order in which power and capital are monopolized by one group (Simbulan, 1965/2005; Villegas, 2009), which is amplified in a colonized society (Lenin, 1970; National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017; Sison, 1987). Inherent in these questions are the lived realities of those who are part of the ethical transaction, especially in a (neo)colonized country like the Philippines; the entry point of the analysis is through class where other identities intersect to amplify the vulnerabilities of the oppressed group (Cassell, 2017; Haider, 2018). Ethical debates involving different groups are not new to the Philippines as a Filipino bioethicist (Professor de Castro) was part of a working group for the initial draft of the Universal Declaration of Bioethics and Human Rights (UDBHR) (Andorno, 2007), with the same representative arguing for an Asian bioethics (de Castro, 1999). This shows that the
Philippines is an active participant in the development of bioethics. de Castro (1999) even partly touches on the argument of this research regarding the incompleteness of the current language and Imperialist character of Western bioethics, which results in an ethical stalemate.

For this section, there is another work of de Castro (de Castro et al., 2021) which can provide a further lens on whose class interest bioethicists from colonized countries write for, which can be observed in the different bioethics articles from the *Developing World Bioethics*. Even though de Castro et al. (2021) recognized the existence of current political and socio-economic hierarchical issues, there are still instances where they carry the class ethics of the ruling elite in writing bioethics articles. In that article, the authors stated that “21 persons were arrested” during the COVID-19 lockdown in the Philippines as truth, instead of ‘illegally arrested’, and the phrase “desperation and ignorance” was employed, a dehumanizing lens used on the poor (colonized) (de Castro et al., 2021, p. 157). This article is just an example of the ethical positions that those in a privileged group hold, which can be linked to their social being or the environment that influenced their consciousness. This mirrors the responses of the former bioethics students when they revert to the dominant language of bioethics or to the colonizing language that their class position mean that they are likely to employ.

To further grasp the ethical position of the opposing classes is to understand the impact of a Marcos, Jr presidency in the Philippines (Moss, 2022; Shweta, 2022), albeit marred with massive fraud (Baizas, 2022; Bordey, 2022; Fernandez, 2022; Rubio, 2022), in the 2022 Philippine National Elections in the context of the continuing monopolization of power and capital by the ruling class (Harvey, 2007; McCoy, 1993; Simbulan, 1965/2005; Villegas, 2009). The possibility of the Lumad schools being opened again under this regime is all but impossible as the Marcoses have a long history of opening the Philippines to large-scale mining activities (Branigin, 1986; Camba, 2015; Gerth, 1986; "Marcos wants cohesive, long-term mining policy," 2015). This reality is coupled with the recently renewed position of the outgoing Duterte regime in approving mining
concessions ("Duterte approves renewal of mining deal with OceanaGold amid opposition ", 2021; "Philippines ends open pit mining ban to reinvigorate industry," 2021; Sarmiento, 2022a) which has faced scientific and community opposition ("End to open-pit ban triggers showdown over Tampakan," 2022; Sarmiento, 2022b). This is the reality of the Philippines; Ferdinand Marcos, Jr. has won a ‘landslide’ election that is founded on fake news, years of historical distortion and manipulation, troll machineries, vote buying, dysfunctional vote counting machines, violence, in short, an election marred with the violent ethics of the ruling class against the oppressed and exploited groups. Thus it is important that the analytical lens(es) used should focus on this reality, that in a semifeudal and semicolonial society (Fanon, 1991; Guerrero, 1979; Lenin, 1970; National Anti-Poverty Commission Secretariat, 2017; Simbulan, 1965/2005) our analysis should not just expose or make visible what seems to be invisible but, more importantly, magnify these issues to bring them to the forefront, especially in the context of bioethics as this study’s focus.

The value of using Fanon’s (1967, 1991) position as a postcolonial writer and Freire’s (2012) critical pedagogy is that together these theoretical frameworks made visible what is the most concrete to the colonized (land) and how the political nature of education can also be used for the liberation of the oppressed. One key aspect of this analysis is the exploration of how class is a central element in the marginalization, oppression, exploitation, domination, and subjugation of the colonized, for instance, the Lumad and other marginalized members of a semifeudal and semicolonial society like the volunteer teachers and former bioethics students. In Chapter 2, this was visualized through the map of mining activities in the CARAGA region, where foreign and local interests, with the help of militarization, illustrate visually how the colonized like the Lumad are subjected to what Alamon (2017) termed ‘a war of extinction’ by their colonizers.

The Lumad, with their ancestral lands replete with natural resources, are targets of extractive industries like mining, logging, and others, owned by international and local elite collaborators that are protected by the state’s armed forces. The violent state
policies, which center on ‘wars of extinction’ against marginalized and oppressed peoples, are met with different forms of resistance, such as that which is manifested in one of its highest forms through the Lumad schools and the Makabayan, Makamas, Siyentipikong Edukasyon (MMS) curriculum framework (Calsado, 2020; Montero-Ambray, n.d.; Sy, 2019). The MMS curriculum, which does not specifically use Freire’s critical pedagogy, uses a transformative form of education that is conscious of its liberating nature and the current class hierarchy in Philippine society. The naïve to critical consciousness exhibited by a greater number of Lumad volunteer teachers and students compared to the bioethics students is influenced by their social conditions, partly by their MMS curriculum, which the former bioethics students mostly lack. If taken everything equal in terms of exposure to a form of transformative and liberating education, it becomes clear that the current class position of the groups is influential in their ethical positions.

Through the lens of Fanon’s postcoloniality, the analysis of the opposing ethical positions within exploiter-exploited or oppressor-oppressed dichotomies reveals that class underlies such divisions. One may then logically enquire as to how class might disentangle other identities that can also be nexus of the ‘wars of extinction’ against the Lumad. As a researcher-activist, with all the privileges and disadvantages my class and identity carry, I am consciously aware how class, as the focal point of analysis, is dialectically and dynamically related to other identities. This complex issue was addressed by Fanon (1967), as he did not see the collision between class and identity. Relevant to this case, the Lumad are not being displaced because they are not Christians, or because they are an ethnic minority, or because their chief is a woman who is not a Christian and also part of an ethnic minority. These identities amplify their vulnerabilities, together with their class and the untapped potential of the capital they own, as viewed by the Imperialists and local elite collaborators, in their ancestral lands.

Freire (2012) was vague in his analysis on who the oppressor or oppressed are (Ellsworth, 1989; Tuck & Yang, 2012), which might lead to confusion as to who is being
liberated in the current order of our society, a fair point from Tuck and Yang (2012) as we need to choose between a Lumad student and a local mining executive for example. Fanon (1967, 1991), on the other hand, was very clear in his assessment; the colonialist (Imperialist) and the colonialist bourgeoisie together with local elite collaborators are the enemies of the colonized, taking away from them their land and all the many forms of value derived from it. In this instance, Fanon showed that the colonized dialectically carry with them their identity as a colonized group and their class in relation and their relationship to the resources of their land (Marx, 2010). In her 2017 article ‘Marxism vs Intersectionality’, Jessica Cassell succinctly addressed this dilemma (Cassell, 2017):

The class nature of bourgeois justice cannot be reformed out of the court system as long as it rests on a capitalist foundation. So while Crenshaw’s demand was for the creation of a new designation of a protected minority within the court system for black women, we must stress that this would not fundamentally change the material and social conditions that gives rise to the compound discrimination she aptly highlighted that they experience in the workplace and broader society … An infinite number of categories could be created within the court system to reflect all the possible intersections of oppression … Why does that oppression occur in the first place, and how can it ultimately be eradicated?

To address this question is to locate the source of oppression; through class analysis it becomes clear that the current social order that produces the existing social hierarchy is the source of oppression of the colonized. Race, gender, ethnicity and other political identities together with class do not compete against each other to determine which causes the oppression of othered groups; class together with other political identities expose how oppression is amplified (Haider, 2018). Through their interview responses, Lumad students address Imperialism, Bureaucrat-Capitalism, and Feudalism as the root causes of the oppression of the Lumad. This is especially apparent when RonRon, without prodding, included in his response to the drowning child thought experiment that there is a need to address what created the pond in the first place. For him, the unsafe
pond is caused by Imperialism, Bureaucrat-Capitalism, and Feudalism. Juxtapose this to the response of the Duterte regime to the COVID-19 pandemic, where they: (1) prioritized the economic and political ties with China instead of closing the borders; (2) pushed for a vaccine-centric response, through a nihilistic view, that to have access to vaccines, there is a need to be subservient to countries like US, China, Russia, and others, through policies supported by Congress and Senate, and (3) subjugated the Filipino people through a militaristic response to the pandemic. The response of the Duterte regime to the pandemic creates a material basis for the critique of RonRon and the other research participants as the source of their oppression – (1) and (2) in terms of Imperialism, (2) of Bureaucrat-Capitalism, and (3) Feudalism.

Again, through a decolonizing lens, especially in the context of power, it is important to position the analysis in the context of the Philippines as a semifeudal and semicolonial society in order to provide a more nuanced analysis. Such an analysis is able to expose the role of previous and current (neo)colonizers in the existence of the oppressor-oppressed dichotomy in a (neo)colonized country, that they are not just mere indirect participants but conscious power players in the current social order. Again, given this analysis, the examination of the Philippine government’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic through the dissection of Duterte’s speeches (Chapter 4) in relation to its foreign policies is not a benign act; rather, it exists as conscious and deliberate colonizing ethics of the exploiter group (Fanon, 1991). Furthermore, Duterte has monopolized this power in collaboration with Imperialist powers:

Yet instead of opening the space for democratic contest and making way for those voices previously marginalized to participate in the public sphere, he has appropriated that power for himself. (Webb & Curato, 2018, p. 15)

In resistance, the responses of the participants, who are also conscious of their positions and responses, on different levels responded against the dominating and subjugating colonizing ethics of the elite. With this analysis, I argue that power can be
possessed and concentrated by individuals and groups and there is an equivalent resistance that exists in the concentration and control of power, as opposed to the conception of power of Foucault where individuals are mere vehicles of power (Balan, 2010).

This analysis is important for locating the source of oppression in the Philippines, in this case a family who belongs to the society’s elite who have benefited from the concentration of capital and the power they hold in the country. Thus, the response of the Duterte regime to the COVID-19 pandemic and crisis should be viewed through this lens, where Duterte and all those who hold power in the Philippines are from a dynastic elite which has rigged the system in their favor while collaborating with different Imperialist powers (Spain, USA, China, others). This power is manifested in a colonizing ethics that the elite hold that is violent against the colonized.

All of these findings subscribe to the central argument of Webb and Curato (2018) in ‘Populism in the Philippines’. For them, these cheap labels do not address a more deeply rooted societal problem that should be addressed through a historical, contextual, and critical approach that is rooted in the Philippines’ colonial past. Populism is not unique to Duterte, as it was employed by his political rivals, like Poe and Binay, during the 2016 elections; more importantly, populism is not unique in the 2016 elections that birthed Duterte, but it is an ever-present reality in the Philippines in different national elections (Evangelista & Curato, 2016a, 2016b; Webb & Curato, 2018). The co-option of history and its implications for the present is one of the ways in which Duterte and his regime have controlled power in the country and appropriated it for himself/themselves. This is reflected in the contents of the speeches that he delivered in addressing the pandemic, where there is a clear use of historical and present realities that prevent him from effectively addressing the pandemic, thus making it seem that his hands are tied to a fascist approach to a health and medical crisis. The historical and present intervention of the left-wing progressive activist groups, of the remaining members of the liberal party, and other political rivals, and the existence of
pervasive, rampant corruption within government were narratives which Duterte milked to misdirect the public regarding the state of the COVID-19 crisis and the regime’s response to it.

The regime’s COVID-19 pandemic response can also be seen as a form of medical populism (Lasco, 2020; Lasco & Curato, 2019), as “the politicisation of a health-related issue, portraying it is a public emergency that demands immediate response” (Lasco & Curato, 2019, p. 2). Furthermore, the regime operationalized this language as a political style that ‘pits the people against the establishment’ during a health crisis and it prospers because of the politicization, simplification, and spectacularization of a complex public health crisis such as that presented by the COVID-19 pandemic (Lasco & Curato, 2019). We also observed their illustration of divisions, as a medical populist approach, through the pasaway (rule-breaker) grand narrative used by the regime to make people enemies of each other due to a dichotomy of behavior of the people – rule follower vs rule breaker (Lasco & Curato, 2019). Additionally, this framing becomes the justification provided by the regime; that they are acting to project to the public that the worsening state of the crisis, during that time, is brought about by the pasaway who fail to follow government guidelines and policies.

This is a visible example of oversimplification of a complex health and medical crisis which can be clearly seen in the NAP Phase 2’s first objective that centers on ‘people’s compliance and vigilance to the minimum health standard or the changing of people’s mindset’. Lastly, as one of the clearest representations of this, the Presidential Spokesperson Harry gleefully shouted in a media briefing, “Panalo na tayo [We already won]. We beat the UP prediction. Congratulations, Philippines! Let’s do it again in July” (Jalea, 2020). This is during a time when the COVID-19 cases were rapidly increasing in the country (2020), with the University of the Philippines (UP) estimating that the total number of positive cases would exceed 40,000. Clearly, we see the manifestation of the government’s attitude towards the people, in this case towards UP as a representative of the people against the government, framing the number of positive cases during that
time as a victory of the regime against the critical public. And lastly, Lasco’s (2020) work on medical populism through the COVID-19 response of Bolsanaro (Brazil), Trump (USA), and Duterte (Philippines), showed common features:

Simplifying the pandemic by downplaying its impacts or touting easy solutions or treatments, spectacularizing their responses to the crisis, forging divisions between the ‘people’ and dangerous ‘others’, and making medical knowledge claims to support the above. (p. 1417)

Clearly, the response of Duterte is consistent with these features, but what we can add to this is the use of different narratives to consciously control the discourse, misdirect the public around the current situation and associated response of the regime, the dehumanizing of the ‘othered’ public as incapable of understanding the complexities of the crisis and the appropriate response to it. Lastly, this colonizing ethics of the elite, as reflected through the pandemic response of the Duterte regime, is not an ethical aberration on the part of the elite. Philippine history is peppered with different militaristic responses from different regimes such as the Escalante massacre (Llana, 2018) and the Anti-Chico Dam struggle (Marcos regime) (Delina, 2020), the Mendiola massacre (Cory Aquino regime) (Curaming, 2013), the Hacienda Luisita Massacre (Macapagal-Arroyo regime) (Petrola, 2018), and the Kidapawan Massacre (NoyNoy Aquino regime) (Santos, 2016), to name a few. Furthermore, the Philippines has been judged to be the worst place in Asia to be an environmental defender for eight consecutive years (Bolledo, 2021) and one of the worst places in the world to be an environmental defender (Globalwitness.org, 2019; Mongabay.com, 2019; Watts, 2019). The statements above show the clearest indication and manifestation of the colonizing ethics of the ruling elite, a violent ethics against the colonized which creates and perpetuates the divisions within a semifeudal and semicolonial society. Through another lens, the Philippines as a semifeudal and semicolonial society is the concrete manifestation of the interests of the ruling class and their violent ethics against the exploited/colonized and the equivalent ethics resistance that they hold.
Conclusion

The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it. (Marx & Engels, 1998)

Class, capital, colonization, land struggle, and ethics may initially seem to be concepts that are seldom addressed in bioethics. Meanwhile, constructs like deontology, utilitarianism, virtue ethics, duties, happiness, and ethical frameworks dominate the discussion in bioethics. Critical studies are making more visible the value of examining empirical and concrete realities in understanding ethical issues and dilemmas, and are bringing attention/contributing to the decolonization movement in the re-centering of our perspective on addressing ethical issues. The existing body of research shows that there are already works which touch on the interrelationship of class and ethics, but there is still a tendency to revert to dominant notions of bioethical principles, frameworks, guidelines, and paradigms. The main value of my research lies in how the approaches of postcoloniality and critical pedagogy can be used to address the incompleteness of the current language of bioethics, not just through the addition of local ethical terminologies, customs or values, but by bringing to the forefront the significance of class, capital, colonization and land struggle in directly confronting the violent ethics of the colonizer.

