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Summary
In the Philippines there is a lot of crime, corruption and poverty. Drugs are an important cause of this, at least according to the Philippine President Rodrigo Duterte. That is why Duterte wants the drug problem to be tackled. This is why he introduced the ‘Oplan Tokhang’, or as we know it, ‘the war on drugs’, as soon as he became a president in May 2016. His goal is to create security for the good citizens by protecting them against crime, poverty and corruption. The country has been experiencing less crime since Duterte’s presidency, yet there is much criticism on Duterte’s approach and also on the approach of the Philippine National Police. This is because the war on drugs is accompanied by the violation of many human rights. Since fighting crime is accompanied by a lot of state violence, it is questionable how people perceive this. Do they consider this violence legitimate, and does this affect the regime’s legitimacy? Therefore it is interesting to research the effects of the war on drugs on the perceived safety of Filipino inhabitants and on how this influences the regime’s legitimacy.

The objective of this research is therefore to better understand how Duterte’s domestic policy to create ‘a safe environment for good citizens’ influences the perceived sense of safety for Filipino inhabitants and also on how this has an impact on the regime’s legitimacy. The main research question that follows from this is therefore: ‘What impact does Duterte’s ‘war on drugs’ have on the perceived safety of Filipino inhabitants and how does this impact the regime’s legitimacy?’

To answer this research question I went to the Philippines to conduct semi-structured in-depth interviews with the local population from different barangays (neighborhoods) in San Jose de Buenavista. I also collected an important part of information from small talk and the media, especially from digital newspapers. After I interpreted my results, I discussed the results with three informants in order to increase the validity of the research.

The barangays in which I conducted my research were quite different in nature. For the results it is important to emphasize the difference between Comon and the other barangays. Comon is one of the poorest barangays of San Jose de Buenavista, and it appears that in Comon most of my respondents suffered from crime before the war on drugs. In the other barangays, San Fernando, Bagong Bayan, Hamtic and Bugasong, less crime is experienced. For the main conclusion it seems that the differences in the level of poverty and earlier experiences of violence have important consequences for security perceptions. These differences appear somehow paradoxical, because in the barangays that were safer in the past, the people feel less secure now. Conversely, the people in the barangays who experienced more crime feel more secure now.
So how does this impact the regime’s legitimacy? Most of the people in Comon agree with the violence. They are the ones who noticed most of the crime before the war on drugs. It seems that they therefore believe that violence may be used for this drug - and crime problem. They feel safer now, because of the violence by the state, and state violence becomes legitimate as soon as people feel that they are protected by it. Most of my respondents outside Comon feel less safe. Most of them indicate that the violence is not proportional for this drug - and crime problem, they believe that there are other solutions such as free rehabilitation, send the suspects to prison, education or the providing of jobs.

There are, however, some limitations to this research, therefore some recommendations for further research have been made. One of the limitations is that this research only took place in one town. Another limitation is that this research did not deal with the degree of police intervention. Moreover, this research only indicates that respondents do not approve innocent victims. However, this research has not dealt with the extent to which there are innocent victims, or the extent to which respondents have experienced this. In addition, this research does not include interviews with (ex)-drug addicts and this research does not address the lacked information provision.
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1. Introduction

“My God, I hate drugs. And I have to kill people because I hate drugs.”

- Rodrigo Duterte, 2016, Inquirer.

On May 9, 2016, Rodrigo Duterte wins the presidential elections in the Philippines with 39% of the votes. In his election campaign Duterte promises to reduce crime, poverty and corruption in the country, of which, according to Duterte, drugs are an important cause. Drugs are therefore a major problem in the Philippines. That is why Duterte starts a war against drugs, also called ‘Project Tokhang’. In the beginning Duterte promised to put an end to drug-related crime within six-months, however soon he admitted that he needed more time (NU, 2016a). Nevertheless, his goal is to create ‘safety’ for the ‘good citizens’ by protecting them against crime, poverty and corruption (Kaiman, 2017). Violence is used “as a spectacle to cow criminals while assuring ‘good citizens’ that they are safe” (Thompson, 2017, p. 11). In short, Duterte’s war on drugs should ensure safety for the citizens. The question is therefore whether the perception of safety in the country has risen since the war on drugs.

However, since Duterte started his six-year term as president, he is notable because of his unorthodox political style (Holmes & Thompson, 2017). Many Filipinos have already been killed because of the war on drugs. This is accompanied by the violation of many human rights. Critics think that Duterte’s war on drugs is morally and legally unjustifiable, and there is a lot of international criticism on Duterte and his policy. In addition, innocent citizens are also the unfortunate victims of the war on drugs (Phillips, 2016). The killing of innocent citizens is neither a crime, negligence nor recklessness, according to Duterte. Instead, it is just ‘collateral damage’ (Al Jazeera, as cited in Phillips, 2016). As a result, the feeling of fear grows in the Philippines (Harvey, 2016). This growth in fear can also be seen in the growing number of people in prisons, where in July 2016 already nearly 60,000 people voluntary went to prison, after they heard that Duterte urged citizens to ‘go ahead and kill drug dealers and users’. Hence, people are locked up in prison because they feel safer inside the prison than outside on the streets (Margan & Groom, 2016). Although Duterte’s policy is meant to create more safety and security, one can imagine that it could also lead to a decrease in perceived safety. That is why it is interesting to investigate whether the war on drugs provides more or less perceived safety for the Filipinos. In addition, this subject on the war on drugs is very topical, and therefore it is interesting to interview people at this moment, with the war on drugs still ongoing.

In addition, it is also interesting to examine how this war on drugs influences the regime’s legitimacy. By saying things such as: “My God, I hate drugs. And I have to kill people because I hate drugs” one can wonder to what extent this war on drugs by the state is perceived as legitimate. Do Filipinos feel safer
now since this war on drugs, and do they therefore approve Duterte’s unorthodox political style? In this connection, the Philippine National Police (PNP) is also widely questioned. The PNP is frequently accused of the unnecessary use of force, their involvement in the drug circuit and the protection of high drug lords. For example, the following news article “Drug war record: PNP ‘expected’ to heed Supreme Court” states that the Supreme Court ordered the PNP to hand in full records of deadly cases from the war on drugs. This indicates that the legitimacy of the PNP is questioned, because apparently the PNP needs to be monitored. Therefore it is interesting to research the influence of the war on drugs on both Duterte’s legitimacy and the legitimacy of the PNP.