Critical pedagogy highlights the political nature of education and how it can be used to subvert the current capitalist system that it has been made to serve, especially, when other ideologies are the basis for redtagging and state impunity. Postcoloniality, on the other hand, especially when rooted back in its analysis to class-based analysis, makes evident the colonizer-colonized condition that is realized through a system under capitalism in general and specifically under Imperialism, Bureaucrat Capitalism and Feudalism. The dichotomies created in our current mode of production, such as the oppressor-oppressed and colonizer-colonized divides, are not just abstract conditions or concepts but are material conditions that influence, control, and dominate ethics through
the monopolization of political, economic, and social capital as dictated by the interest of the ruling class. The ruling class, which represents the oppressor or local elite collaborators of colonizers, through their control of capital, forces their violent ethics on the exploited class (oppressed/colonized). This is dialectical in nature; as the ruling class serves its own class interest, its class interest is manifested in its control of capital and domination of ethics for its own benefit but to the detriment of the exploited class. In turn, the exploited class resists this monopolization of capital and dominant ethics through an ethics of resistance, and this can be observed through the responses of the research participants, anchored in their material conditions, in the different thought experiments.

Thus, in pushing for a decolonized critical bioethics through the lens of postcoloniality and critical pedagogy, this research not only serves as a critique of the current formulation of bioethics, but also provides a wider lens to understand and address bioethical issues and dilemmas through a richer language of the ethics of resistance of the oppressed/colonized. Thus, as observed in the different articles in *Developing World Bioethics*, bioethicists from the developing world, who tend to use the current dominant language of bioethics when addressing ethical dilemmas and issues, actually have available a richer language through the lens of decolonized critical bioethics. Lastly, pushing for decolonized critical bioethics is to turn into reality Marx and Engels’ proposition of changing the world (bioethics) rather than just reinterpreting bioethics in various ways, since reinterpretation is unlikely to benefit those presently subjugated by those at the top of the current hierarchy of social classes. In the end, I argue that education that is rooted in the material conditions of the colonized, such as the MMS/NSMOE curriculum framework of the Lumad schools, that serves their class interest and struggle, provides a strong foundation for developing an ethics of resistance of the colonized against the colonizing ethics of the ruling class. Class consciousness was manifested by the different research participants as a function of the degree of influence of the dominant culture on them. Those who are directly connected to the Lumad struggle showed the presence of an ethics of resistance while those who
academically understand the plight of the oppressed have a tendency to revert to the dominating ethics of the ruling class.

To further develop what this research has started, bioethicists should not shy away in using class-based analysis in their research as this can anchor their analysis to concrete conditions that the discipline should embrace more moving forward. Ethical issues related to Artificial Intelligence, autonomous vehicles, parachute/colonizing science, International Agreements and Declarations and other issues that dominate bioethics will be better understood if class analysis is used with the same authority as other bioethical philosophies, frameworks, and guidelines.
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### Appendix 1.1 *Review of Developing World Bioethics Journal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Ethics Education in Post-Graduate Medical Curricula in I.R. Iran. (Nikravanfard et al., 2017)</td>
<td>Research training in medical curriculum in Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuit to Post: Ethical issues of social media use by international medical volunteers. (Tabb et al., 2021)</td>
<td>Implication of use of social media by researchers from developed countries to developing countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models for truth-telling in physician-patient encounters: What can we learn from Yoruba concept of Ooto? (Ewuoso, 2019b)</td>
<td>Use of local language on truth-telling in guiding bioethical guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral habitus: An approach to understanding embedded disrespectful practices. (Subramani, 2020)</td>
<td>The concept of moral habitus offers theoretical grounds for understanding these attitudes and behaviors in hospital settings, while engaging in ethics and patient-centred care debates, to bridge the gap between theory and practice of respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution of research ethics in a low resource setting: A case for Uganda. (Ochieng et al., 2020)</td>
<td>Development of research in ethics in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the Sterility of a Distinct African Bioethics: Addressing the Conceptual Bioethics Lag in Africa. (Ssebunnya, 2017)</td>
<td>Addresses the universability of African insights to bioethics, instead of arguing for the value of these insights on their own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion services and ethico-legal considerations in India: The case for</td>
<td>Highlighting the ethico-legal considerations as a need for transition from a provider-centered to a woman-centered abortion service model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| transitioning from provider-centered to women-centered care.  
Basu, (2021) | Setting a rational limit on conscientious objection so as to prevent the adoption of an attitude shaped completely by the personal beliefs of the physician or the patient |
|---|---|
| Ethical discourse of medical students and physicians on conscientious objection: A qualitative study in Turkey  
(Keleș et al., 2021) | Application of the definition of *Ubuntu* which captures the core aspects of the theory in ethical literature on the same, to address ethical issues around unsought information of misattributed parentage in the field of transplant |
| Managing ethical challenges around misattributed parentage within the clinical context: Insights from an African moral theory.  
(Ewuoso, 2019a) | The use of African perspective in addressing the current dominance of Western thought to bioethics |
| African perspectives in global bioethics.  
(Tosam, 2018) | Role of the institution in the conduct of an ethical research |
| Unethical authorship practices: A qualitative study in Malaysian higher education institutions.  
(Olesen et al., 2018) | Issues arising reflect this particular political economy of research and includes questions to emerging regulatory and ethical frameworks |
| Understanding Health Research Ethics in Nepal.  
(Sharma et al., 2016) | The implication of red envelopes in the medical profession in China |
| Corruption or professional dignity: An ethical examination of the phenomenon of “red envelopes” (monetary gifts) in medical practice in China.  
(Zhu et al., 2018) | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations for community engagement when conducting clinical trials during infectious disease emergencies in West Africa. (Folayan et al., 2019)</th>
<th>The value of engagement that facilitates collaboration rather than partnership between researchers and the community during epidemics is acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The vicious circle of patient–physician mistrust in China: health professionals’ perspectives, institutional conflict of interest, and building trust through medical professionalism. (Nie, Cheng, et al., 2018)</td>
<td>Current mistrust in medical field in China that can be addressed by rectifying institutional conflict and promoting medical professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The social practice of medical guanxi (personal connections) and patient–physician trust in China: an anthropological and ethical study. (Zou et al., 2018)</td>
<td>The use of guanxi or professional connections in China in the context of patient-physician trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Enemy as a Patient: What can be Learned from the Emotional Experience of Physicians and Why does it Matter Ethically? (Rubinstein &amp; Bentwich, 2017)</td>
<td>The view of doctors on their patients as enemies due to the creation of feelings of animosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking an ethical theory for the COVID-19 pandemic outbreak with special reference to Bangladesh’s law and policy. (Bhuiyan, 2021)</td>
<td>The failure of the pandemic model in Bangladesh stems from deficiency of inclusion of bioethics that may affect people in a pandemic situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural considerations in forgoing enteral feeding: A comparison between the Hong Kong Chinese, North American, and Malaysian</td>
<td>Cross-country analysis of the ethics of enteral feeding on people with dementia and end-of-life situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Islamic patients with advanced dementia at the end-of-life.  
| (Ngan et al., 2020) |
| Ethics of folk medicine among the Igbo.  
| (Ogu, 2021) |
| This work looks at the main ethical underpinnings of Igbo folk medicine of South-Eastern Nigeria in the context of *Omenala*. It concludes that the ethical principle of *Ọfọ* and *Ogu* make treatment efficacious, promote patient-healer relationships, and guides healers and patients. |
| A critique of the principle of ‘respect for autonomy’, grounded in African thought.  
| (Behrens, 2018) |
| An argument against respect for autonomy as an individualistic value that might not address more communitarian values in Africa |
Appendix 3.1 Sample translation of interview transcripts from a former bioethics student, a Lumad student and a volunteer teacher

Bioethics student from Science High School

Hi! How are you?

(On her studies abroad affected by the pandemic) So there, we were surprised, I think everyone’s really considering it … Because even before the visa issue, I was already skeptical in continuing. The reason being, actually, I was not really that satisfied with my experience with NYU. Like right now, I am paying so much but … It is not enough … so even before, I was very hesitant about it. Even now, with the immigration issues that was put on top, I think we are all very discouraged right now in continuing. Also, other international students, we are all reconsidering our plans.

1. Why did you join the bioethics elective?

I think it is one of the the most interesting, especially I planned on taking a bio core for SYP (senior year program), I thought it would be relevant to my core and if ever on my future course because I planned, if ever to take bio in college. So, that was the biggest reason then but also some minor parts. I also heard from 2018s who took bioethics course, it was really fun and they learned a lot. And the format was very different from the other electives that it is not like a normal class that there a lot of requirements, kind of like a seminar or just really like a small discussion-based class, which I found intriguing. Because we did not really have a lot of classes like that from Grade 7-9.

2. If you can remember, what were some of the most meaningful experience/s in the class?
What I remember talking about my dad after, because we talked about abortion. I think it was one off the top of my head now that we discussed in class. Because I think it was also very biological but then I don’t remember the specifics of the discussion about abortion but I remember I discussed it with my family afterwards. It made an impact with me ... like what is your opinion, I wanted to know also their opinion about it. Another one I remember that you were teaching us was like when you talked about statistics, and like how even like making meaning of the significance of a value compared to, based on data that mostly no one thinks in countries which ... I remember thinking that I considered statistics as very scientific and objective. Never did I realize that, I was not able to consider the bias. And then the other ... I remember that sometimes it was super heavy, like when we talked about euthanasia... when I think about bioethics sometimes it was like, I come out of the room like it was so heavy it would be an hour of just really like deep thinking. I think especially the heavier topics, like euthanasia and abortion, I think those were the most memorable. Since when I talked about it with my dad (abortion), since my parents are very religious, we argued with our opinions. Because my dad is pro-life and then because i think since we talked about it in a very science manner. Like when does life really start, when can you consider something alive, so, my opinions were very opposite. I did not see it the way my parents did, it was like really a debate then.

3. As far as you can remember, were all or most students able to participate in the class? (Can you paint a picture of the classroom setup?)

Since we were around just maybe 15 students uttermost, and then I remember we would always arrange the chairs like circle so that we would see each other. And in terms of participation, I think definitely there were still students who participated more than others, especially, more than me I would say. I think the setup was also advantageous but also you can see everyone and really engage but at the same time intimidating because when you talk and when you call on someone, everyone has a great view of you and the things you were saying. So, it was very intimate for sure and I
feel like, I can still remember who my classmates were, I think the fact that, we, even if it wasn’t an everyday class, if I remembered correctly, like I still form opinions of the people in that class because we talked about such, like big issue and issues we really need to form an opinion. I think it could be both because like I said a while ago, like some topics were very difficult and sometimes first time I encountered the topic during our class. Just looking at the level of the date or the level of thinking, like in normal day-to-day conversations I don’t engage that greatly, for example with my parents or family. So, I think sometimes it’s also, I don’t know if I had enough knowledge to answer and second, the confidence also, wasn't there to really give my opinion. And, going back to the intimidation and like I felt sometimes people will be really good at explaining their side, but for me, I will just be saying simple stuff, so I will choose not to speak up.

4. How were ideas and thoughts shared during the classes? Can you provide a picture or description of how those exchanges happened or occurred?

I think what was nice about our discussions was that we were given a situation or you would start the discussion and then everyone will just pile on to what you said. And then the discussion will flow from there and I don’t remember that you would be like, "oh Jana please give your answer". You will just be like if you have something to say, it was just a very natural kind of conversation, it wasn’t like go on and say something. If you wanted to say something, you could, but then we were not forced to say anything.

5. How can you describe the atmosphere of the class? Did it have a supportive atmosphere, a safe space, or any description you can give about the atmosphere of the class?

I don’t remember which specific topics that for sure i feel like we did get into like people with debates at times that it was like we bounced off each other’s opinion like someone will agree with you or someone will disagree. Regarding the atmosphere I think it was generally like we just all wanted to hear from each other. It wasn't ... it was very
intimidating but then I never felt like, “Oh I might say something wrong or like if I disagree with anyone that they will intensely debate me”. It was like, OK, it was a safe space for everyone to debate .... even if you don’t disagree, you can debate and engage with each other like without getting messy.

6. Did you experience cumulative learning; meaning, did you feel that the lessons were structured so that previous lessons supported lessons that were discussed later?

I think, honestly, I don’t remember which topic that we covered in each quarter like I kind of remember that’s just like one and a whole thing. But then I still do remember the first, when we had readings and then so the principles that we would learn from all those readings, you would also guide us into like incorporating those principles in the discussions like different issues. For example, in a certain topic that I wouldn’t easily be able to bring in the more like real moral ... how can I describe it? ... I wouldn’t realize that, “Oh this can be used to look at those issue”. So, I think you would sort of guide that and then by the time that we have reports and papers, I think we were more confident of with what we learned especially when we accomplished those presentations. Because I remember it was individual reports and a group paper, so I feel like that we have a good understanding already by that time. We used what we learned from the first quarters.

7. What is your favorite thought experiment or moral dilemma, if you have any? Was the use of the thought experiments or moral dilemmas helped in any way in the discussions? For a bioethics class, are moral dilemmas and thoughts experiments enough for discussions?

What I remember was, if someone was ... like if there was a child who was drowning, would you help this child or leave him. I don’t know if there were other factors ... that was what I remember. I think for sure the thought experiments were helpful to the discussion because it can be given in an application ... because when we discussed for
example, utilitarianism by itself it can feel very like isolated from real life. But then we would talk about thought experiments, like it was a way to put myself in the shoes of like the actor in the experiment, when we study utilitarianism, I just like ... but then for the actual thing like maybe I would be against that and then I remember that because you said maybe the problem itself ... this and that ... and why is there like a pool and a child drowning and I think that's where the third question comes in. It's important when you bring out to the classroom and talk about how we will use it in like in the real world because it may it seem direct that it seems you automatically will save a life ... which is not completely true. If you did not mention it, I would probably would not that … I can think outside the boundary of the thought experiments.

8. How did the class influence you then and now?

I think even from the start I remember we have to write an essay in order to get into the class. And I remember the question was just “Why?”. I remember that was the question, the prompt was why. I remember answering it a certain way with very like classroom answer. And I was like, well maybe, this isn’t how, this might not be how the normal answer looks like, so I scrapped my first essay, and I made another one that was more like random and a little deeper than the first one. I think it was very influential how it encouraged me to think to approach a certain situation like definitely different angles and the course made me speak out more because before then I try to contribute more to the discussion. Because even it was uncomfortable, it is really nice for everyone because we learn from everyone. So, I feel like it helped me form and be more firm in my beliefs, because I made choices with issues.

9. The class was one of the most engaged – or what your generation says ‘woke’ – classes I taught. Did the class influence you or your classmates in staging the protest/s during those days, especially, when the late dictator was buried in the National Heroes’ Cemetery?
What I remember is that I took the class at the same time with the Marcos thing, and I remember that a lot of the outspoken people in the batch are in our bioethics class, like Ralph, also Barber, and like Danela and who are even now are very vocal. And I remember how we made a statement; I don’t know if it was a bioethics statement or like we made it as profile picture at that time. I view those things, it was very political, active and I feel like I definitely was influenced by members of the class and the class as a whole what we learned during the class. I feel there were a lot of very strong voices in that class, it was very encouraging back then for me to like speak out.

*Drowning child thought experiment*

I think I am not thinking about it enough. I would save the child because I feel like it is the right thing to do and compared to the money and inconvenience of ruining my shoes and being late to class ... if I can save the child, it is worth it.

*Climate crisis thought experiment*

My thought process now, one of the things I am considering is what I learned from bio and Pisay, like progress can look different ... like progress for us and progress for the IPs. So, I cannot force my view of progress on them but then the fact that you said thousands of lives can be affected in the future like without taking their ancestral land. So, if I don’t do it then I would save the lands and the people like the IPs for the future ... (groans) ... I remember that when we studied environmental ethics during bio 4, I was like, let us just let everyone die ... that was evil but I would justify with utilitarianism and I would probably ... That I know we cannot reclaim the lands ... like I can’t ... I will just make sure that they still have a home after. Sorry ...