In short, this thesis investigates the influence of the war on drugs on the perceived safety and on how this has an impact on the regime’s legitimacy, hereby it will also be identified whether Filipinos regard the state violence as legitimate. State violence becomes legitimate as soon as people feel that they are protected by it. This mainly concerns the extent to which the state does its job well (Burkens et al., 2006). In addition, it is important that citizens perceive their state as legitimate, because this means that there is more trust in political leaders (Bakke et al., 2014). This is important because when one wants to deal with risk and to guarantee public safety, one needs to be trusted (Mogensen, 2015). Before I elaborate more on this, I first give an extensive background on the war on drugs.

1.1. Background: War on Drugs
As mentioned before, on May 9, 2016, Rodrigo Duterte wins the presidential elections in the Philippines with 39% of the votes. In his election campaign Duterte promises to reduce crime, poverty and corruption in the country, of which, according to Duterte, drugs are a major cause. Drugs are therefore a major problem in the Philippines. There are three million drug addicts in the Philippines, according to Duterte (however official statistics show a much lower figure, see Figure 1). Nevertheless, it is a big problem among the poor population, and there is also a lot of involvement in drugs among children and youth, this concerns both illicit drug use, sale and trafficking (Njord et al., 2010). According to Matt Wells from Amnesty International (2017) there is a lot of involvement in drugs among the poor population because drugs are an easy way to make money.
Duterte divides ‘his people’ into two groups (Reyes, 2017). The first group consists of drug dealers, drug addicts and criminals. They are seen as those who violate the law, who are a danger to social welfare and who impede economic growth. The second group consists of law-abiding and god-fearing citizens. They are seen as the victims of violence, the citizens needed for economic development and the basis of the well-being for future generations. Duterte states that the first group must be eliminated in order to protect the second group (Reyes, 2017), because then he is able to “care for law abiding, god earing young persons . . . because they are our resources” (Al Jazeera, as cited in Reyes, 2017, p. 118-119) and this way he can “slaughter the idiots for destroying his country” (Muggah, 2017). Hence, disabling the first group ensures personal safety, public safety and law and order for the second group (Reyes, 2017). Violence is used “as a spectacle to cow criminals while assuring ‘good citizens’ that they are safe” (Thompson, 2017, p. 11). Hence, Duterte wants to protect the ‘good citizens’ against crime, poverty and corruption in the country, of which drugs are a major cause (Kaiman, 2017).

Since Duterte started his six-year term as president, he is notable because of his unorthodox political style (Holmes & Thompson, 2017). He fights a fierce battle against the war on drugs. There is a strong approach by the PNP against people who are accused of being drug dealers and drug users. The reports about the number of homicides are quite different. For example, one newspaper states that one year ago, in March 2017, already more than 7700 people were killed (Maas, 2017). Another newspaper even states that a few months later already 12000 people would have been killed (Intal, 2017). The second newspaper states, however, that the majority of the killings had nothing to do with drugs use, this may explain the difference in number between the two newspapers. In addition, the second
newspaper argues that the policy was misused for political and personal liquidations, even children
were murdered under false conditions. A third article estimates the number of murders by the police
and civil guards somewhere between 3000 and 7000 (Holmes & Thompson, 2017). In short, many
people have been killed, but the numbers in the newspapers are different.

On July 1, one day after Duterte was inaugurated as president, he said: “if you know addicts, go to
them and kill them, because it is too painful if the parents have to do this themselves.” However, he
also said that he would act within the limits of the law: “I know the limits of the law and the authority
of a president, I know what is legal and what is not” (NU, 2016a). Nevertheless, it may be clear that
Duterte fights a ‘merciless battle’ against crime. Agents and civilian guards are allowed to shoot
suspects to death, under the guise of a ‘war on drugs’, and although Duterte stated that he would act
within the limits of the law, there is nevertheless a violation of human rights. Critics think that Duterte’s
war on drugs is morally and legally unjustifiable. That is why many believe that the United States (US)
and the international community must condemn and sanction the Philippine government (Felbab-
Brown, 2017). Therefore, on December 20th, 2016, the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC)
announced that they wanted to start an investigation against Duterte because of his fight against drug-
related crime (NU, 2016b). Also, Duterte’s controversial policy generated a lot of criticism from all over
the world. The United Nations (UN), the United States, the European Union (EU), and the Roman
Catholic Church, among others, turned against the Philippine president. Another example is from the
International Criminal Court (ICC) in The Hague, they announced in February 2018 a preliminary
investigation into the violence in the Philippines, because Duterte committed crimes against humanity.
The ICC will research if Duterte is responsible for thousands of drug killings (NU, 2018a). Also the
Human Right Watch (HRW) is keeping an eye on Duterte. They already published an article wherein
they blame Duterte for the murders, because Duterte calls on civilians to attack drug traffickers (NU,
2016a).

The international community also has great concerns about Duterte, this has to do with, among other
things, all kinds of previous remarkable statements by the president. During his election campaign in
2016, Duterte received worldwide attention with his sexist statements about women. He made a ‘joke’
about rape and murder when he spoke at a campaign: “I saw her face and I thought, ‘What a pity…
they raped her, they all lined up. I was mad she was raped but she was so beautiful. I thought, the
mayor should have been first” (BBC, 2016). On the International Women’s Day, on the 8th of March
2018, there was a Women’s march in the Philippines. This was especially a protest against President
Duterte. According to the protesters Duterte is the biggest violator of women’s rights in Asia (NU,
2018b). In addition, Duterte has even more controversial statements. First, he compared himself with
Hitler: "Hitler massacred three million Jews. Now, there are three million drug addicts. I’d be happy to
slaughter them.” Second, he described Barack Obama as a “son of a whore” (BBC, 2016). One can wonder how someone like Duterte, who jokes about rape and murder during his election, can win the presidential elections. Therefore it will now be explained why people voted for Duterte during the elections.

People were frustrated with crime, corruption and inequality in the Philippines. In addition, the number of homicides in the Philippines in 2013 was the highest in Asia, and the eleventh highest in the entire world (World Bank survey, cited in Jenkins, 2016). Duterte’s predecessor Aquino did not manage to solve the problems with crime, corruption and poverty. That is why many Filipinos needed someone with a firm approach to sort things out. Duterte appeared at the right time to put things in order. Duterte is seen as someone who will actually bring change, who manages to fight crime and who manages to eradicate corruption (Jenkins, 2016). In addition, it is striking that the provinces with the highest crime index voted for Duterte. In 2016 the PNP released a list of the fifteen cities with the highest number of index crimes from 2010 to 2015 (ABS-CBN News, 2016). The crimes included are murder, homicide, robbery, theft, carjacking and physical injury. From those fifteen cities, there were thirteen cities in provinces where the majority of the people voted for Duterte. Hence, in the provinces with the most crime, many people seemed to want change. Why Duterte is seen as someone who will bring change, is because of his performance as a mayor in the city of Davao, twenty years ago. He caused a significant positive change in Davao. Under his authority, Davao changed from a dangerous city, to one of the safest cities in the country. He managed to tackle corruption, and also crime rates fell sharply (NU, 2016b). Duterte really wants the ‘good citizens’ of his population to be well: “I don’t care if I burn in hell, as long as the people I serve live in paradise” (Somoza, 2016).
Figure 2: Map Philippines Presidential Elections 2016.
The consequences of the war on drugs are multiple, both negative and positive. One of the negative consequences is that not only drug dealers, drug addicts and criminals are killed, but also innocent citizens (Phillips, 2016). The killing of innocent citizens is neither a crime, negligence nor recklessness, according to Duterte. Instead, he argues that it is ‘just’ collateral damage (Al Jazeera, as cited in Phillips, 2016). As a result, the feeling of fear among both ‘good’ citizens as drugs dealers/users grows in the Philippines (Harvey, 2016). This growth in fear can also be seen in the growing number of people in prisons, where in July 2016 already nearly 60,000 people voluntary went to prison, after they heard that Duterte urged citizens to ‘go ahead and kill drug dealers and users’. The prisons are so full now, that there is not enough room left for everyone. Because of this all the prisoners cannot sleep at the same time, so they have to sleep in turn. Despite this, people still want to be locked up in prison because they feel safer inside the prison than outside on the streets (Margan & Groom, 2016).

Figure 3: Philippines’ most overcrowded jail in Quezon City. Source: World Press Photo, 2017.

However, the Filipino government indicates that there are many positive changes in the country because of the war on drugs. The war on drugs should ensure a decrease in crime, poverty and corruption in the country. This must lead to ‘safety’ for the ‘good citizens’. In addition to the war on drugs, Duterte’s policy also ensures other changes. For example, Duterte fights against Islamic State (IS) rebels in the south of the country. He declared Marawi (city in the south of the Philippines) free of IS-rebels on October 17th 2017 (NU, 2017). Also, gambling is a big problem in the Philippines. Therefore, Duterte wants to completely eliminate internet gambling in his country. The Filipino gambling industry is one of the liveliest in Asia and has attracted many foreign companies over the last ten years, this gambling industry involves billions of euros (NU, 2016b). In addition, Duterte has also ensured a law that more than a hundred state universities and colleges in the Philippines grant free tuition. Before I
turn to the influence of Duterte’s war on drugs on the perceived safety of Filipino inhabitants, I first elaborate the approach of the war on drugs.

1.2. Approach War on Drugs
What exactly is the approach of the war on drugs? Do the police and citizens really have a free license to kill? What are the actual rules? How should the state and the police deal with the drug problem?

Oplan Tokhang is from the Visayan (group of languages in the Philippines) words, ‘toktok’ and ‘hangyo’, which means ‘to knock and to request’. This means the literal knock-and-plead operations by the PNP. The PNP will visit the house of an alleged drug user or pusher. Then the PNP will ask the drug user or pusher to stop with their illegal activities and to surrender to the police, afterwards the drug user or pusher will be monitored for further assessment. This is to encourage them to change for the better. However, soon this Tokhang house visits by the police became bloody and controversial, because the police killed drug suspects who, instead of surrendering, allegedly fought back.

However, in January 2017 Oplan Tokhang was temporarily stopped. The PNP was no longer authorized to conduct operations, all drug-related operations were temporarily conducted solely by the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA). However, in January 2018 Oplan Tokhang returned, with guidelines to ensure less bloody results. The PNP issued a list of do’s and don’ts when conducting anti-drug operations. Measures were put in place to prevent bloody operations, for example the wearing of body cameras by the police in order to record their operations. In addition, it was more strictly enforced that corrupt and abusive policemen would be removed from their position. These measures ensured respect for human rights and strict adherence to the rule of law. More attention would be paid on transparency, accountability and command responsibility. Nevertheless, according to the PNP, if the life of policemen are at risk, then the policemen have the right to defend themselves. In short, the PNP wanted to ensure less bloody results, however the PNP could not promise an anti-drug campaign that would be completely bloodless.

1.3. Scientific Relevance and Societal Relevance

1.3.1. Scientific relevance
With this research, I aim to gain insight into the impact of Duterte’s war on drugs on the perceived safety of Filipino inhabitants and on how this influences the regime’s legitimacy. Hence, I expect to add knowledge on the academic debate of perceived safety / fear of crime. This debate includes, among other things, disagreement about how the fear of crime should be defined. Different scholars find different aspects of importance to include in the definition (Khruakham & Lee, 2014; Chadee et al., 2013; Jackson, 2005). I also want to contribute to which aspects are important to include in the definition. Another debate concerning the fear of crime is that it is very subjective and therefore hard
to operationalize (van Swaaningen, 2006). Also, the answers to survey questions on fear of crime and actual responses to crime have been widely questioned (Tseloni & Zarafonitou, 2008). This is because several studies have shown that often a vague question formulation is used that is insufficient to measure correct timing, intensity and frequency (Tseloni & Zarafonitou, 2008). Hence, one can see that the research on fear of crime, for both the formulation as the operationalization of the concept, has been criticized much. Therefore I expect to contribute to the academic debate, by getting a better understanding of perceived safety / fear of crime, and by being able to contribute to the definition of the concept and its operationalization. In addition, little research has been done about this concerning the Philippines. Therefore it is interesting that my thesis can contribute to this debate. Also, a lot of research about the fear of crime is quantitatively measured, yet there is a lot of debate on how to properly measure it. Through conducting qualitative research, I try to generate a better understanding of which aspects are important for the concept. This is because qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. Hence, by responding to experiences of the respondents and by conducting the research qualitatively, I hope to contribute to deeper insights into the fear of crime.