*Technology thought experiment*
I think the tech is promising, actually. That was my first reaction. It is promising in the way that it looks like no one will get hurt with the research that is being done and if it can help the premature babies then ... right now, I can't see anything bad.

I don't know if I am thinking really hard about it, like with the economic aspect, like with all drugs, I can view it like all of it ... like the big pharma companies can control government access to drugs and like how insulin is so overpriced. But it is not an option not to produce them. I am having a hard time looking at the side of the argument that like that this should be discontinued, like research, just because a big company can make profit for themselves. But I think, I guess from the capitalism, it feels very natural for me. Like of course the company is like does the research and try to profit off it as much as possible. But then I think, we should not stop producing it just because we might encounter this problem. I think we can do the right steps in the future. Like in terms of accessibility and keeping it affordable for everyone.

I think for me now, especially with lab research, I think there is also a lot of pushback with, for example, like all the processes that doing research made possible. And sometimes it feels like we are trying to solve all the problems just because we can, we are trying to keep so many people from dying just because we can find a solution, but should we? Like, it sound evil but with overpopulation ... like with the technology it is becoming more difficult to be in control of the ... I don’t want to say all rich must die. I’ll just go ahead, like going back to, I feel like the benefits outweigh the problems. In that if we can save lives, the labs are doing it … I mean we are not harming anyone ....

*Poverty thought experiment*

It seems like they are waiting in line and like they are all carrying empty rice sack or maybe they are waiting for food, am I just describing more of what the audience or like the purpose? I think the child ... is like being used to elicit sympathy like when we said
this author frame them as ... and like it is just framed like to make you feel sorry for the child.

It is somewhat questionable, especially it kind of assumes that these kids are, like, don’t have a childhood. And like they are immediately pitiful; it is kind of like it expects you to look at the background and see just like bad or negative. And it is not being ... and it tells me like it is about hunger ... or I really need to help. It is like the first picture that it just gives you a picture that they want you to see as like poverty and then it is like help us.

They look familiar, it does not look like a foreign people; it looks like me and it looks like what I see every day. I feel like maybe I am the wrong audience for it because I think the intention was pull on your heartstrings... I mean ... it seems like it is something very different from what they normally see. So, it seems very normal or maybe I am just desensitized. It just felt like normal.

For example, because it is like a direct ... like they are directly asking from me like here is a box do you want to donate ... I mean normally I would donate ... I think the fact that it is there already and that’s all I need to do. But for example, if I was given a brochure to send money, I will be less inclined to do that. But with charities it is like I don’t know why I have grown more cautious that like such charities that ... yeah ... I am reading a lot about like ... how white people feel like they have to save everyone. That charities are supposed to be ... they use pictures from developing countries ... it feels more often now so whenever I give help, I prefer that I know the person or where I would be directly giving them help and not giving my money to an organization where I don’t really know where it is going to ...

For sure it is not my everyday reality; I do acknowledge and know that I am privileged and I don’t have financial troubles. But I think more on it is like the Philippine reality that it is what they see every day; like when you go out, like compared this to the United
States like when you go out on a walk out on a walk you are not going to see that level of poverty compared to you go anywhere in the Philippines. It is something within reach.

I think ... my own definition of helping others and how charities help others is that, it is actually really doing the action of giving something like money or like when you want to help people it is more a way to do ... enjoy the things I enjoy like basic things like eating and basic needs like clothes, shelter. I just view differently when you have others do charity ... kasi (because) if it’s more mababaw na (shallow) asking other people to do the work. Like I am just trusting them na they get it done instead of me doing it myself.
Lumad student

Intro: Hi! How are you today?

(Interviewee narrated the current problem his family is facing…) Regarding my family’s [problem], we haven’t solved it yet but perhaps we can come up with alternatives to figure it out. As for myself, I’m fine. I have no other problems aside from my family. Overall, I have no problems. Regarding Lumad school, I’m not OK because most of them [have been closed down], have gone and almost nothing’s left. But in terms of struggle, we still continue. Regarding LBS [Lumad Bakwit school], we’re OK. The kids can still manage how they miss their families, diverting their [attention] to farming. We have small gardens/farm here so the kids have things to work on. Unlike before, if they want to just lie down, they can just lie down and [do nothing]. Since we have the garden, the kids have a positive [outlook]. They can work out their personal crisis at the farm and bring back their skills and our way of life when we were still in our communities.

We have farm schedules, 6-7am in the morning and 4-6pm in the afternoon. So, if there are kids who like to go farming, they go there. And our priority in farming is the marketing team since they have the least amount of tasks to do, so they are the ones who regularly go to the farm. Even before the pandemic, the marketing team already exists. But since the pandemic, only a few are allowed to go out (and minors are prohibited). Thus, only R can go out. So, the marketing team shifted its focus on farming. This October 10, we will harvest petchay and radish. Maybe we’ll cook sinigang but we’ll see. It still depends on what’s available. We need seeds. We have a lot of mustard right now but the kids don’t like them, they’re bitter and they’re not used to eating them. We’re hesitant to plant them again because the kids might not consume them.
1. First, can you tell me about yourself? Why are you part of the Lumad Bakwit school and why do you continue to be part of it even if receives a lot of threats?

I am Bagobo-Tagabaua, a subtribe of Bagobo. Most of our tribespeople are in Davao del Sur. From grade 7 to grade 10, I studied in Lumad school at the Salugpongan tatanu igkanugon Community Center. Before, I studied in one of DepEd’s public schools. I used to be different than what I am right now. Before, I used to smoke marijuana, drink a lot ... heavy drinking, and I could say my life seemed to be a waste. When I was in our community, I'm not the Brian that people know [right now]. When I entered Lumad school, I could say that I really changed a lot ... in terms of how to treat people, and [how to take care of] others and also the environment. Before, I'm not fond of farms, I'm not fond of doing farm work. But when I studied in Lumad school, I realized how important it is to go back to the land, to till the land for the community. That is where I understand the importance of learning agriculture. Also because of the words of our teachers, I was able to change myself, change my worldviews from a person who was OK with just a stick of cigarette and has no concern about his environment and his community. Before, what I just care about is whenever my barkada [slang for friends] is around and we go somewhere else. I have no concept of having concern over others, of taking care of myself and the community. But in Lumad school, I have seen how important everyone is, of how important it is to study and go back to serve your community. Because before, I believed that when I finished my study, I will take this course, I will take engineering. But when I went to Lumad school, my dreams changed. I want to be an agriculturist, a full-fledged agriculturist and I want to be a teacher ... to go back to the community and apply into practice what I’ve learned from school.

Why do I still want to continue [in studying] in Lumad Bakwit school despite the threats? I haven’t mentioned my problem with my family. They are threatened by the military. Why do I still continue? Because I became awakened to the reality and experiences that tell us not to keep silent in one corner [within our comfort/ safety zones]. For me, I
believe that I have to continue the struggle because it is not just for me and my generation but what I am fighting for is for the next generations too. Our struggle is not just rooted from the Lumad school but from our ancestral lands facing mining corporations’ environmental plunder … and if these [ancestral] lands are plundered, we have nothing left for the next generations. That’s why we … us, it [the struggle] became important] to me, because the Lumad school changed my worldview in life and also the society. I want to continue what I have started because as I have said, this is not just for us but for the next generations. If the ancestral lands are gone, the next generations have no land till and nowhere to go … the environment is destroyed. That’s what strengthens me to continue. The fear, the harassment, I treat them as a strong foundation to continue.

2. Why is there a need for the Lumad schools to exist? For you, what does it represent?

First, we have to root out why Lumad schools exist. First, for the longest time that DepEd serves the youth, it has not addressed the needs of the youth, even in the urban, what more the youth in the rural areas, like us, the Lumad youth. So, the Lumad schools were built out of this need, but of course the difference is that Lumad schools aim to preserve culture and defend ancestral lands. Because as we all know, the DepEd as [part of the] governments. It does not hold the value of the youth defending their ancestral lands for the next generations. Instead, they instill in the minds of the youth that “you, Lumad should do this in the future … go to other countries, you can be rich”. Not because of me being biased as a Lumad school student, but DepEd really teaches the youth to be individualistic, to be selfish. But in Lumad school, the thinking is not like that because the curriculum, Makamasa, Makabayan, at Siyentipiko, is being practiced by the schools. It’s not secret or being hidden but is practiced because it shows the youth how, and why is it important to go back and give back to the community … It shows the importance of defending the ancestral lands and the importance of free education for the youth. The system of education being mentioned by the government is only a privilege for the youth. If you have money, you can be educated. But in Lumad
school, even though you have no money, or you are just a poor peasant or a lowly farmer, or generally poor, you don’t need money to learn. Because education should not be sold. Because it is a right of the youth to have education, so my answer to the question why Lumad school needed, who will provide a real system of education? That kind of education [Lumad school] should be given to all the youth not unjust Lumad youth, the out-of-school youth. There are a lot of out-of-school youth because they have nothing, they can’t go to school if they don’t have money. If you privatize the [school], it becomes a privilege, they can’t get it. Because the Lumad youth, just like most of the youth [are poor], they can’t go to school.

It [Lumad school] represents the importance … it shows us our rights, what Lumad needs to do. It shows how important the Lumad culture is, how important land is, the importance of health. It’s not just knowledge, education that it carries, it also carries health and agriculture. It represents not only one, if you compare it with the public school or the government, it really represents this and that and what should be done ... [unlike DepEd] which represents just one, one culture to the youth that “you can be like this and go to other countries”. Lumad school represents being mass-oriented, nationalist and scientific youth in the future. Lumad struggle represents the defense of the ancestral lands, and also the advancing free education and MMS as a whole, in our society.

3. Can you describe your current situation, in terms of the Covid-19 pandemic and what is happening in the Philippines?

In the time of the pandemic, here at LBS, kids are having [emotional] crisis since they can’t go back to visit their families. They miss their family. And also, we’re like… we’re just inside one space where we cannot roam around and go out because of the virus. So, the effect of the virus in our community is that the government grabs the opportunity to encroach our lands and infiltrate our community, the defenders of our ancestral lands. It [the government] uses the pandemic as an excuse to enter and [threaten] the
indigenous peoples who defend the ancestral lands. They are also red-tagging different organizations who help in the struggles of the Lumad. On the issue of Terror Law, the [situation] worsens here … we have observations that we are being monitored. It worsened. Because of the pandemic, it has been easier for them to pass the terror [bill] into law. That is also our [focus] on our security because they will use it [the law] not just against us, the Lumad youth but also to others who dissent against the government's bad governance. It will intensify, the government… because it’s already a law. They will have the right to [suppress] the struggles of the people. As for us, we have observations that we are being subjected to intel operations.

4. How has this affected the different schools for the IP communities?

In terms of Lumad school, there are no more left. We in Salugpungan, there is no more [school], same with CTCSM, the schools have been closed down because DepEd refused to give them permit to operate. Even in Caraga [region], they are already starting to close down schools there. The only Lumad schools left are the Lumad Bakwit schools in Manila, Cebu and Davao. These are the only existing schools which serve as Lumad schools and refuge for Lumad youth to continue our studies. So, these are the only ones left. In our communities, there is none.

5. Can you tell the importance of a school that caters to the needs of the IP communities?

It is really important because primarily it provides free education to the youth and it values the importance of ancestral lands, the rights of the children … and it’s not just about education but it’s about agriculture and health too. If not for the Lumad schools, we Lumad kids will remain illiterate and maybe, until now, we would still be ignorant of our rights. If not for the Lumad schools, we have already lost our ancestral lands to large-scale mining corporations. So, for us, Lumad school is of great importance because it … it’s like a torch amidst the darkness, amidst the oppression we are
experiencing. It gives us the light that shows how important life is … [how important] the land is itself is. It informs us our rights as a Lumad, as a human, as a youth.

6. How have this administration and other administrations impacted the IP communities and their schools?

Since … If we dig deep in the history of the past administrations, there have been intense attacks and oppression against the Lumad community not just during Noynoy’s time, not just during Duterte, nor Erap nor Arroyo, but since Spanish colonization, the American colonization and the Japanese occupation. Now, because of the government’s increasing needs, the oppression intensifies… because of their personal interests to seize the ancestral lands of the indigenous peoples. Nothing’s changed, violence is still present. Trampling of the human rights of the Lumad still continues. Despite the existing laws [on the indigenous peoples] passed by the state, these laws are not applicable to us Lumad because these laws do not favour us, even if its contents are intended for the indigenous peoples because in the first place, in essence, it’s implementation do not favor the indigenous peoples.

7. Lastly, can you tell us the importance of the curriculum framework being used in the different IP school communities and how valuable is this for the struggle of the IP communities.

The importance of the MMS … first in the communities. Because of the MMS curriculum, it teaches kids that learning is not only inside the school, because it should also go out of our schools, to our community to share learnings on agriculture, on how to improve the agriculture of our community as well as the health. Through MMS, we are taught not to serve other countries but to go back and give back to communities who needed us [our knowledge and skills] the most. Don’t leave your community starving of their needs, the needs that you are aware of. The MMS [curriculum] does not teach us to be individualistic. Rather, it teaches us to be humane in our community. The
mindset should not be for the other countries. In terms of the struggle, we scientifically analyze [the conditions of] our society through MMS which serve as our weapon. Because we analyze … if it is destroyed, our ancestral lands will be destroyed and not just the culture of the Lumad but the entire community as well. We’ll be erased from history, not that we’ll be erased like we never existed, but we’ll cease to exist, we’ll be driven away from our communities. That’s why MMS serves as our weapon in continuing the defense of our ancestral lands.

*Drowning child thought experiment*

For me, I’ll save the child because I won’t exchange life to even expensive clothes … the value of life is greater than clothes and even when your teacher scolds you [for being late] or you will be dropped out of school, you can still enrol the following year, right? If the child dies, he/she can never go back to life next year, but if your shoes and clothes get dirty or worn-out, you can still replace them. You cannot replace a dead child with the same child. If I compare this to society … if I’m a person from a higher economic class, living a luxurious life who doesn’t bother about his needs anymore, and sees Lumad youth drowning from oppression … if I would think “why would I save them when I already have this kind of life? I wouldn’t even care for them”. But for me, I’ll save them, the drowning child. What causes the poverty of the Lumad youth is the state itself and the imperialist plunder of ancestral lands, these lands are rich in agricultural [resources] and the Lumad community can sustain its economic needs without being dependent on the government. So, the thing that impoverishes the Lumad youth is the government itself, it’s the [environmental] plunder of large corporations … it’s the use of violence by the state against our communities.

*Climate crisis thought experiment*

For me, I won’t grab the natural resources of the indigenous people’s ancestral lands because in the first place, the [urban] area can be more protected if the environment is
protected. Why would you take the minerals, when if not for the destruction of the environment, the city wouldn’t be flooded? And the green city they are talking about … building these kinds of “green city” is not the answer to preventing typhoons. Instead, the key to preventing [disasters due to] typhoons is strengthening the environment, not ruining it. Because if you destroy the environment, it will dictate whether it will drown your entire province. That’s why for me, what I will do is I will teach the people how to defend the environment. I can still compare this to society, to the societal situations … that who dictates to grab all the resources are like the imperialists themselves. They are the ones who dictate, lead and control the ones governing and tell them to do this to resolve the problem on typhoons. The typhoon is the hunger which we experience, not the literal typhoon as the problem identified in the thought experiment. [It is] hunger, the crisis of our society. For the leaders to resolve this problem, he/she has to grab all the resources but if he/she obeys all the dictates of the imperialist countries, just like our current president, our resources will really be depleted. And if these resources are depleted, the government doesn’t know that if the resources of an area are really, really gone, poverty and crisis of the society will worsen.