Also, I aim to add knowledge on the academic debate of legitimate state violence with this research. First, by explaining the debate on the monopoly of legitimate violence by the state, this debate is about why a state should have a monopoly on violence. This is still a widely discussed concept. Berg & Wendt (2011, p. 7) argued that critics “have pointed out that the monopoly of state violence may itself become the wellspring of boundless violence”. Second, I explain the debate of legitimate state violence. For my thesis it is interesting to measure the extent to which Filipino inhabitants think that state violence is considered as legitimate, and why. However, little research has been done about this. Therefore it is interesting that my thesis can contribute to this debate. Also, a lot of research about legitimate state violence is quantitatively measured. However, qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. Hence, by responding to experiences of the respondents and by conducting the research qualitatively, I hope to contribute to deeper insights into the perceptions of legitimate state violence. In doing so, I would like to explore the role of state violence in contributing to state legitimacy.

Finally, I also aim to contribute to the academic debate of legitimate states. It is important to wonder to what extent the regime in the Philippines is considered as legitimate, therefore I aim to explore the role of state violence in contributing to state legitimacy. This is important because when a state is considered as legitimate by its citizens, then this means that there is more trust in the political leaders (Bakke et al., 2014). This contributes to trust that violence by the state is proportional and justified. In addition, there is also more acceptance of state violence if a state is seen as legitimate (Jackson et al.,
2013). However, there is little consensus over what exactly makes a state legitimate or representative in concrete terms (Milliken & Krause, 2002). There have been different attempts to resolve the question of how states and regimes could be legitimate in the eyes of the people (Jackson, 1993). In addition, it has been difficult to do good measurements about state legitimacy, and it is measured in many different ways (Gilley, 2006). Hence, there is a lot of disagreement about how to define state legitimacy, so I expect to contribute to this debate with my thesis. In addition, little research has been done about the extent in which the Philippine regime is considered as legitimate by its inhabitants. Therefore it is interesting that my thesis can contribute to this debate. Also, a lot of research about state legitimacy is quantitatively measured. However, qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. Hence, by responding to experiences of the respondents and by conducting the research qualitatively, I hope to contribute to deeper insights into the perceptions of state legitimacy.

1.3.2. Societal relevance
Corruption, crime and poverty are major problems in the Philippines. In addition, the Philippines have the eleventh highest homicide rate in the world (Jenkins, 2016), hence one can understand that all these aspects influence the fear of crime / perceived safety. Hence, to increase the citizens’ safety, Duterte introduced a policy involving a war on drugs. This thesis is of societal relevance, because it tries to understand the effects of the war on drugs on the perceived safety / fear of crime and how this in turn impacts the regime’s legitimacy. It is also interesting to find out whether the policies of Duterte work, and to what extent human rights organizations are rightly concerned.

In addition, this thesis is of societal relevance because of the importance and influence that the fear of crime has on the daily human life. Therefore it is important to measure the fear of crime. The fear of crime affects multiple factors in human life. One should take, for example, a look at Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943). This hierarchy of needs explains what motivates people. Maslow believed that people are motivated to achieve certain needs. When one need is fulfilled, a person seeks to fulfill the next one, and so on. When one looks at Maslow’s hierarchy, in Figure 3, one can see that our most basic need is physical survival, hence this will be the first thing that motivates our behavior. However, one can also see that safety is the second thing that motivates our behavior, hence safety is an important element that one needs in order to achieve certain needs.
Figure 4: Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Source: Simply Psychology.

Also, the fear of crime is important in relation to other aspects. Fear of crime has a demonstrable influence on individual behavior and the degree to which the quality of community life is experienced (Westover, 1985; Tseloni & Zarafonitou, 2008; Khruakham & Lee, 2014). When people feel afraid they tend to avoid unsafe places or locations, reduce social activities outside the home, obtain security tools and minimize the possibility of crime victimization in other ways (Khruakham & Lee, 2014, p. 4). In addition, not feeling safe can lead to various mental health problems and maladjustment, moreover it can lead to negative social behavior and emotional difficulties (Yablon & Itzhaky, 2015). Hence, safety and security are important aspects of human lives and well-being. Therefore, it is important to know whether people actually feel safe. If I find out, for example, that people still feel unsafe since, or because of, the war on drugs, this could help raise awareness of the impacts of the war on drugs. Additionally, if I find out why people feel unsafe, this may lead to addressing the shortcomings of the war on drugs.

However, there is another very important aspect why it is important to measure the fear of crime. This is because fear has an influence on how people perceive politics and needs. This can lead to the notion that extreme measures are allowed in case the security situation asks for this, particularly if people’s lives are at risk. This in turn can ensure that measures such as state violence become legitimate. Therefore it is interesting to find out if fear legitimizes measures such as state violence in the Philippines. However, it can also be the other way around: state violence in the Philippines can also create a more dangerous situation, a situation that creates more fear. The research objective, the main research question and the sub-questions will be discussed in the following chapters.
1.4. Research Objective

The objective of this research is to better understand how Duterte’s domestic policy to create ‘a safe environment for good citizens’ influences the perceived sense of safety for Filipino inhabitants and also on how this has an impact on the regime’s legitimacy.

This thesis will have a theoretical focus, because I aim to contribute to the academic debates on perceived safety / fear of crime; legitimate state violence; and legitimate states. This is especially interesting because little research has been done about these debates on the war on drugs in the Philippines. Therefore it is interesting that my thesis can contribute to this debate. In addition, as said before, a lot of research about the fear of crime; legitimate state violence; and legitimate states are measured quantitatively. However, qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. Hence, by responding to experiences of respondents and by conducting the research qualitatively, I hope to contribute to deeper insights into the perceptions of fear of crime; legitimate state violence; and legitimate states.