Technology thought experiment

First thing I felt is of course wonder/ awe because there are people who can invent such thing that can save a premature [baby], that he/she can make it live. It can also be used in our life, in circumstances needing that [invention]. Of course, I’m in awe because he/she is really smart to invent that kind of machine which can help. But for me, I can’t … how … what will be its effect on the child. A child born from its mother is still different from a child who has been incubated in order to live. Kumbaga, I don’t know its effects … this is the question in my mind right now.

It will be right if it addresses the need, because the issue of our system, if you don’t have money, you cannot avail a service. If you don’t have money, you cannot [avail] this kind of technology. If this technology is further developed here or worldwide, it is of
great importance but the poor might not benefit from it because the ones who are well-off are the only ones who can afford. Those who can afford this service are the only ones who can use the technology. If the mindset of the inventor is that it is intended for the ones who need it and it won’t be privatized, I can say that this technology is really right.

In terms of technology, technology is not bad because it goes alongside with the development of a society. It’s not bad if it is for everyone. It only becomes bad if the technology itself is being used for plunder, for trampling on human rights of everyone… this technology becomes bad. If the technology is used not for personal interests but for the interest of the many, it becomes right. Just like cell phone, we, as users, it becomes bad for you if you overuse it. You overuse it, you become negligent of your work, it becomes bad for you. If you use cell phone for work, it is good for you.

*Poverty thought experiment*

Children are used to get funds, not really. For me, were the parents considered in this [scenario]? Does this really reflect the situation of the children, or it was just captured in a particular event then submitted [posted]? Like was it just captured … was the photo taken, without permission, and … in other words … I’m having trouble describing, because there are no words, it's just a picture. Can you describe the picture?

Those kinds of pictures are in the urban community, am I right? If we say we should help the Filipino children, because helping is for … But my initial question is, I cannot really [answer] because my answer might be far from the main point, because my answer is this: the Filipino children should be equipped to survive and attain decent life which should be provided with the aid of the government. Because children should not be used … We need funds for the children, for the children in the Philippines and other countries too. But it should really be the government who should take necessary actions on how to help the children. Like us for example, we are here to gather support. Instead
of the government helping us with the problems regarding our communities, they are the ones who drove us off [our communities]. Children … should not be doing … the government should take steps so that children in every nation can be provided with a good future. I'm really not good at visuals (pertaining to the photo of a poor child waiting for relief shown to him as part of this exercise)

**Questions on the thought experiment**

In terms of how I feel … first let’s discuss the difference between the two pictures. The child in the first [picture], he doesn’t look … He’s sturdier than [inaudible]. In other words, you can see that, in reality, he’s in an urban community and he’s out of school. That was my answer a while ago. I’m lost again. Can you please repeat the question? (I repeat the question.) What I felt when I saw the picture was, I felt why is this happening in our society? Why can’t they, why can’t the government address the youth themselves … because the government should resolve how it can make the youth productive. That should be its [government’s] concept, that it should not take its youth for granted, who will provide life for the country, the youth. The people in position, if they die, who will replace them? Of course, the youth. If you don’t equip the youth with adequate knowledge on the world, he/she won’t be productive. That’s why Lumad schools provide … and teach the youth their value in society, your value in the future. We are taught that we should be involved in what’s happening in our society. This government is indeed negligent of its youth. It does nothing but to exploit and plunder the public funds. Instead of providing the youth who really needs education the most, it [the government] gave its [funds] … funded the AFP (Armed Forces of the Philippines) whose aim is to sow terror to the Lumad youth. So instead of allocating funds for this time of pandemic, instead of addressing this crisis, it doesn’t aim to resolve this crisis for it aims to resolve the issue of “terrorism”. But the pandemic should be prioritized, because it’s the pressing issue right now.
It [the picture] doesn't reflect my current situation because it shows a child asking [for help]. Because we, we don't beg. We don't beg because we willingly fight for it. Because when you say beg or ask [for something], it seems like you’re doing nothing but to beg, but the government does not willingly give what you need. You need to fight for it. Similar to a quote from an old philosopher “Don't wait to be given what you need, you have to strive to improve, you don't just ask, you have to do something [to get it]”. Because begging or asking for something does not resolve the problems of the community, of the society itself.
Volunteer teacher of Lumad schools

Hi! How are you today?

That's the problem right now … especially if the classes start

1. First, can you tell me about yourself? Why are you part of the Lumad Bakwit school and why do you continue to be part of it even if it receives a lot of threats?

I'm from Bicol, like teacher Elsa. we're both volunteers. We joined just this year, just this school year as part of the Bakwit school. We were invited to volunteer as teachers, and we agreed. We were fresh graduates, we tried and so far, it's OK. I came from a family of farmers. We are not scholars from Lumad schools. I didn't belong to any organization nor had an idea about Lumad Bakwit school. I just learned about it here. This is my second year volunteering in LBS [Lumad Bakwit school]. It's not that stressful, it's really OK. It seems I became more humane and my views on things around me improved.

At first, I had no idea and had no intention to stay longer [as a volunteer]. I just told myself “let's try and see”. Then when you came to this point where you learn about the situation of the children, the situation of the schools, and the kind of education that moulds not only the students but the teachers as well, it seems it’s really different from the schools I’ve had taught to because I also taught in public schools before. It’s very different (comparing both). One of the reasons why I stayed is maybe because my heart became closer to the kids. There was a time. In December when I went home, I could have just decided not to return and just stay in Bicol. But I returned in January.

It is not in my personal mindset to set what I will get myself into, I just try and then let's see if it works, then that’s where my heart is. If my heart does not belong to it, then it doesn’t, then don’t. As simple as that. It’s not because I understand this and that. It’s more on if your heart is there, then so be it. It is no longer difficult to decide not to stay.
I think the Lumad school seems to be a guide not to alienate, rather to hone. Lumad school has an advocacy not to alienate students and teachers, that there is no authoritarianism when it comes to school like only teachers will always be followed. When it comes to Lumad school, you can ask questions, kids can ask why is it like this or like that? It can be developed at the same time, Bakwit school is so beautiful. Even if you do not get along very well in class but you will understand, your ability as a student will come out and not what education dictates you to give.

2. Why is there a need for the Lumad schools to exist? For you, what does it represent?

For me, the existence of Lumad school is about agriculture, that is the Philippines is an agricultural country, why wouldn’t you teach about agriculture, right? Now, many of my acquaintances, my former classmates, after class, they also have nothing else to do but return to the farm. So why do you separate agricultural education from their lives? If there are millions of children who rely on agriculture for their livelihood, education should adapt to it, which is what Lumad schools do right now. It adapts its education to the livelihood of the Lumad. I hope so [for other schools] too.

3. Can you describe your current situation, in terms of the Covid-19 pandemic and what is happening in the Philippines?

Education ... seems like, especially this pandemic, people have nowhere to go. Maybe if their education is agricultural, they might have the capacity to attain sustainable food, but no, because their system of governance and education is separate from the needs of the people. So, currently, it greatly affects ... especially now, the pandemic exposes the government’s incompetence, that it cannot provide food and other social commitments [services] to the public or the people. Maybe if the education incorporates health, sustainable agriculture, then people will return to their places, plant there and
live a sustainable life. The current pandemic situation really affects what's happening in the Philippines … especially many are hungry.

4. How has this affected the different schools for the IP communities?

What the regime did greatly affects … the entry of mining companies significantly affected and displaced a lot of Lumad [communities]. Also, the absence of … it’s easier for them to enter … it doesn’t happen because … it seems like they are the ones destroying the school. The indigenous peoples are prevented from developing, forcing them to evacuate and mainstream what is happening there … because if this regime or the governance is not like this, it would be better. Even if there is no [help], if they do not interfere with the Lumad communities, they [Lumad] can handle themselves. They do not desire to want this and that, in fact they are the ones who built their own school. They are the ones who taught themselves to have sustainable agriculture. The kind of governance right now … the [IPs] are peacefully living… only to be interfered with such worthless …

5. Can you tell the importance of a school that caters to the needs of the IP communities?

The greatest difference of the Lumad school is that the type of its education is anchored to what the indigenous peoples are. It doesn’t push for a semicolonial culture. For example, in introducing the alphabet, it’s not A for apple, it’s not another English word, but it’s referenced to their own local language. For example, in our math [class], instead of tackling only numbers, we connect it to farming, to how much should be the size or measurement of this, or how many are this and that. It all connects to how they would live when they go back to their communities, something that DepEd schools do not do.

6. How have this administration and other administrations impacted the IP communities and their schools?
Nothing, they did nothing but to harass and kill Lumad leaders, close down Lumad schools ... maybe these are their major contributions. Then the entry of mining companies, displacement of Lumad communities, militarization in rural areas. Maybe these are the major contributions of this administration. Even under Duterte ... under other presidents, Lumad schools are really being [attacked] ... by different administrations because of the indigenous peoples’ aspiration to have the right to self-determination. They are prevented from having that because of their land that can be grabbed by big, powerful individuals.

7. Lastly, can you tell us the importance of the curriculum framework being used in the different IP school communities and how valuable is this for the struggle of the IP communities.

In the community, MMS is a big deal because it teaches the kids to go back to their communities to teach ... to fight for their land, that they won't be oppressed nor displaced again. To assert for their rights, like that. In Lumad struggle, MMS is of great importance because students won’t be individualistic or selfish who will just be thinking how he/she alone will rise [from poverty]; rather, he/she will uphold the Lumad struggle and he/she will bring his/her people. It is because the curriculum being taught in Lumad schools is mass-oriented. MMS is indeed that important not only for their learning but also for their fight for their rights.

Drowning child thought experiment

Perhaps I will save the child ... it’s like saving the child is far more important. And if your problem is just your clothes getting wet, it can be washed. I would think, life is more important than material possessions.
Maybe in terms of what's causing it … it's a recurring cycle, that even if you leave it, there will always be a lot of people who will be affected, that's why it's better to [address] the cause of poverty.

*Climate change thought experiment*

If they want green city, why not just improve the current situation of the Lumad and make it environmentally [friendly] without trampling on the Lumad? Because they, the indigenous peoples themselves know how to take care of the mountains. Why evict [them], right? If it can be improved and not converted into a green city, because green city, the name “city” itself raises a question that of course only the powerful again can afford to live there. That's why it should be opposed because it’s not for the majority.

*Technology thought experiment*

What I felt was ... I asked right away who will be tested first. Is it OK to test that [technology] to humans? That was the first thing that came to my mind, who will be that person? Who will be the first baby to be tested on? If it fails, who will be responsible for it?

Since it will just be the big, powerful people again who will profit from this research, especially if it is nor owned by the people, perhaps only few people can access this good technology … it’s the privileged [people] again. It only adds up [to their privilege]. Especially now, if you are poor and you don’t have money, illnesses are difficult to cure. If the basic issue of treatment for normal or typical [illnesses] is already difficult for the masses, how much more for these types of advanced technology for treatment?

Technology is not bad if it is centered around the needs of the people, the masses. But if the technology is only for a few, to hold or enslave more people, then it is harmful. If it
can save more people, why not, right? But especially during this time, it's impossible, because of the kind of society that we have that favors the privileged.

*Poverty thought experiment*

What comes to mind is in times of typhoons, during distribution … falling in line. Kids are scolded or maybe they have no one to be with at home, so their mothers bring them when they get relief goods from the barangay. It seems it’s not just the situation of the child, but the situation of the community. Joblessness, homelessness, landlessness, lack of social services … these are not just the situation of the child alone but his/her entire community as well. Perhaps you’ll ask why. You’ll ask of course why not … the effort/ perseverance of the child should not be glorified. Rather, we should ask why they are in that situation. With the current status in life, you cannot really do anything. You have no wealth, you have no possessions, you cannot really do anything than enquire/examine what is really happening.

Yes, of course. It represents homelessness … because a lot of people, take myself as an example, I came from Bicol and it seems our entire town is experiencing the same. Wherever you go, you can say that only a few have their own [houses]. For example, sir, in our town [Agdangan], you can only see one beautiful house standing in our entire barangay. That’s the proportion of the well-off people and the poor. And for me, it’s indeed a representation or a microcosm of the Philippines.

Maybe the main essence of helping is knowing what is happening to the child, and live his/her life. That’s helping, because it doesn’t stop … for example, by just giving up a seat for an elderly, because it’s just typical for us. But the real essence of helping is to live the life of the [person/s] you want to help, for you to know their struggles and why they are in that situation.
Appendix 3.2 Personal demographics of volunteer teachers of Lumad Schools

Albert – A fresh graduate of education; thus, a new teacher who has no prior engagement with the Lumad school or any organizations related to it. He was engaged by an organization to teach in the Lumad school, or in this case, the Lumad Bakwit school. He is not a scholar of the Lumad school. From a family of farmers.

Bella – A Lumad scholar who graduated from the Lumad school, giving back to the school and the community by being a volunteer teacher. She mentioned that she understands and relates to the struggle of the Lumad, her community. She is not thinking of how many years she will give back to the community through her return service.

Elvira – A fresh graduate of education. She is an elementary education graduate. She was engaged by the same organization that introduced the Lumad Bakwit school to teacher Albert that led her to volunteering in the Lumad Bakwit school.

Maricel – Hails from the Southern province of the Philippines, Mindanao; thus, she is familiar with the Lumad. Not a Lumad herself but benefitted from the Lumad school as a scholar. Is in her second year of her five-year return service as a former scholar of the Lumad school.

Roberto – from Mindanao. Prior to being a scholar of the Lumad school, has experience interacting and volunteering in Lumad schools. To continue her studies, she became a scholar of the school and after graduation is now volunteering in the Lumad Bakwit school as part of her return service.
Appendix 3.3 Personal demographics of Lumad students

Aida – 18 years old, female, Moro/Uvu-Manovo, Lumad school student, Grades 8-12.

Jose – Male, Lumad student.

Lorna – 19 years old, female, Uvu-Manobo/Cebuana, Lumad school student, Grades 11-12.

Fe – 17 years old, female, Uvu-Manobo, Grade 11 during the time of interview but with the Lumad school longer.

Lina – Female, Lumad school student from Grades 7-12.

Jose – 20 years old, male, Manobo/Cebuano, college student, 2 years in Lumad schools, Grades 11-12.

Aubrey – 21 years old, female, Subanen/Bisaya, college students, Lumad school student from Grades 8-12.

Marikit – 21 years old, female, Lumad, Lumad school student from Grades 8-12.

Raymond – 21 years old, male, Mansaka, college student, studied in Lumad schools from 8 years old, Grades 2-12.

Thalia – 19 years old, female, Lumad student, Lumad school student from Grades 1-12.

RonRon – Male, Bagobo/Tagabua, subtribe of Bagobo, Lumad school student from Grades 8-12.
Appendix 3.4 Personal demographics of former bioethics students

Pedro – Age 21, he/him, Course: BS Geology

Kenneth – Age 20, he/him/his, Course: BS Agriculture

Indira – Age 19, they/them or she/her, Course: BS Biology

Kylie – Age 18, she/her, Course: BS Molecular Biology and Biotechnology

Diane – Age 20, she/her, Course: BS Psychology

Randolph – Age 20, he/him, Course: BS Public Health

Rene – Age 19, he/him, Course: BS Public Health

Jacob – Age 19, he/him, Course: BS Environmental Science

Janice – Age 20, she/her, Course: BS Economics

Samuel – Age 20, he/him, Course: BS Psychology
Appendix 3.5 The drowning child thought experiment

On your way to work, you pass a small pond. On hot days, children sometimes play in the pond, which is only about knee-deep. The weather’s cool today, though, and the hour is early, so you are surprised to see a child splashing about in the pond. As you get closer, you see that it is a very young child, just a toddler, who is flailing about, unable to stay upright or walk out of the pond. You look for the parents or babysitter, but there is no one else around. The child is unable to keep his head above the water for more than a few seconds at a time. If you don’t wade in and pull him out, he seems likely to drown. Wading in is easy and safe, but you will ruin the new shoes you bought only a few days ago, and get your suit wet and muddy. By the time you hand the child over to someone responsible for him, and change your clothes, you’ll be late for work. What should you do?
Appendix 3.6 Climate crisis thought experiment

Every year your country is being devastated by strong typhoons/storms, which greatly affects the country’s capital. As the leader of this country, you can act on this perennial problem by building a green resilient city. In order to do this, you have to take resources from the ancestral land of an indigenous people’s community, displacing them in the process. If you do not take the resources from the IP community, as a result of stronger and stronger typhoons/storms that will devastate your country, there will not only be economic and political repercussions, but also hundreds to thousands of deaths in your city. What will you do as the leader of the country?
Appendix 3.7 Technology thought experiment

Show to the participant the video of the sheep that developed through ectogenesis or an artificial womb. See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dt7twXzNEsQ

Ask the following questions:

1. What did you feel while watching the video?
2. Do you think it is ethical for us to do such experiments or develop these kinds of technologies?
3. In the future, let us say that such technology can be used by humans, should we use that for our own benefit? Why or why not?
Appendix 3.8 Poverty thought experiment

1. Can you describe the picture?
2. What do you usually feel when you see this kind of picture?
3. What should you do or what do you usually do when you see such a pic? Do you give to charities like these? Why or why not?