1.5. Main Research Questions and Sub-Questions

The Main Research Question is: ‘What impact does Duterte’s ‘war on drugs’ have on the perceived safety of Filipino inhabitants and how does this impact the regime’s legitimacy?’

In order to answer this main research question the following sub-questions have been drawn up:

1. To what extent do people in the Philippines feel insecure?
2. What do they perceive as the major threats to their safety?
3. To what extent do they consider state violence as reducing these insecurities?
4. To what extent do they perceive state violence as appropriate/fair/justified and thus legitimate?
5. How does state violence contribute to state legitimacy?

1.6. Research Design

To carry out this research I went to the Philippines for almost three months. There I stayed in San Jose de Buenavista (next: San Jose), in the province of Antique, on the island of Panay in the Western Visayas. Filipino cities and municipalities are subdivided into barangays. A barangay is a native Filipino term for a village, district or ward. The barangay where I lived was called Comon.

The research took place in the months of March, April and May. I conducted the research through semi-structured in-depth interviews with the local population, particularly from San Jose. I also collected an important part of information from small talk and the media, especially digital newspapers. An extensive version of the research design can be found in Chapter 4 Methodology.
1.7. San Jose de Buenavista: the Barangays
As one could read in the previous section, I conducted my research in San Jose. Here I interviewed residents from different barangays, most of the respondents lived in the barangays Comon and San Fernando. Chapter 5 Results will show that occasionally a distinction will be made between Comon and the other barangays. That is why, for the sake of clarity, I explain in this section the importance of the distinction between Comon and the other barangays. The results will show that in Comon the most respondents suffered from crime before the war on drugs, and that the respondents from Comon therefore notice the biggest positive difference since the war on drugs regarding crime. In the other barangays on the other hand, the respondents hardly experienced any form of crime before the war on drugs, especially in San Fernando. Therefore, they also notice little (positive) difference since the war on drugs regarding crime. This information seems to be important when interpreting the results. Comon is located near the center of San Jose, this may be a reason that they therefore experienced more crime. Bagong Bayan (another barangay) is also relatively close to the center, however, the three respondents from Bagong Bayan indicate that they have little trouble with crime. The other three barangays, San Fernando, Hamtic and Bugasong are far outside the center of San Jose. The respondents from these three barangays indicate that, in general, they experience little crime in their barangay.

1.8. Let’s Care Foundation
Before I turn to the theoretical framework, I first introduce Let’s Care Foundation. This is the foundation where I could do my research internship. Let’s Care is a foundation with multiple projects, such as ‘Let’s care for the girls’; ‘Let’s care for the boys’ and ‘Let’s eco farm’. However their main project is ‘Let’s care for the girls’. This concerns a home for abused, mistreated and neglected girls between the ages of seven and nineteen years. A team of professional people is available 24 hours a day with information and guidance, wherein they want to envision a safe, warm and nurturing environment. In addition to providing care, nutrition and medical care, they support the girls in the processing of their traumas. The rehabilitation program lasts approximately eighteen months, after the program they return to their own (foster) family or any other safe form of living.

However, as one can see, my research has a different subject. However, I could stay in the volunteer house of Let’s Care, and the staff also helped me a lot with carrying out my research, such as arranging respondents. The reason why I mention and introduce Let’s Care here is to avoid confusion, because Let’s Care will also be mentioned a few times later in the thesis.
1.9. Thesis Outline

After the introduction I first discuss the theoretical framework, in Chapter 2. In the theoretical framework I explain the following three concepts: perceived safety (‘fear of crime’), legitimate state violence and state legitimacy. I discuss what the concepts entail, and I discuss the theoretical debates of the concepts. Then, in Chapter 3, I discuss the operationalization of these three concepts. Then Chapter 4 will follow, the methodology. This chapter explains what exactly has been researched in this thesis, and how this has been done. In Chapter 5 the results of the interviews are presented. This is done by discussing the results of the interviews per sub-question. Finally, this thesis will conclude with the conclusion and discussion in Chapter 6. Here the main research question will be answered, followed by a reflection on the academic debates, and on the societal – and scientific relevance of this thesis. After that I conclude this thesis with the limitations, recommendations and with my own learning experiences.
2. Theoretical Framework

To better understand the impact of Duterte’s war on drugs on the perceived safety of Filipinos and the impact on the regime’s legitimacy, I use three central concepts. These concepts are: perceived safety (‘fear of crime’), legitimate state violence, and state legitimacy. The war on drugs aims to create ‘safety’ for the ‘good citizens’, by protecting them against crime, poverty and corruption (Kaiman, 2017). Therefore it is interesting to explain the concept of ‘perceived security’, however in this research I refer to the ‘fear of crime’ when I talk about the ‘perceived security’. The reason for this will be explained in the next section. Since Duterte uses an unorthodox political style (Holmes & Thompson, 2017) to fight this war against drugs one can wonder if the Filipinos perceive the state violence as legitimate. Therefore also the concept of ‘legitimate state violence’ will be explained. In addition, it is interesting to know if this program of the war on drugs influences the legitimacy of the state. Hence, the concept of ‘state legitimacy’ will also be elaborated.

2.1. Perceived Safety (Fear of Crime) and Actual Safety

The literature shows that a distinction can be made between ‘perceived safety’ and ‘actual safety’, and it is important that one makes a distinction between these two concepts (Schneier, 2008a; 2008b; Khruakham & Lee, 2014). The actual safety can be measured with the likelihood of different risks. However, safety is also a feeling, based on one’s psychological reaction to risks (Schneier, 2008a; 2008b). For example, you may feel unsafe even though you are actually safe. Or vice versa, you feel safe even though you are not safe. An example is given by the Bureau of Justice Statistics National Crime Surveys (Hinkle, 2015). They found out that older-citizens and female groups felt the most fearful in society. However, it turned out that the most likely victimized group are young males. Moreover, it turned out that the main predictor of fear for an individual is not the actual crime rate. Hence, there are other factors that cause the fear of crime. Later research showed that the fear of crime is dependent on minor crimes and other public nuisances (Hinkle, 2015). However, the actual – and perceived safety can be related to each other and they can also influence each other. For example, when the actual safety improves by, for example, more police on the street, then it is likely that the perceived safety also increases, but this does not necessarily have to be the case. The concepts do not have the same meaning and are therefore different concepts (Schneier, 2008a; 2008b). This is why one should distinguish the concepts from each other (Schneier, 2008a; 2008b). This thesis will focus on the perceived safety (fear of crime) rather than on the actual safety. This is because this thesis is about how safe people feel since the war on drugs and how they experience it, and not about how safe or dangerous the war on drugs really is. In addition, for my thesis it is also relevant how the perceived safety influences the regime’s legitimacy.
In the literature ‘perceived safety’ is often been referred to as the ‘fear of crime’ (Hinkle, 2015). Since the fear of crime is not ‘a reflection of actual risk’ a lot of studies measure perceived safety on the basis of people’s perceived fear of crime (Delbosc & Currie, 2012). As a result, a lot of literature and debate can be found about the fear of crime. Therefore, to operationalize perceived safety, I use the literature about the fear of crime. This is because ‘fear of crime’ is a broader concept than ‘perceived safety’ and moreover, ‘fear of crime’ is a concept that has been measured more often in the literature (Hinkle, 2015). Hence, it is interesting to measure the ‘fear of crime’, after all ‘good citizens’ need to be protected against crime, poverty and corruption. Did the fear of crime change since Duterte’s policy? Do citizens perceive less crime since the war on drugs, and did therefore their fear of crime decrease? Or is it the other way around and do Filipinos feel less safe since the war on drugs?

2.1.1. Fear of Crime

Garofalo (1981) defines fear as: “an emotional reaction characterized by a sense of danger and anxiety for physical harm in a criminal victimization” (p. 854). But what is the ‘fear of crime’?

There is some disagreement about how the fear of crime should be defined. Fear of crime can be defined in terms of “a perception of the environment, a state of cognition or an emotional state” (War, as cited in Khruakham & Lee, 2014, p. 3). However, recent scholars argue that it should better be understood as a state of emotion, rather than a state of perception or cognition, where anxiety and stress are important terms to consider (Khruakham & Lee, 2014). Ferraro and La Grange define it as “the affective response to crime and its situation cues” (as cited in Chadee et al., 2013, p. 1896). Also, psychological stress turns out to be important to incorporate to define fear of crime (Khruakham & Lee, 2014). However Jackson (2005, p. 13) argues that fear of crime must be defined as a set of related constructs to emphasize the complex and subjective nature of this phenomenon, and that it should not just be defined as ‘worry’ or ‘safety’. Jackson argues that these narrow and theoretically under-specified definitions have led to rather limited analyses. ‘Worry’ and ‘safety’ are just single indicators, but multiple indicators provide a broader support for the conceptualization that contains a circuit between emotion, risk perception and environmental perception. Therefore he offers “multiple new indicators of a broader conceptualization than so far exists in the literature” (p. 13). His definition consist of a range of perceptions and responses to the environment and to perceived risk and vulnerability (Jackson, 2005, p. 140).

It is important to measure the fear of crime, because the fear of crime has a demonstrable influence on individual behavior and the degree to which the quality of community life is experienced (Westover, 1985; Tseloni & Zarafonitou, 2008; Khruakham & Lee, 2014). When people feel afraid they tend to
avoid unsafe places or locations, reduce social activities outside their house, obtain security tools and minimize the possibility of crime victimization in other ways (Khruakham & Lee, 2014, p. 4).

Another, very important, impact of fear is that fear has an influence on how people perceive politics and needs. However, fear can also be over-exaggerated by politics. A good example of this can be found in Oberschall’s (2000) article. Oberschall highlights ethnic manipulation by political leaders and explains that manipulation is successful by spreading fear, insecurity and hatred. As an example Oberschall states that Yugoslavs experienced ethnic relations through two frames: a normal- and a crisis frame. In the normal frame threats and lies were unbelieved and unaccepted. However, in the crisis frame they became believed and raised fear. Hence, the crisis frame provided opportunities for political leaders to organize aggressive actions against other ethnicities.

Thus, fear has an impact on how people perceive politics and needs. This in turn can lead to securitization. This theory of securitization is developed by the Copenhagen School. Security issues are created by ‘securitizing speech acts’, these acts ensure that threats are recognized. This does not necessarily mean that there is already actually a threat, instead the speeches represent it as a threat. In short, securitization, according to the Copenhagen School, is: “the specific speech act of framing an issue as an ‘existential threat’ that calls for extraordinary measures beyond the routines and norms of everyday politics” (Abrahamsen, 2005, p. 58). This in turn can lead to the notion that extreme measures are allowed in case the security situation asks for this, particularly if people’s lives are at risk. This can ensure that measures such as state violence become legitimate. This could also be the case in the Philippines. Perhaps the problem of crime in the Philippines is exacerbated by politics. After all, as already stated in Chapter 1 Introduction, Duterte wants to make believe that there are three million drug addicts in the Philippines. However, official statistics from 2015 show a much lower figure, with ‘only’ 1.8 million drug users. This could mean that the problem of crime and safety could be used as an issue to win votes.

In short, it is important to measure the fear of crime for two reasons. The first reason is that the fear of crime has an influence on personal well-being and the quality of community life. The second reason is that fear has an impact on how people perceive politics and needs. It is interesting to find out if this fear legitimizes measures such as state violence.

However, the problem with the fear of crime is that it is very subjective and therefore hard to operationalize (van Swaaningen, 2006). Also, survey questions on the fear of crime have been widely questioned (Tseloni & Zarafonitou, 2008). This is because several studies have shown that often a vague question formulation is used that is insufficient to measure correct timing, intensity and frequency (Tseloni & Zarafonitou, 2008). This is also apparent in Jackson’s (2005) article, in which he
states that the ‘wrong’ or ‘limited’ definition of fear of crime led to rather limited analyses. Also Chadee et al., (2013) argue that much literature about the ‘fear of crime’ has focused on the role of risk perceptions to understand fear of crime. Hence, one can see that there is a lot of disagreement about how to measure fear of crime, so hopefully my thesis can contribute to this debate.