1. For the Indigenous Peoples context: Does this represent your reality?
2. What do you feel when you see these kinds of picture?
3. For you, what is the meaning of helping others or giving to charities
Appendix 3.9 Semi-structured interviews

Hi! How are you?

As a former student of the bioethics class last SY 2017-2018, I invited you to participate in this research in addressing the role of postcolonial theory and critical pedagogy in the development of a decolonized critical bioethics education.

(Provides the information sheet and consent form)

Before proceeding to the questions on moral dilemmas, I would like to ask some questions with regard to your classroom experience when you had your bioethics class.

1. Why did you join the bioethics elective?
2. Can you remember some of the most meaningful experience/s in the class?
3. In your recollection, were all or most students able to participate in the class?
4. Is there reciprocity? Or were we able to share thoughts and ideas to each other? Can you cite an example?
5. Was the classroom environment or atmosphere ‘supportive’? Meaning, that there is freedom in the classroom to express one’s own ideas without the fear of giving a wrong answer or being ridiculed.
6. Did you experience cumulative learning or did you feel that the learning is directed towards the gradual accumulation of knowledge through steps, which follow each another?
7. Was it purposeful? Especially the moral dilemmas and thought experiments that were given in class and the other requirements?
8. The class is one of the most engaged or what your generation say as ‘woke’ class I taught, did the class influence you or your classmates in staging the protest/s during those days, especially, when the late dictator was buried in the National Heroes’ Cemetery?
9. How did the class influence you then and now?
Hi! How are you today?

1. First, can you tell me about yourself? Why are you part of the Lumad Bakwit school and why do you continue to be part of it even if receives a lot of threats?

2. Why is there a need for the Lumad schools to exist? For you, what does it represent?

3. Can you describe your current situation, in terms of the Covid-19 pandemic and what is happening in the Philippines?

4. How has this affected the different schools for the IP communities?

5. Can you tell the importance of a school that caters to the needs of the IP communities?

6. How have this administration and other administrations impacted the IP communities and their schools?

7. Lastly, can you tell us the importance of the curriculum framework being used in the different IP school communities and how valuable is this for the struggle of the IP communities.
Appendix 3.10 Sample data on Lockdown measures and vaccines as the only solution to the pandemic

March 13, 2020 speech

Lockdown measures

1. I am now addressing the nation together with the civilian, military and police sectors – the organizations that would count in our enforcement of the laws to protect the people of the Republic of the Philippines.

2. At meron ho kaming itong task force, inter-agency ‘to, kasali na ang military pati pulis kasi kailangan namin ang tulong nila kung sakali man lalala talaga ‘to. Maybe this would create a public disturbance, disorder, but tingin ko hanggang diyan lang naman kasi you know, I know that you want to follow because you want to help everybody including yourself and your family.

3. ‘Pag makita ka sa labas, pasakay sa --- palaboy-laboy ka lang diyan, wala kang ginagawa, sisigaw-sigaw kayo, lalapitan kayo ng pulis pati military… And then maybe if you are arrogant, dadalhin ka istasyon for record purposes, that you are disobeying, that you are intransigent and that you are not fulfilling your duty.

4. Ayaw ko na masita kayo ng pulis pati military. It could be messy. Kasi mga – ‘yung iba sa inyo suplado. And itong mga pulis pati military, they have their orders to enforce.

5. For Manila, may ... Ayaw namin gamitin ‘yan pero – kasi takot kayo sabihin “lockdown”. And a – but it's a lockdown. There is no struggle of power here. Walang away dito, walang giyera. It’s just a matter of protecting and defending you from COVID-19.

6. Hindi ito martial law. It is not a martial law. It's not even something extraordinary. But what is sought – what is sought to be solved here is the again, walang iba except to fight the virus and to exact compliance. Mas mabuti talaga 'yang maniwala kayo.
7. Pero ang sa totoo, in a total breakdown, public disturbance, alang-alang kami ang iharap mo. Wala naman kaming... It's always the military who keep things in the country in order. Sila 'yan. Titingnan nila na everything is in order everyday of their working days. Tingnan nila na ang Pilipinas safe at gumagana ang lahat ng mga tao pati mga opisina.

Vaccine measures

2. Huwag kayong matakot, huwag kayong manerbiyos pero wala pang sabi ko mga antidote nito. It would only come in a form of a vaccine. Kagaya ng kagatin kayo ng aso tapos there is the – ang tawag nila rabis or rabies, if you may, pang-away.

March 16, 2020 speech

Lockdown measures

1. You know, you do not have to say that. Eh ano mo lang you’d encourage people to, yang to assert something na kaunting bahay lang, makipag-away sa pulis...
   At kung lumaban ka sa pulis, it is a direct assault.
2. You – you seem to give a side comment that is not good. Instead of saying na hindi ang pulis, sabihin mo, “Sumunod kayo sa mga pulis because ang pulis kumukuha ng order dito sa itaas.
3. Remember, this is an emergency. And during an emergency, tumabi kayong lahat and give it to the people who are responsible for protecting the country, alleviating the suffering and enforcing public order.
5. And remember what I said: Obey the police and the military ... You can be arrested. Sumunod lang kayo at wala tayong problema.
6. Again, do not fear. Wala kayong dapat katakutan sa military pati police. They are just there to execute order. Hindi naman nila order. Order dito sa itaas ,yan, dito sa amin

March 20, 2020

Lockdown measures

2. We are in a critical time. We have resorted to this extreme measure of an Enhanced Quarantine or quarantine for Luzon, because the magnitude of the threat that we are facing calls for it. By its nature, it severely restricts the freedom of movement of our countrymen, and thus deprives many people of the ability of earning a living for the coming weeks. [to the LGU] Do not make this quarantine or quarantine more difficult for our people than it already is. LGUs should take note of this – that at this time let us make ourselves clear that we are not a separate from a republic or from each other.

3. Let me add that at this time I do not think it is just a quarantine or quarantine. I think that we are already in the stage of a lockdown simply because the contagion continues to take its toll in the countryside.

4. We are not alone. But let our country lead the way in imposing a lockdown [that] is strict enough to effectively kill COVID-19, liberal enough so that our people will not die of hunger, and orderly enough, so that our country will not be driven towards chaos during this difficult time.

March 24, 2020 speech

Lockdown measures

2. To the brave men and women of the Armed Forces of the Philippines and the Philippine National Police, thank you as well for ensuring peace and order in these trying times.
3. The Department of National Defense and the Department of the Interior and Local Government, along with the Armed Forces of the Philippines and the Philippine National Police, are now ramping up the implementation of the National Action Plan or NAP, as we speak, to reinforce the efforts of the Department of Health in containing COVID-19.

March 30, 2020 speech

Lockdown measures

1. I am not a cruel man. Pero kung may report ang pulis, I will order your detention hanggang matapos itong COVID-19.

April 1, 2020 speech

Lockdown measures

2. My orders are sa pulis pati military, pati mga barangay na pagka ginulo at nagkaroon ng okasyon na lumaban at ang buhay ninyo ay nalagay sa alanganin, shoot them dead.

3. Iyong mga goods, bigas, kung ano pang iba ibigay ng gobyerno, bilisan ninyo at pagkain 'yan … Kasi 'pag magulo, walang order, walang distribution na mangyari kasi inaagaw, ina-ambush. Kaya mapipilitan ako na sabihin: Huwag na huwag ninyong gawin 'yan kasi I will not hesitate to order to shoot you.

Vaccine measures

1. We are awaiting for God’s blessing na magkaroon tayo ng vaccine either from sino diyan na bright boy: China, Russia, America. I’m sure na kung meron na sila, they will share it with the rest of the world.
April 4, 2020 speech

Lockdown measures

1. Ang – ito ang pulis, ito ‘yung tao na aarestuhin. Ito ‘yung tao na nakita niya pumatay, nagnakaw, nag-rape o mere suspicion. Magkakamali ang pulis. Ngayon itong mga riot at itong paglabag sa ating regulasyon for people to, you know, avoid converging so that you will not pass the germs.

2. ‘Pag sabi ng pulis sumama ka kay nagkasala ka, well you have to go. We have to go to the police. You cannot fight it out kasi kung valid ang pag-aresto sa iyo, lalo na ‘yung paglabag ng mga – itong ano ngayon sa Bayanihan Act.

3. Ngayon kung lumaban ka, ang sinabi ko – pati kasi si chief ng PNP ayaw niya. At the start of the statement sinabi ko, pagka lumaban kayo, inaresto kayo, at inilagay mo sa delikado ang buhay ng pulis, o talagang bubunot ka ng baril o hampasin mo ang pulis ng bato, ‘pag tinamaan sa ulo patay, sabihin mo – barilin mo, patayin mo. ‘Yan ang batas.

4. Pero ‘yung kung sabihin na, “Ay hindi ako magsama. P***** i** pat – gusto mo wala akong kasalanan, magpatayan tayo, wala akong kasalanan.” Huwag mong gawain ‘yan kasi ‘pag ginawa mo ‘yan, talagang mamamatay ka o makapatay ka ng pulis because your responsibility is to submit to the authority of the police or the police to bring you to the police station for proper investigation or documentation.

5. Ang akin, policy sa taas. Ito, huwag ninyong gawin. Ito, gawin mo. ‘Yan. At ang mag-enforce niyan pulis pati military. Wala na akong pakialam kung pagkatapos sinong nahuli, sinong na ...


Vaccine measures

2. Kung walang maimbento, if they cannot – not really invent – but if they cannot come up with a vaccine, patay tayong lahat. Hindi tayo makalabas, hindi na tayo makatrabaho. Maglabas ka, patay ka.

3. You know, it’s a vaccine. Ang vaccine, ganito ‘yan. Ang ahas. ‘Yan diyan sa ... Meron dito, there’s a facility here, I think it’s near Muntinlupa na may mga cobra natin. Kinukunan ‘yung ano nila – venom, ‘yung juice nila na poisonous.

April 6, 2020 speech

Lockdown measure

1. Alam mo may mga tao talaga ‘yung mga official, mga former generals pa, ika-cut nila ang – “pag lumaban at ‘pag ang buhay ng pulis or military nasa alanganin, bumaril kayo at sa ulo mo kung hindi aabutan ka”.

2. Ang ginastos ko naman sabi ko ... At ‘yung mga tao na humahawak diyan, mga military ano ‘yan – military na nakikita ko, PMAer na may prinsipyo at ... So buwan-buwan lang tayo ha.


4. Kung lahat lang tayo magtago ‘di wala na. I have also to – magsusugal rin ako. If you really want to know, we have discussed it actually even before this, we are inclined to extend the lockdown up to April 30. Tingnan natin after that
Vaccine measures

1. Alam mo ang sagot ko kasi dito, sagutin ko na lang, ang solusyon nito is vaccine. Walang iba. Unless and until the bright boys, the scientific minds, can come up with a vaccine or a previous – sabi nila 'yung sa malaria.

2. Ngayon bumaba ang patay nila. Pero the prediction is really dire. For as long as there is no vaccine, or any medicine that these men of science can think of to put an end to it, we will suffer.
Appendix 3.11 Sample speeches on failure of communicating the COVID-19 pandemic

The following excerpts show how the government failed to communicate their response effectively to the public

May 13, 2020 speech

2. Failure of communication- Pardon my broken Tagalog. Pero sa mga kababayan ko, kayo, ako (But to my countrymen): Do not panic. Huwag kayong masyadong ma-stress na parang hindi mo na magawa ang gusto mong gawin. (Do not be stressed that it seems you cannot do what you want to do.)

3. Proceeds with stating that there is no cure, or it will just die a natural death- The crisis is very, very clear, COVID-19 is spreading all throughout the country including the Philippines. Ang ano ho natin dito is there is no cure. Wala naman tayong mabili sa mga botika, pharmacy, to buy the medicines to cure COVID-19. (There is no cure. We cannot buy it from the pharmacy, to buy the medicines.) Kung --- if there is a slowdown in the contagion or ganun ‘yan eh, kan – medyo mawala lang ng kaniya, that is the history of itong mga sakit na ito. They come and go in every two or three generations. Meron talagang problema na itong ibinigay sa atin at wala tayong magawa. (If there is a slowdown in the contagion or that is how it is- it will just disappear on its own, that is the history of diseases like this. They come and go in every two or three generations. There are these problems that are given to us and we cannot do anything about them.)

4. Stating the biological nature of the disease, but then proceed to ordering the people to just obey the orders of the government – It’s a virus ... But most of all, try to obey what government is suggesting or ordering you to do. It starts with a virus. The virus weakens your body. And it weakens your body, lahat na papasok (everything will enter), then it will kill you. P***** i** itong virus na ito, walang ginawa, ganun (“expletive* this virus, did not do anything, like that). Papasok sa katawan mo ‘yan (It will enter your body), just like AIDS, makes
you weak, then it allows other germs to come into your body and you get sick. Usually pneumonia ‘yan. And it’s virulent. So, seek treatment as soon as possible.

5. Provides with a solution to the problem that does not exist yet – Huwag kayong matakot, huwag kayong manerbiyos pero wala pang sabi ko mga antidote nito (Do not be afraid, do not be nervous but there is not antidote yet.) It would only come in a form of a vaccine.

6. Framing the outbreak as a peace and order issue- ‘Pag hindi kayo nag-cooperate, ah the problem would start and it would start with you and end with you pagka ganun. (If you do not cooperate, ah the problem would start and it would start with you and end with you if that is the case.)

7. Highlighting the role of the military even though they do not have the capacity to address the crisis- Ang military, ako, lahat na hindi doktor walang alam, wala kaming maitulong sa inyo. (The military, me, all those who are not doctors do not know anything, we cannot do anything to help you.) It’s only the medical people and medical experts who can help us. So, listen to them.

8. Government structural response to the pandemic – Meron tayong istraktura (We have a structure). The structure really ... People are asking, “What is your prepa ...? Where is the structure?” My God, ‘yung structure natin is itong health. (My God, the structure is this health.)

March 16, 2020 speech

2. Stating the biological nature of the disease, but then proceed to ordering the people to just obey the orders of the government- Mahirap kasi itong COVID-19 is (This COVID-19 is difficult) – even the mere contact of the skin and if you do not take the precautionary measures then you will get it and you will die. Ang ano ko sa mga kababayan ko baka nga minamaliit Ninyo ... So kayo, if you want to test the waters and end up getting sick well ... Kasi ang sinasabi namin huwag kayong lumabas muna ng bahay (To my countrymen you might be
underestimating ... So, to you, if you want to test the waters and end up getting sick well ... Because what what we are saying is do not go out of the house.)

3. Government cannot do anything – Wala rin tayong magawa (We cannot do anything). Alam mo (You know) we want to do business, we want to make money, we want to move but there is no interaction now and there is no trade to speak of and there are no flights going out, in, and for you to do business.

4. Failure of communication – Itong (These) other countries, because of the sensitivity of the Filipinos, eh maraming ano kasi, hindi magkaintindihan ang Task Force. They wanted it more acceptable – sa libro lang man. But actually in other contract – in other towns, countries, it’s really a lockdown.

Well, ang ano dito is the – „wag kayong magisa-isa. Eh tutal „yun namang luto mantika ,yan eh. Kung may mantika ka diyan na bumubula, pakibuhos na lang „yung virus diyan sa ... P******** na –kaya nga l”m not changing the – galit ako sa virus na yan. (Well, what is in here is the – do not be singled out. In the end, it can be cooked by oil. If you have oil in there that is boiling, just pour it over, the virus there ... *expletive* that is why im not changing the – I am angry at that virus.)

Pag ayaw mo rin, eh di wag na lang. OK lang. Yung – yung mga kaibigan namin sa kabila – tutal magkita man tayo sa impiyerno balang araw. (If you do not want too, then, we will stop it. That is OK. Our friend on the other side – we will be seeing each other in hell in the future.)

March 20, 2020 speech

2. Failure of communication – Let me add that at this time I do not think it is just a quarantine or quarantine. I think that we are already in the stage of a lockdown simply because the contagion continues to take its toll in the countryside.

3. Framing the outbreak as a peace and order issue – I know you have the mandate to deal with emergencies affecting your localities. I was a mayor myself,
in case you have forgotten. But this is an emergency of national proportions, and therefore it is the national government that should call the shots.

You know let me be just ... Sundin na lang natin tutal para man ito sa lahat (Let us just follow everything as this is for everyone). Do not try to overdo things or think that you can do what you want to do because that is not allowed. We, you know, move in one direction, in one unison, precisely to place the contagion in control for the better health of our Filipino, our countrymen ... Huwag kang magbiyahe (Do not do it on your own). Isa lang, sa gobyerno lang. (There is only one, only from the government.)

March 24, 2020 speech

1. Framing the outbreak as a peace and order issue – First, let me reiterate my sincerest gratitude to all our courageous frontliners in this war, especially our healthcare workers – our doctors, nurses, medical technologists, and other allied health professionals.

I now call on every Filipino to participate in this war by following the guidelines set by the national government and your local officials. Nothing is more important [now] than your cooperation.

I repeat: Stay home. Huwag matigas ang ulo (Do not be hardheaded). The outcome of this war depends largely on you as well.

March 30, 2020 speech

1. Framing the outbreak as a peace and order issue – As always, I give my sincerest gratitude to all those who are fighting in the frontlines: Our doctors, nurses, allied health professionals, police, soldiers, civil servants and everyone performing essential services in the private sector. I assure you that your efforts will be rewarded. Your heroism will not be forgotten.

Ito ho ang garantiya ko: Ginagawa namin ang lahat ng makakaya namin. May mga doktor na, mga nurses, attendants, namatay. Sila ‘yung nasawi ang buhay
2. Failure of communication – Huwag kayong matakot ngayon. Huwag na huwag kayong matakot kasi sabi ko may pera ako at kung meron man ang palpak-palpak diyan kaunti, ayusin namin ‘yan. (Do not be afraid now. Never be afraid because I told you I have money and if there are some failures there, we will fix it.)

April 1, 2020 speeches

2. Failure of communication – Mga kababayan kong Pilipino (To my countrymen), I am addressing you once again about the problem of COVID pandemic. It is getting worse. So once again I’m telling you the seriousness of the problem and that you must listen.

3. Government structural response to the pandemic – In the meantime, habang naghihintay tayo, marami hong problema na pumuputok na. Hirap na nga tayo, wala ng trabaho, walang negosyo, and there are people really – you know you ... You try to mess up with ‘yung kakaunti nating ... (In the meantime, while we are waiting, there are a lot of problems that are arising. We are already in a difficult situation, no jobs, no business, and there are people really – jyou know you ... You try to mess up with the few things that we have ...)

April 4, 2020 speeches

1. Failure of communication – Mga kababayan kong – mahal kong mga kapatid na Pilipino. Kailangan ako magsalita dahil marami ang tanong o tanong ng mga
kababayan natin. So, I am constrained to talk to you if possible almost every day because there are so many issues and questions that are being asked from us in government.

Kung ikaw gusto mong mamatay, wala naman nagpipigil sa iyo. But what we’re trying to prevent is you from contaminating your good neighbor, getting the germs and – patay.

At wala akong sinabi ... Remember this, abogado ako. I never said in public shoot to kill, period. Sinabi ko – always 'yan maski 'yung sa human rights diyan sa UN, if you think that your life is in danger, maging biyuda ang asawa mo na maganda, mag-asawa uli, at ang mga anak mo mawalaan ng tatay, 'pag tinignan mo na delikado ang buhay mo, patay, unahan mo na, patayin mo.


April 6, 2020 speeches

1. Failure of communication – To my countrymen, for this talk with you I proposed to divide my discussion. The first is I must read the report of the inter-agency. Kailangan malaman ninyo na ang lahat na ito galing sa task force para lang ito sa COVID. So, but there are things which are not included here or needs to be expounded more thoroughly; then I will discuss it in the second stage of my talk by just answering the questions that have come to me officially sa mga sumbong ng tao through texts and there are it’s about a thousand really. But we, you know, endeavor to read it so that malaman ng tao kung ano ang nangyayari sa sitwasyon natin ngayon.

Ako, desperado na rin. Sabi ko nga nakatutok ako sa bintana makita ko na lang nag lu ... May tulog ako? Kanina nagising ako mga three plus. ‘Pagka –
dalawang beses ako umihi before getting to bed. And once talagang mag-ihi ako isang beses then umaga na.

My God is the true God. It's only one God. Doon lang ako na ... Hindi ako nag-ano ng iba. One God lang ako para isang salita lang. Hindi na marami pa akong intermediary, parang santo, may checkpoint diyan. Diretsoako. At saka hindi na ako nagsisimba. At ang Diyos ko is God the Father. He is only one.

Tayong mga — ako, abogado, wala talaga ako. Wala akong maitulong except gagawin ko lang kung ano ang makabuti sa bayan na 'wag ma — 'wag bumaligtad. Pero sabi nga dito, the resources is not infinite. Infinite is everlasting. It's finite. Finite is hanggang — may border lang talaga.

2. Framing the outbreak as a peace and order issue- Everybody wants war, trouble, because kung wala ng giyera ang kita nitong mga ‘to, these countries producing the armaments and the lethal things in an inventory sa bodega, ganun ‘yan. Isipin mo na lang kung wala ng gulo. Sinong magbili ng bala? Sinong magbili ng baril? Iyan ang — ise-share ko ‘yung nalaman ko lang. The little knowledge that I have, I’m sharing it with you.
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March 16, 2020 speech

2. Correcting the position of the government – You know, you do not have to say that. Eh ano mo lang you”d encourage people to „yang to assert something na kaunting bahay lang, makipag-away sa pulis. Correct, you cannot be arrested if you are out. But if you are advised to go home, and you grapple with the police with words and ultimately it comes to – dalhin ka sa istasyon for a public disturbance or pub – disobedience to a lawful authority, pwede ka talagang dalhin sa istasyon. At kung lumaban ka sa pulis, it is a direct assault. But itong may – may mga dalawa kasing ...


March 24, 2020 speech

1. Common political objectives – To my fellow public servants, let us set aside our differences and work in solidarity to overcome this pandemic. We only have one common enemy and that is COVID-19. Our transparency, integrity, accountability and responsiveness are needed and I expect all of you to exercise all these in safeguarding our fellow Filipinos.
March 30, 2020 speech

1. Issue of corruption – Pero talagang ‘pag nagkamali kayo dito, hindi ko kayo palusutin. I will see to it even tomorrow, if I discover some embezzlements, some hoarding there, at dina-divert ‘yung pagkain sa mga tao na dapat hindi sa kanila, you better think.

2. Pero kung mamulitika ka tapos mabalitaan ko na ‘yan ang nagawa mo, I will suspend you ora mismo. And for those who are really absconding the money, I will detain you, I said; and maybe I will release you pagkatapos ng COVID.

April 1, 2020 speech

1. Issue of peace and order – Pero maghintay kayo. Huwag ninyong gamitin ang pwersa. I am addressing the left na ‘yung pambabastos ninyo ‘yung slamming about the distribution. Remember kayong mga left: You are not the government. Naintindihan ninyo ‘yan? Hindi kayo nasa gobyerno and you cannot be a part of what we are planning to do for the nation.

   Huwag Ninyo ... Huwag ninyong subukan ang Pilipino. Do not try to test it. Alam mo we are ready for you. Gulo o barilan o patayan, I will not hesitate my soldiers to shoot you. I will not hesitate to order the police to arrest and detain you. Kayong mga Kadamay, hindi – walang, wala ng awa-awa. Diyan na kayo. Ang nahuli, wala. I will not tolerate ‘yang sabihin mo na bitawan mga politiko, bitawan. Do not play hero at this time because you would abet or is it that word – to encourage people to violate the law.

doon sa matatanggap doon sa recipient ng Pantawid. Idagdag mo na lang ang pera na 'yan doon sa kanila kasi kanila 'yan.

April 4, 2020 speech

1. Correcting the position of the government – Ganito 'yan, ito ang pulis ... 'Di pagkatapos nito, huwag na kayong maniwala diyan sa mga – ako na ang nagłę-
lecture sa ating mga kababayan. This is very important because there are so
many complaints and I'm sure in the coming days, there will be arrests – arrests
made and a lot of complaints and a lot of lousy lawyers like Chel Diokno giving
encouragement for people to violate the law.

Ito si Chel Diokno sinabi pa niya na, “Sige ako magdepensa sa inyo.” Alam mo,
Chel Diokno, kayong mga oposisyon, dilaw, huwag ninyong pilitin ang pagkatao
ninyo na magsali sa gobyerno. Kayo, nag-sigeng tapon-tapon ng black
propaganda kasi malapit na ang eleksyon.

subukan mo. Subukan mong mag-converge-converge. Sige. Constitutional right
man kaya 'yan. Subukan mo. Sumali ka. 'Pag hindi ikaw ang ipa-una ...

Huwag mo nga akong ... May panahon na – ng politika. Ito panahon ng krisis,
pangdagdag ka. Mga ibininigay namin, 'yon ... 'Yan lang ang nagawa mo. Bakit?
Gaano ka ba kayaman at gaano kami kahirap? Manalo ka sana. Ang problema
sa iyo – dean ka kaya ng College of Law.

Now 'yung kay Mayor Vico, isang beses lang ako nagsalita, 'yung pag-proclaim
ko ng emergency. Sabi ko huwag ito, huwag doon, huwag doon. Pagkatapos
noon, wala na. Nandito lang ako sa ...


5. Common political objectives – Ah may ... Alam mo, meron talagang taong g***. Si Leni was calling the private sector na magtulong. Naghingi siya ng tulong. Tama ’yan. Maghingi ka ng tulong sa kapwa mo tao, sa hirap.

Ako, wala akong ano kay ... Alam mo, trabaho rin ni ... Ako, when panahon na i-criticize ko si Leni, ganun na lang ang lang – sometimes the language that I use is very ... Pero itong panahon na ito na wala namang kasalanan ’yung Vice President. Nag-ano – nag-ano nga na magtulong. Bakit ipa-imbestiga mo sa ...?

April 6, 2020 speech

2. Issue of corruption – Eh ang edad ko, I just turned 75 last month. With the remaining years, anuhin na – anuhin ko ‘yan? May I ask itong sige na “corruption, corruption” ah walang ...
3. Correcting the position of the government- Kagaya ng itong mga nagpo-
posturing, may sabihin ka ang sentence mo – pulis ‘yan ha, ang sabihin lang
niya, “Ah bawal ‘yung magpatay ang pulis”. Nasira tuloy kung ano at bakit ka
pwedeng patayin. At may bakit na hindi ka – hindi dapat pumatay ang gobyerno
Appendix 3.13 Letter of intent to conduct research in Lumad schools

__________Date

Sr. Concepcion P. Gasang, M.A., Ed.D.
Chairperson, Community Technical College of Southeastern
CTCSM, Board of Trustees
Email: srchingma@gmail.com
CC: ctcsm24@gmail.com

Dear Sr. Concepcion,

Padayon!

I am Chuckie Calsado, a member of AGHAM (Advocates of Science and Technology for the People) and a PhD student/researcher from the University College London- Institute of Education, doing research on bioethics education using postcolonial theory and critical pedagogy. In connection to this, through previous and current work with Lumad Schools in Mindanao (CTCSM, MISFI, and Salugpongan) and the Lumad Bakwit School (LBS) in NCR, I would like to request to conduct my research in your school in collaboration with the community members, administrators, teachers, and students. The Nationalist, Scientific, and Mass-Oriented Education (NSMOE) Framework of the Lumad schools are key to my understanding of the role of postcolonial theory and critical pedagogy in a decolonized critical bioethics education.

This research will not only help in informing my research on the role of postcolonial theory and critical pedagogy in a decolonized critical bioethics education but will also help in the STEM curriculum of the Lumad Schools. The research will entail the observation of STEM classes in the Lumad Schools, interview with administrators and community members on the history and struggle of the Lumad Schools, and the interview proper with students on different bioethical dilemmas.

The different ethics forms, as approved by the UCL-IOE Research Ethics Committee, are attached to this letter.

Hoping for your positive response.

Best regards

Chuckie Fer A. Calsado
PhD student, UCL-IOE
Information sheet for Indigenous People Schools

My name is Chuckie Fer A. Calsado and I am inviting you to take part in my research project, Bioethics and Postcolonial Theory. I am currently a PhD student of University College London- Institute of Education researching on Critical Bioethics Education and the role of Postcolonial Theory and Critical Pedagogy in addressing some of its incompleteness as argued in the literature. Currently, the focus of my research is on the STEM education and its impact to marginalized communities, which lead me to researching on bioethics, postcolonial theory, and critical pedagogy. I have done research with different marginalized communities in the Philippines and have been involved in writing and training of the K-12 curriculum. The UCL Institute of Education has been in the forefront in doing ground-breaking research on education and social science, thus, placing it in the top of university rankings worldwide. This research is made possible through the help and funding of the Department of Science and Technology- Science Education Institute through its DOST-SEI Foreign Graduate Scholarships in Specialized Priority Fields in Science & Technology.

I am hoping to find out the role of postcolonial theory in addressing the current formulation and framework of bioethics education and and explore the implication of critical pedagogy as a teaching method and framework among learners and teachers. , especially in the context of a critical bioethics education. I very much hope that you would like to take part in this study. This information sheet will try and answer any questions you might have about the project, but please don’t hesitate to contact me if there is anything else you would like to know.

For the parents of the students, the study is only focused on their response to moral dilemmas on different thought experiments that are currently being used in bioethics education and some formulated by the researcher. This questions will try to elicit moral responses from the participants of the research. Please explain the research to your child and discuss whether or not they want to take part. I will also ask the children
before the task/interview and make it clear that they can drop out if they wish with no negative consequences.

Who is carrying out the research? I am Chuckie Fer A. Calsado, a PhD student from University College London-Institute of Education and also a teacher from Philippine Science High School-Main Campus under the scholarship of DOST-SEI Foreign Graduate Scholarships in Specialized Priority Fields in Science & Technology.

Why are we doing this research? This research is trying to address how critical pedagogy can be used in raising social awareness among learners and teachers. Currently, Bioethics addresses moral dilemmas and issues through different ethical principles, frameworks, declarations, and others. Additionally, there is a difference on the classroom discussions and the application of these discussions on the ground such as on medical procedures, social science research, and others. This research argues that logical reasoning and argumentation are not enough in addressing moral dilemmas which is central to bioethics. The lived realities of those from the Global South might be helpful in addressing some of these current issues.