Other often used indicators to measure fear of crime are: ‘feeling unsafe alone at home after dark’; ‘feeling unsafe walking alone after dark’; and ‘worry about becoming a victim of crime’. An example of scholars who use these indicators to measure fear of crime are Tseloni and Zarafonitou (2008, p. 387). However, according to Jackson (2005) this is too simplistic and it does not capture the most interesting parts of the concept, which are ‘emotion’, ‘risk perception and vulnerability’ and ‘environmental perception’. Nevertheless, most studies on fear of crime do, however, still contain questions along the lines of ‘feeling unsafe alone at home after dark’ (Khruakham & Lee, 2014). According to Khruakham and Lee this is a very important concept to involve, because “nothing is worse than feeling fearful when staying in the house, since the home is considered to be the safest place” (p. 4).

With this thesis I want to contribute to the debate on the fear of crime, because there is a lot of disagreement about how fear of crime should be defined and what concepts should be included in the definition. I want to do this by researching how safe people feel since the war on drugs and how they experience it. In addition, I want to find out how the perceived safety influences the regime’s legitimacy. It is important to measure the fear of crime, because it has a demonstrable influence on individual behavior and the quality of community life. Another very important reason to measure the fear of crime is that fear has an influence on how people perceive politics and needs. In addition, it is interesting to find out if the perceived fear legitimizes measures such as state violence. Besides, little research has been done about this concerning the Philippines. Therefore it is interesting that my thesis can contribute to this debate. Also, a lot of research about the fear of crime is quantitatively measured. However, qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. Hence, by responding to experiences of the respondents and by conducting the research qualitatively, I hope to contribute to deeper insights into the fear of crime. I want to achieve the deeper insights by including a number of aspects concerning the fear of crime. These aspects come from two other studies (Jackson, 2005; Khruakham & Lee, 2014), but by giving it my own qualitative twist and by adding aspects that are important for the war on drugs in the Philippines I hope to gain new interesting insights into the fear of crime. The aspects are: worry about victimization; estimate of the likelihood of victimization (Jackson, 2005); victimization; and neighborhood disorder/crime (Khruakham & Lee, 2014). With these aspects I hope to answer the first two sub-questions (Sub-question 1: to what extent do people in the Philippines feel insecure? Sub-question 2: what do they perceive as the major threats
to their security?). In Chapter 3 Operationalization I explain why I choose these studies and how I operationalize the concepts.

2.2 Legitimate State Violence
For my thesis it is interesting to measure the extent to which Filipinos perceive state violence as legitimate, and why. State violence becomes legitimate as soon as people feel that they are protected by it. This mainly concerns the extent to which the state does its job well (Burkens et al., 2006). To understand why states have the right to maintain a monopoly on violence, and to understand when this violence becomes legitimate, I first turn to the debate about the state’s monopoly of violence.

2.2.1. State’s Monopoly of Violence
The state’s monopoly of violence is a widely discussed concept. The Filipino state wants to destroy elements such as organized crime, corruption and poverty in the country (Makabenta, 2017). In order to do this, they have a monopoly of violence. An important keyword considering the monopoly of violence is ‘legitimacy’. State violence becomes legitimate as soon as people feel that they are protected by it. This mainly concerns the extent to which the state does its job well (Burkens et al., 2006). Hence, the state’s violence has to be legitimate. However, considering the way how Duterte applies violence, one can wonder why a state should have the monopoly on the legitimate use of violence. Therefore the debate on the state’s monopoly of violence will be discussed next.

A precursor of the concept of a monopoly of violence can be found in the work of Thomas Hobbes (1651). He argued that a subjugation from the citizen to an absolute sovereign authority is necessary for a safe and quiet life. To be able to accomplish this, one needs a common power. To ensure this, a ‘social contract’ must be drawn, with the aim of a social cohesion for the society. This will ensure that the society can function as a whole. Hence, the sovereign can only use his monopoly of violence to ensure peace and order and to prevent violence in the society (Hampton, 1988). In addition, in order to live a safe and quiet life the population must cede the right of violence to the sovereign by accepting the ‘social contract’.

The first scholar who actually described ‘the monopoly of the legitimate use of violence’ was Max Weber in his essay Politics as a Vocation (1919). He argued that states prohibit the use of force by their citizens and residents. Instead, institutions such as the police and armed forces have the right to use force to maintain order. This means that the state is an organization that has the exclusive right to use, threaten or authorize physical force against residents of its territory. The ability to maintain this monopoly is an important measure of the legitimacy and stability of a state. Public order and the general welfare of a society benefit from the fact that only the government has the exclusive right to
perform police- and defense tasks. In addition, the exclusive power of the state should ensure social welfare, but only if the state acts within the interests of the citizens.

Also Tilly (1985) argues that a state has a monopoly of violence in order to sustain its existence and to provide protection. The government offers protection not only against external violence, but also against local violence, which is also the case in the Philippines. However, the oppressive and extractive actions of governments often cause great ominous situations for the lives of their own inhabitants (Tilly, 1985). The difference between ‘legitimate’ and ‘illegitimate’ violence is therefore becoming increasingly vague (Tilly, 1985).

Finally, Burkens et al., (2006) also argue that one of the reasons for a monopoly of violence is that “the state . . . should ensure that citizens can live to a reasonable degree of security . . . the citizen has . . . the right to be protected by the government against persons who violate the norm . . . If the state does not or not sufficiently maintain the law, then it loses its legitimacy” (p. 100). Burkens et al., argue that the degree of legitimacy is mainly seen in the extent to which the state properly performs his task.

2.2.2. Legitimate State Violence

As one can see there are many reasons why a state has the monopoly of violence and when the violence becomes legitimate. Therefore, it is interesting to know to what extent state violence is considered as legitimate in the Philippines.