Why am I being invited to take part? You are being invited (or your child) is being invited to take part in this study, as the school uses transformative education as its framework through a form of critical pedagogy in its teaching. As a teacher (or a student) you are directly involved in a learning experience that seek to address social issues and take part in achieving social justice. Thus, even if the classes do not specifically discuss moral dilemmas in bioethics, the lessons are geared toward addressing social issues that mirrors the discussion around moral dilemmas. This study hypothesizes that this pedagogy and your lived experiences (the language of postcolonial theory) might be able to shed light on the formulation of a critical bioethics education through critical pedagogy and postcolonial theory.

What will happen if I choose to take part? If you choose to take part, As a teacher- your classroom will be observed to understand how critical pedagogy through your own curriculum framework is being used and integrated in discussing your lessons. This will also inform the study on how the discussions are able to address subject-specific questions and when possible how it is being related to social issues. The study aims to observe a minimum of six classes per teacher. A semi-structured interview will accompany the class observation which centers on how well they understand the framework of their curriculum, how well they are able to apply it in their class discussions, moral dilemmas such as the drowning child thought experiment, to name a few. The interview may take more or less than an hour depending on the answers by the participant/s. Lastly, with the permission of the participant/s the interview will be audio recorded which will be transcribed after the field work for data processing and analysis.
As a student, the study aims to conduct a semi-structured interview with students which centers around their experience in the school, the form and function of their school, the social issues they face, and the moral dilemmas such as the drowning child thought experiment and others. This interview may last more or less than an hour depending on the answers of the participant/s. Lastly, with the permission of the participant/s the interview will be audio recorded which will be transcribed after the field work for data processing and analysis.

Will anyone know I have been involved? As a community boarding school, participant anonymity might not be possible, but even if this is the case, as the nature of the questions do not involve sensitive information and other information that may pose greater risk or harm than what the participants experience on their day-to-day activity, then participant anonymity might not be paramount to the study. Even if this is the case, the study will take all the necessary measures to prevent identification of the participants and the school (if they wish to be anonymous) in the reporting in the study.

Could there be problems for me if I take part? As a participant, if you feel that you may face great risk or harm at any point of the study, then you have the right to withdraw any time. As the research is focused on the curriculum framework and its application, it does not pose any greater harm than what you as a participant experience in your day-to-day activity.

What will happen to the results of the research? The results of the research will be sent first to you as a participant for your review of its contents and implication. When an agreement is reached that all information are in proper order and do not in any way harm the school and the participant/s it will only then that the information will be included in the study. If the school asks to be named, whenever possible in the discussion of the research, then this study will take all efforts to meet this expectation, otherwise it will make all the necessary measures to make all participants together with the school anonymous if they wish. Data storage will be only for the duration of the study, if the participant/s and the school wish to obtain a copy of the raw data it will be provided to them following all guidelines and policies on such request.

Do I have to take part? It is entirely up to you whether or not you choose to take part. We hope that if you do choose to be involved then you will find it a valuable experience. There will be no negative consequences in not taking part or withdrawing at any point of the study.
Local Data Protection Privacy Notice

Notice:
The controller for this project will be University College London (UCL). The UCL Data Protection Officer provides oversight of UCL activities involving the processing of personal data, and can be contacted at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk

This ‘local’ privacy notice sets out the information that applies to this particular study. Further information on how UCL uses participant information can be found in our ‘general’ privacy notice:

For participants in research studies, click here

The information that is required to be provided to participants under data protection legislation (GDPR and DPA 2018) is provided across both the ‘local’ and ‘general’ privacy notices.

The lawful basis that will be used to process your personal data are: ‘Public task’ for personal data.
Your personal data will be processed so long as it is required for the research project. If we are able to anonymise or pseudonymise the personal data you provide we will undertake this, and will endeavour to minimise the processing of personal data wherever possible.

If you are concerned about how your personal data is being processed, or if you would like to contact us about your rights, please contact UCL in the first instance at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk.

Contact for further information Chuckie Fer A. Calsado/ chuckie.calsado.18@ucl.ac.uk/

If you have any further questions before you decide whether to take part, you can reach me at [chuckie.calsado.18@ucl.ac.uk/]. If you would like to be involved, please complete the following consent form and return to [contact email/address] by [insert date]. This project has been reviewed and approved by the UCL IOE Research Ethics Committee.

Thank you very much for taking the time to read this information sheet.
Title of Research: Bioethics and

If you are happy to participate in this study, please complete this consent form and return to Chuckie Fer A. Calsado in person or at the address below. Also, if you have any concerns or complaints you can contact my supervisor, Professor Michael J Reiss, m.reiss@ucl.ac.uk. Tick the Yes or No box depending on your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read and understood the information leaflet about the research / Train and Engage Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to be audio-, video, and/or photo-recorded during the classroom observation, interview sessions, and/or project facilitation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that if any of my words are used in reports or presentations they will not be attributed to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I can withdraw from the project at any time, and that if I choose to do this, any data I have contributed will not be used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I can contact Chuckie Fer A. Calsado at any time and request for my data to be removed from the project database.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3.16 Doctoral Student Ethics Application Form

Chuckie Fer A. Calsado
Department of Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Assessment
UCL Institute of Education
20 Bedford Way London WC1H 0AL
chuckie.calsado.18@ucl.ac.uk

Doctoral Student Ethics Application Form

Anyone conducting research under the auspices of the Institute of Education (staff, students or visitors) where the research involves human participants or the use of data collected from human participants, is required to gain ethical approval before starting. This includes preliminary and pilot studies. Please answer all relevant questions in simple terms that can be understood by a lay person and note that your form may be returned if incomplete.

Registering your study with the UCL Data Protection Officer as part of the UCL Research Ethics Review Process

If you are proposing to collect personal data i.e. data from which a living individual can be identified you must be registered with the UCL Data Protection Office before you submit your ethics application for review. To do this, email the complete ethics form to data-protection@ucl.ac.uk. Once your registration number is received, add it to the form* and submit it to your supervisor for approval. If the Data Protection Office advises you to make changes to the way in which you propose to collect and store the data this should be reflected in your ethics application form.

Please note that the completion of the UCL GDPR online training is mandatory for all PhD students. The link is here: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/legal-services/ucl-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/gdpr-online-training

Section 1 Project details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Bioethics and Postcolonial Theory (Working Title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Student name and ID number (e.g. ABC12345678)</td>
<td>Chuckie Fer A. Calsado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>*UCL Data Protection Registration Number</td>
<td>Date issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Supervisor/Personal Tutor</td>
<td>Dr. Michael Reiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Course category (Tick one)</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEdPsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>If applicable, state who the funder is and if funding has been confirmed.</td>
<td>Departmen of Science and Technology (Philippines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Intended research start date</td>
<td>October, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Intended research end date</td>
<td>December 31, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Country fieldwork will be conducted in</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>If research to be conducted abroad please check <a href="http://www.fco.gov.uk">www.fco.gov.uk</a> and submit a completed travel risk assessment form (see guidelines). If the FCO advice is against travel this will be required before ethical approval can be granted: <a href="http://ioenet.inst.ioe.ac.uk/about/profservices/international/Pages/default.aspx">http://ioenet.inst.ioe.ac.uk/about/profservices/international/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
j. Has this project been considered by another (external) Research Ethics Committee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>External Committee Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No (x)</td>
<td>go to Section 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If yes:**
- Submit a copy of the approval letter with this application.
- Proceed to Section 10 Attachments.

**Note:** Ensure that you check the guidelines carefully as research with some participants will require ethical approval from a different ethics committee such as the National Research Ethics Service (NRES) or Social Care Research Ethics Committee (SCREC). In addition, if your research is based in another institution then you may be required to apply to their research ethics committee.

### Section 2 Research methods summary (tick all that apply)

- (x) Interviews
- (x) Focus groups
- (x) Questionnaires
- Action research
- (x) Observation
- Literature review
- □ Controlled trial/other intervention study
- □ Use of personal records
- □ Systematic review  
  **if only method used go to Section 5.**
- □ Secondary data analysis  
  **if secondary analysis used go to Section 6.**
- □ Advisory/consultation/collaborative groups
- □ Other, give details:

Please provide an overview of the project, focusing on your methodology. This should include some or all of the following: purpose of the research, aims, main research questions, research design, participants, sampling, data collection (including justifications for methods chosen and description of topics/questions to be asked), reporting and dissemination. Please focus on your methodology; the theory, policy, or literary background of your work can be provided in an attached document (i.e. a full research proposal or case for support document). **Minimum 150 words required.**

The primary focus of the research is to critique the current bioethics framework – how bioethics is being taught and its theoretical foundation. Additionally, the main research also has a public engagement project attached to it funded by UCL Public Engagement. Teachers and students of an Indigenous People’s School in Mindanao, Philippines are the participants of the main research. Meanwhile, volunteer STEM teachers are the main participants of the attached UCL Public Engagement project who will interact with students and teachers from the Indigenous People’s School who have travelled to the capital of the Philippines. Thus, the research has two ethical concerns – the main research and the public engagement (‘Train and Engage’) project. Additionally, a pilot-study has been agreed with the course administrator to be conducted through an audit of a Masters critical bioethics course in a graduate school in London, UK.
The main research aims to add to the ‘incompleteness’ of the language of bioethics through postcolonial theory, which is able to provide another epistemological lens in understanding issues, dilemmas, etc. that are central to bioethics education. Additionally, critical pedagogy is expected to provide the critical consciousness-raising of individuals that current bioethics education does not touch on. In order to achieve these objectives of the research, a qualitative method will be used for the research. It will be a case study of an Indigenous People’s School in Mindanao, Philippines that will also use ethnographic methods such as community immersion (the schools are agricultural boarding school), classroom observations, interviews, questionnaires (will use moral dilemmas that are staple questions in bioethics classes), focus group discussions, and field notes. Some of the data will be obtained through audio-, photo-, and video-recording devices with permission from the participants.

The research will use a purposive sampling method, as participants will be from a specific sampling site and specific to a particular kind of school in the Philippines (Indigenous People’s Schools and graduates of science high school bioethics elective). The recruitment of participants will follow an informed consent process, where the aims and procedures of the research will first be discussed with prospective participants so as to ensure their genuine, informed consent to the research. Informed consent will not be treated merely as an administrative tool to be accomplished; rather, respecting the particularities of the participants to the research will follow a genuine informed consent process. The same methods will be applied to the Train and Engage project, whose aim is to develop and design the Indigenous People’s (IP) school STEM curriculum but the participants will be volunteer teachers rather than students and teachers of the IP schools.

### Section 3 Research Participants (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Early years/pre-school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Ages 5-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Ages 12-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>Young people aged 17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Adults please specify below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Unknown – specify below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>No participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** Ensure that you check the guidelines carefully as research with some participants will require ethical approval from a different ethics committee such as the National Research Ethics Service (NRES) or Social Care Research Ethics Committee (SCREC).

### Section 4 Security-sensitive material (only complete if applicable)

Security sensitive research includes: commissioned by the military; commissioned under an EU security call; involves the acquisition of security clearances; concerns terrorist or extreme groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes □</th>
<th>No □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Will your project consider or encounter security-sensitive material?</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Will you be visiting websites associated with extreme or terrorist organisations?</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Will you be storing or transmitting any materials that could be interpreted as</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoting or endorsing terrorist acts?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Give further details in Section 8 Ethical Issues

### Section 5 Systematic reviews of research (only complete if applicable)

| a. | Will you be collecting any new data from participants? | Yes ☐ * | No ☐ |
| b. | Will you be analysing any secondary data? | Yes ☐ * | No ☐ |

* Give further details in Section 8 Ethical Issues

If your methods do not involve engagement with participants (e.g. systematic review, literature review) and if you have answered No to both questions, please go to Section 8 Attachments.
Section 6 Secondary data analysis (only complete if applicable)

a. Name of dataset/s
b. Owner of dataset/s
c. Are the data in the public domain? Yes ☐ No ☐
   If no, do you have the owner’s permission/license? Yes ☐ No* ☐
d. Are the data special category personal data (i.e., personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person’s sex life or sexual orientation)? Yes* ☐ No ☐
e. Will you be conducting analysis within the remit it was originally collected for? Yes ☐ No* ☐
f. If no, was consent gained from participants for subsequent/future analysis? Yes ☐ No* ☐
g. If no, was data collected prior to ethics approval process? Yes ☐ No* ☐

* Give further details in Section 8 Ethical Issues

If secondary analysis is only method used and no answers with asterisks are ticked, go to Section 9 Attachments.

Section 7 Data Storage and Security

Please ensure that you include all hard and electronic data when completing this section.

a. Data subjects - Who will the data be collected from? All data from the research will come from students (17-18 years old), teachers and volunteer teachers.

b. What data will be collected? Please provide details of the type of personal data to be collected: There will be no personal data that will be collected, such as age, gender, and other demographic details. To inform the study, the main research will categorise participants into students and teachers, whereas, in the Train and Engage project all participants will be volunteer teachers. Data that will be collected will be from community immersion, classroom observations, student and teacher interviews, questionnaires, and focus group discussions.
### c. Is the data anonymised?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Do you plan to anonymise the data?**
  - Yes* (x)
  - No

- **Do you plan to use individual level data?**
  - Yes* (x)
  - No

- **Do you plan to pseudonymise the data?**
  - Yes* (x)
  - No

* Give further details in Section 8 Ethical Issues

### i. Disclosure

- **Who will the results of your project be disclosed to?** The results of the main research and the Train and Engage project will be disclosed to the participants as part of their right to have their participation in the research removed or included. The Department of Science and Technology, as the funding institution, only requires the final output of my project; thus, their access to the results will be from the final outcome of the research.

### ii. Disclosure

- **Will personal data be disclosed as part of your project?** No

### f. Data storage

- **Data storage** – Please provide details on how and where the data will be stored i.e. UCL network, encrypted USB stick**, encrypted laptop** etc. To prevent illegal access to the data, data collected will not be stored in the cloud and other network systems. A password-protected USB stick and personal laptop will be used to ensure protection of data collected.

  ** Advanced Encryption Standard 256 bit encryption which has been made a security standard within the NHS

### g. Data Safe Haven (Identifiable Data Handling Solution)

- **Data Safe Haven (Identifiable Data Handling Solution)** – Will the personal identifiable data collected and processed as part of this research be stored in the UCL Data Safe Haven (mainly used by SLMS divisions, institutes and departments)?

  - Yes
  - No
  - Not applicable

### h. How long will the data and records be kept for and in what format?

- **Data** will be kept for the duration of the research, and subsequently for the timeframe required by UCL (five years). It will be stored in different formats that will be used in the research - Word, Excel, NVivo, jpg, png, and other file formats that will be used in the research.

### h. Will personal data be processed or be sent outside the European Economic Area? (If yes, please confirm that there are adequate levels of protections in compliance with GDPR and state what these arrangements are)

- **No**

### h. Will data be archived for use by other researchers? (If yes, please provide details.)

- **No**
If personal data is used as part of your project, describe what measures you have in place to ensure that the data is only used for the research purpose e.g. pseudonymisation and short retention period of data

* Give further details in Section 8 Ethical Issues

Section 8 Ethical issues

Please state clearly the ethical issues which may arise in the course of this research and how will they be addressed.

All issues that may apply should be addressed. Some examples are given below, further information can be found in the guidelines. Minimum 150 words required.

- Methods
- Sampling
- Recruitment
- Gatekeepers
- Informed consent
- Potentially vulnerable participants
- Safeguarding/child protection
- Sensitive topics
- International research
- Risks to participants and/or researchers
- Confidentiality/Anonymity
- Disclosures/limits to confidentiality
- Data storage and security both during and after the research (including transfer, sharing, encryption, protection)
- Reporting
- Dissemination and use of findings

Prior to the main research proper, a pilot study will be conducted on a Critical Bioethics course that is being offered in one of the Universities in London. The pilot study aims to situate and provide context and information on how current bioethics education is being run and what ‘critical’ means in its formulation. This will provide a backdrop to the research question that this research aims to discuss, address, and analyse. The pilot will only observe the conduct of the course/class and undertake an evaluation of the course curriculum; interviews and other methods that involve direct researcher-participant interaction will not be used. Additionally, the research aims to observe courses that are being offered in a US-based University Bioethics Summer School through an exchange program that is being offered by UCL. Acceptance to this exchange program, or through another funding opportunity, will allow the researcher to collect richer data in contextualizing bioethics education through three contexts: Philippine, UK, and US contexts. If not accepted to the Summer School program, the UK pilot study and data collected in the Philippines are enough to inform the research.

As some of the participants are Indigenous People who have a history of marginalization and oppression, the research will take extra measures to prevent the perpetuation and reproduction of these. Customs and traditions will be respected; also, even if I have previously worked with them, familiarity should not result in possible discrimination or negative labelling of the group. Hopefully, this
addresses the vulnerability of the participants, as indigenous people, who have history of marginalization and oppression.

As a piece of international research, where applicable, it will follow the guidelines and policies that the Philippines require in conducting research with human participants. If it is not explicitly stated, this research will take extra measures in respecting its human participants in the research, who are also the co-creators of the research.

The research will not impose extra risk compared to the day-to-day risk that the participants experience. Possible risks to the researcher in conducting the research in Mindanao will be mitigated through close coordination with the organization that facilitates research with the Indigenous People’s Schools. As this will be a field work in a less urban area, there might be risks associated with air and land travel, field immersion-associated illnesses such as fever, indigestion, and others. Schools that are under threat of closure will not be visited. If risk is too high, the researcher will use his judgment so as not to expose himself to risk that is greater than what he is exposed to in his day-to-day activities. The same will be observed for the Train and Engage project that is attached to this research: the risk to volunteer teachers will be minimized to the risk they are exposed to in their day-to-day activities.

Information that will possibly expose participants to great risk and their identities will not be collected, such as their names, genders, ages, locations, etc. The research is only concerned about data on classroom discussion and interactions, answers to interviews and moral dilemmas; thus, demographic information is not important in this research. Additionally, the same is expected from volunteer teachers in the Train and Engage project; thus, confidentiality and anonymity will be kept. A possible limit to confidentiality is the association of the researcher to the target research participants, as the researcher has previously worked with the target schools and is also working with them and other organizations for the Train and Engage project. This limit to confidentiality will not create additional risk or harm to participants and the researcher as the main research and the Train and Engage project are aimed at pedagogy and curriculum design and development.

To ensure data storage and security during and after the research, the researcher will take all measures in minimizing the transfer of information from one form to another and from one device to another. Furthermore, data encryption will be used through programs such as Veracrypt to ensure that data collected are protected from any form of intrusions.

Prior to finalization of the research, all data collected will have gone through the approval of research participants in the main research and in the Train and Engage project. An opt-in procedure will be used as a standard to ensure that consent is given prior by the participants at the start of the research, and if any of the participants ask for their data to be withdrawn in any part of the research process, the researcher will respect this and do as requested. The final day of withdrawal of data is expected to be after the results of the research has been shown to the participants for their perusal and before the final defense of the dissertation.
Please confirm that the processing of the data is not likely to cause substantial damage or distress to an individual Yes (x)

---

**Section 9 Attachments** Please attach the following items to this form, or explain if not attached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Information sheets, consent forms and other materials to be used to inform potential participants about the research <em>(List attachments below)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes ☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If applicable/appropriate:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approval letter from external Research Ethics Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The proposal (‘case for support’) for the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full risk assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Section 10 Declaration**

I confirm that to the best of my knowledge the information in this form is correct and that this is a full description of the ethical issues that may arise in the course of this project.

I have discussed the ethical issues relating to my research with my supervisor. ☒

I have attended the appropriate ethics training provided by my course. ☒

**I confirm that to the best of my knowledge:**

The above information is correct and that this is a full description of the ethics issues that may arise in the course of this project.

Name | Chuckie Fer A. Calsado

Date | September 4, 2019 first submission  
| September 17, 2019 revised submission  
| October 30, 2019 final revision

Please submit your completed ethics forms to your supervisor for review.
Notes and references

Professional code of ethics
You should read and understand relevant ethics guidelines, for example:
or
or
British Sociological Association (2017) Statement of Ethical Practice
Please see the respective websites for these or later versions; direct links to the latest versions are available on the Institute of Education
http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ioe/research/research-ethics

Disclosure and Barring Service checks
If you are planning to carry out research in regulated Education environments such as Schools, or if your research will bring you into contact with children and young people (under the age of 18), you will need to have a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) CHECK, before you start. The DBS was previously known as the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB). If you do not already hold a current DBS check, and have not registered with the DBS update service, you will need to obtain one through at IOE.

Ensure that you apply for the DBS check in plenty of time as will take around 4 weeks, though can take longer depending on the circumstances.

Further references
The www.ethicsguidebook.ac.uk website is very useful for assisting you to think through the ethical issues arising from your project.

This text has a helpful section on ethical considerations.

This text has useful suggestions if you are conducting research with children and young people.

A useful and short text covering areas including informed consent, approaches to research ethics including examples of ethical dilemmas.

Departmental use
If a project raises particularly challenging ethics issues, or a more detailed review would be appropriate, the supervisor must refer the application to the Research...
Development Administrator (via ioe.researchethics@ucl.ac.uk so that it can be submitted to the IOE Research Ethics Committee for consideration. A departmental research ethics coordinator or representative can advise you, either to support your review process, or help decide whether an application should be referred to the REC. If unsure please refer to the guidelines explaining when to refer the ethics application to the IOE Research Ethics Committee, posted on the committee’s website.
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Appendix 4.1 Speeches and words: Word frequency

The following words: corruption, de Lima, detect, isolate, komunista/communist, Leni/Robredo, lockdown, mass, npa, prevent, quarantine, reintegrate, test, trace, treat, Zarate; termed as CI from here on, put an initial indelible impression to where the narrative and discourse the speeches of the president are heading, it is a mishmash of incoherent narratives and discourses at first glance but on deeper inspection one can see that the speeches, slurred and incoherent, try to deflect or veer away from the issue of the pandemic and how to effectively and humanely respond to it.

The speeches are supposed to focus on addressing the CoViD-19 pandemic in the Philippines, specifically, on the different policies that the regime formulated in responding to the disease and the different socioeconomic impacts it brought to the country. Reflecting on the different words that form the initial categories in the speeches, I run a word frequency query using NVivo 20 to have an idea on what words were the most used in the speeches and if this reflect the Initial Categories (CI).

Arbitrarily, I used a 100 most frequent words query and crosschecked it to the CI to see if the categories will correspond to the most frequent words used. Again, these steps will provide an added nuance on the overall picture that the speeches are painting, provided that frequency words do not determine weight on the narrative and discourse. Later on, these words will be counterchecked to the specific phrases or sentences where they were used to determine how or why they were used. The initial run yielded the following words that can be deemed to have some relevant connection to the CI: covid (29th), time (52nd), health (55th), million (68th), vaccine (71st), ‘pera’ or money (72nd), percent (79th), cases (81st), and quarantine (93rd).

Second run

To scrape off common words like prepositions, conjunctions, and others the stop words function of NVivo 12 was used. This aims to streamline and remove unnecessary words that do not form the narrative and discourse coming from the regime. A second run of
The second run reveals other words that might be of importance that were overlooked in the first word frequency search, the following words are: people, general, barangay, region, and public. People may be related to the CIs as they are the recipient or target of the government’s response to the pandemic. While general may pertain to the type of quarantine that was being implemented, i.e. GENERAL community quarantine, while, barangay, region, and public may refer to the scope of the response. The following words are deemed to form the narrative and discourse coming from the regime in their response to the pandemic:

Covid (1st), time (2nd), health (3rd), people (4th), million (5th), vaccine (6th), pera (7th), percent (8th), cases (9th), general (10th), quarantine (11th), barangay (12th), region (13th), public (14th), workers (29th), country (30th), pulis (32nd), national (43rd), Davao (56th), trabaho (58th), money (64th), law (66th), Philippines (69th), bakuna (70th), number (74th), local (77th), police (81st), military (84th), community (87th), ncr (88th), force (91st), help (92nd), face (95th).

Below are the results of the crossmatching of C1 and most frequent words processed:

Medical and Governance- as concepts related to geographic areas of concern the following fall under the given CIs: barangay, region, public, country, national, Davao, Philippines, local, community, ncr. What is interesting in these words is the inclusion of Davao (56th) prior to Philippines (69th) and ncr/NCR (88th). We can expect ncr/NCR to be used most than any other geographical region in the Philippines, in relation to the pandemic response, as it is ground zero of the disease transmission and most affected region in the country. In relation to this, the Philippines should be, if not used most, mentioned more than Davao as the response relates to the whole country more than Davao as a region or province. The only possible reason that Davao takes precedence over ncr/NCR and Philippines is that it is where the president started his political career and his family still have political control. This already shows the priority that the narratives are taking, which is, away from the main source of the problem. All the other
words are then expected to take a major portion of the speeches as they are the target of the policies in addressing the pandemic.

Governance – workers, trabaho/work, force (if related to workforce) are interesting as these show that these words related to the economy take priority even when a country or the world for that matter is under a pandemic. This will later relate in the succeeding chapters where we cannot separate the discussion of economics, politics, and ethics. Going back to the words, will this also be related later if the word health that was mentioned earlier is related to these words or do they only inhabit a position solely related to economics? Lastly, further analysis will be done if health is related to healthcare workers, or if workers mentioned here do not include them as this has great implications to the priority of the government.

This leads us to the next words, pulis/police, military, force (force used by the police or military), and law. As of now, healthcare workers such as doctors, nurses, and other allied professionals have not been mentioned explicitly compared to pulis/police and military. This shows what the critique of the government have been saying for the past year, that the response to the pandemic has taken a peace and order character, rather than, a holistic medical response. And these words are related the above CIs as they have been the major players or the frontliners of the government to the pandemic. This is reflected in few selected members of the Presidential Security Group secretly receiving illegally procured and administered vaccines last October and the president revealing later that he also received the same vaccine. Additionally, these words are most related to lockdown as a CI as they were used to man and maintain the rules of the different lockdowns/quarantines and arrest the violators. Thousands of cases of human rights violations have been recorded during the implementation of the lockdown rules, where, civilian citizens were put in dog cages for violating curfews (citations), a former military personnel with PTSD was killed by policemen because of social distancing violations (citations), civilians dying of exercise and from different forms of brutality coming from the implementors (citations).
Possible reason why these words also take a high number of mentions in the speeches is that they are related to the CIs komunista/communist, NPA, and corruption as they are used to address this CIs.  

Meanwhile, money is again possibly related to budget for the pandemic response and corruption, bakuna/vaccine as the main response of the government to the pandemic, number is expected to be mentioned relating to the quantification of the response and results of the response. Help is usually used in the speeches to show how incapable the government is in responding to the pandemic; thus, help is greatly needed. Lastly, face is expected to be greatly mentioned as face mask and face shield are the main response of the government to the pandemic which are enforced by police and military personnel.

Third run

The third run of the word frequency search yielded the following additional words: dismissed (40th), billion (43rd), private (45th), año (46th), mask (48th), bong (49th), hospital (62nd), manila (63rd), cebu (65th), testing (75th), china (76th), medical (82nd), corruption (85th), lorenzana (88th), doh (90th), rate (95th), iatf (99th). First two impressions that this word frequency search impressed on me are the presence of the word dismissed which is related to corruption that falls under the initial Ci-s stated in this chapter and the personalities ano and bong (Senator Bong Go, close-aide of Duterte) and lorenzana, which made me reflect on the presence of Duque (69th) and Galvez (77th) in the first word frequency search. At first, I did not consider the presence of Duque (Secretary of Health) and Galvez (Chief Implementer of the Covid response) in the word search as they are expected to be quite present in the discussion. But the presence of bong (49th) over other words such as hospital (62nd), testing (75th) medical (82nd), and doh (Department of Health) (90th) is quite interesting as it shows that the senator takes a huge position in the discussion either as an actor or as part of the discussion/s.
Meanwhile, as the first impression stated in the initial Categories, it is quite clear that corruption takes quite an important position in the discussions as dismissed (40th) was the first word added in this third run, while, corruption (85th) becomes an explicit topic in the discussions. This supports the formulation of the initial categories on corruption/governance (i.e. corruption, de Lima, komunista/communist, Leni/Robredo, npa, and Zarate) as they bound the words mask (48th), hospital (62nd), testing (75th), medical (82nd) and the words doh (90th) and iatf (interagency task force) (99th) after corruption. As these are speeches discussing the state of the Philippines under the pandemic, priority discussions should be focused on health and medical response not on other issues such as corruptions and other words related to it. It seems that the supposed health and medical response, through the words mask, hospital, testing, etc., are only interspersed among issues relating to corruption.

Other observations in this run is the presence of the word private (45th) as the government greatly relies on private institutions in responding to the pandemic, mask (48th) as discussed earlier where it is related to face as the main response of the government to the pandemic, manila (63rd) and cebu (65th) as centres of high cases of the disease, testing (75th) this will be further analysed if this is related to mass testing as an initial call of civil society groups in addressing the pandemic which is denied by the government, China (76th) as the government through the president made it a policy to be closed alliance with it, even with current territorial disputes and uneven investments, rate (95th) this may relate to the rate of infection and rate relating to economy.

Fourth run

The 4th word frequency search did not yield much words of consequence, most are just derivatives of other words mentioned earlier such as pilipinas (68th) and Philippine (87th), vaccines (64th) of vaccine and bakuna, and of work (70th) of trabaho. Other terms of consequence that came up are bahay/house (60th), pandemic (63rd), virus (66th), social (76th), lgus/local government units (79th), and lockdown (80th). This run seems to form what is included in the response of the government to the pandemic: bahay/house
which translates to staying at home that is also related to the lockdown as the main response of the government to the pandemic, social for social distancing, and lgus/local government units as the main actors in responding to the pandemic. What I found most interesting here is the third time that word relating to vaccines came up, thus, this made add up all the time that the vaccine and its other derivatives came up. The total number of mentions of vaccine/vaccines/bakuna adds up to 699 times, which is second only to covid (799 times), this reflects the priority of the regime in how it will respond to the pandemic, through the promise of vaccination. Additionally, this 4th run of the word frequency search reinforces how the government responded to the pandemic, through local and individual actions that limit individual movements without prioritization of a more systemic national health response.

**Fifth run**

The 5th word frequency search yielded the following words: dominguez (70th), test (76th), contact (77th), economy (87th), misconduct (91st), philhealth (92nd), ombudsman (94th), healthcare (96th), patay (98th), roque (99th). Dominguez and Roque are part of the cabinet, where Dominguez is the secretary of finance while Roque is the presidential spokesperson, they are expected to be part of the discussion. Here, the importance of the economy is reinforced through the inclusion of Dominguez as finance secretary and economy as a topic of concern. Two relevant finding here is the late appearance of test and contact and the reappearance of words related to corruption (misconduct, philhealth, and ombudsman). Adding the number of mentions of test and testing together will only yield 240 mentions, well below the words pulis/police/military (598), quarantine/lockdown (425), and vaccine and its derivatives (699), again, reinforcing the central narrative of the government’s response to the pandemic. Testing is one of the main effective responses to the pandemic but given the prioritization of the government, it used a peace and order response that is mainly composed of a police/military personnel leading the response to ensure quarantine and lockdown measures, while the country waits for a proven, effective, safe, and working vaccine. Additionally, given the kind of response the government is implementing, it focused on issues of corruption that
are not directly related to the issue of the pandemic, where misconduct in the government is discussed which relates to the presence of the ombudsman as the government body concerned in these issues. The PhilHealth or the Philippine Health Insurance Services both stand here as the institution that addresses the health and medical needs of the Filipinos in the time of the pandemic but also reminded the audience of the corruption issues that involved its officials. Lastly, an interesting word here patay/death (98th) seems innocuous at best as it relates to the death brought about by the pandemic, but, in a quick search of the treemap of the word patay we can observe that it is not only about the number of deaths related to covid but also about how komunista/communist/NPA are being made to be part of the discussion.