Jackson, Huq, Bradford and Tyler (2013) wonder why people believe that state violence is acceptable, and thus perceived as legitimate. In their article they study people’s beliefs about the acceptability of state violence to achieve social control and social change. Jackson et al., argue that it is important to understand why people generally have a positive opinion on state violence. That is why it is important, according to Jackson et al., to conduct a research into the attitudes of the society towards violence by the state. As a result Jackson et al., stated that people accept state violence to achieve social control “as a substitute for the police, for self-protection and the resolution of disputes” (p. 479). Violence by the state can be both a means for social control or social change (these two concepts are collectively called “private violence” in Jackson’s et al., article). According to Jackson et al., little research has been done about links between state legitimacy and private violence, this means that there is little work about whether the normative attitudes of people to the state are influenced by their opinion on private violence.

With this thesis I aim to contribute to the debate on legitimate state violence. I want to find out to what extent Filipino inhabitants think that state violence is considered as legitimate, and why. However, little research has been done about the extent to which Filipinos perceive state violence as
legitimate. Therefore it is interesting that my thesis can contribute to this debate. Also, a lot of research about legitimate state violence is quantitatively measured. However, qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. Hence, by responding to experiences of the respondents and by conducting the research qualitatively, I hope to contribute to deeper insights into the perceptions of legitimate state violence. I want to achieve the deeper insights by including a number of aspects that are important concerning the war on drugs in the Philippines. With these aspects I hope to answer the third and fourth sub-question (Sub-question 3: to what extent do they consider state violence as reducing these insecurities? Sub-question 4: to what extent do they perceive state violence as appropriate/proportional/fair/justified and thus legitimate?) In Chapter 3 Operationalization I explain how I operationalize this concept.

2.3. Internal State Legitimacy

After having discussed the legitimate use of violence by the state, it is important to wonder to what extent the government of the Philippines is considered as legitimate. This is important because when a state is considered as legitimate by its citizens, this means that there is more trust in political leaders (Bakke et al., 2014). This contributes to trust that violence by a state is proportional and justified. In addition, there is also more acceptance of state violence if a state is seen as legitimate (Jackson et al., 2013).

One can make a distinction between international legitimacy and internal legitimacy. Since this research is about the legitimacy of the Philippines for the Filipinos inhabitants only the latter is important. Internal legitimacy is defined by Jackson and Rosberg (1984, p. 177) as: "the recognition of a state and its government as rightful by its population." Also Beetham (2013) argues that for legitimacy it is important that the power is acknowledged as rightful. In addition, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development views legitimacy as follows: "i) the acceptance of political authority by a population; or, ii) political authority that is acquired and exercised according to certain socially accepted normative standards and criteria" (Clements, 2014, p. 13-14). In short, what matters is that the population perceives the state and its power as legitimate.

There is little consensus over what exactly makes a state legitimate or representative in concrete terms (Milliken & Krause, 2002). There have been different attempts to resolve the question of how states and regimes could be legitimate in the eyes of the people (Jackson, 1993). In addition, it has been difficult to do good measurements about state legitimacy, and it is measured in many different ways (Gilley, 2006). For example, some scholars found it important to focus on social and economic conditions. Other scholars, on the other hand, opted for socio-psychological factors as a source of state legitimacy. Another movement focused on specific political attitudes and their potential role in legitimacy. Other scholars considered political attitudes the most important factors. A final example
comes from scholars who included geography and demography when they measured the legitimacy of the state (Gilley, 2006).

Bakke, O’Loughlin, Toal and Ward (2014, p. 591) argue that the internal legitimacy of states depend on how convincing they are to their citizens as state-builders. Bakke et al., pose this argument based on respondents’ perceptions of democracy, welfare and security. In addition, internal legitimacy is about the social contract between the ruler and the one that is being ruled. This contract ensures that the ruler provides benefits, such as social order, to the ruled. The ruled accepts the right of the ruler to rule in return. To ensure that the population does not turn against the state, the state must ensure that it is trusted, believed, and accepted as a regime. In addition, the state provides control, protects citizens and provides public goods. According to Bakke et al., ‘internal legitimacy’ is a concept with distinctive and discrete dimensions: state legitimacy, regime legitimacy and institutional legitimacy.

To research internal legitimacy Bakke et al., pose questions that are useful to explain how legitimate the people perceive the entity, its regime and institutions. Bakke et al., found out that people’s concern about public goods, such as democracy, economic development and perceptions of safety and security are important determinants for internal legitimacy. In sum, Bakke et al., their findings suggests that: “internal legitimacy is not tied only to the key Weberian state-building function of monopoly of the legitimate use of force; people are just as concerned about these entities’ ability to fulfill other aspects of the social contract” (p. 603).

With my thesis I want to contribute to the debate about state legitimacy. I want to find out to what extent to government of the Philippines is considered as legitimate by its inhabitants. This is important because when a state is considered as legitimate by its inhabitants, this means that there is more trust in the political leaders (Bakke et al., 2014). This contributes to trust that violence by the state is proportional and justified. In addition, when one wants to deal with risk and to guarantee public safety, one needs to be trusted (Mogensen, 2015). In addition, there is more acceptance of state violence if a state is seen as legitimate (Jackson et al., 2013). There is little consensus over what exactly makes a state legitimate or representative in concrete terms (Milliken & Krause, 2002). In addition, little research has been done about the extent in which the Philippine government is considered as legitimate by its inhabitants. Therefore it is interesting that my thesis can contribute to this debate. Also, a lot of research about state legitimacy is quantitatively measured. However, qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. Hence, by responding to experiences of the respondents and by conducting the research qualitatively, I hope to contribute to deeper insights into the perceptions of state legitimacy. I want to achieve deeper insights by including a number of aspects that are important concerning the war on drugs in the Philippines. These aspects
are: state-, regime- and institutional legitimacy (Bakke et al., 2014). With these aspects I hope to answer the fifth sub-question (Sub-question 5: how does state violence contribute to state legitimacy?) In Chapter 3 Operationalization I explain how I operationalize this concept.
3. Operationalization

3.1. Measuring the Fear of Crime

Earlier in this thesis one could see that the fear of crime is measured in several ways. Therefore, I use different aspects from two studies to measure the fear of crime, which partially overlap. I choose the aspects that are logical and important for the situation in the Philippines. The studies that I choose are from Jackson (2005) and Khruakham and Lee (2014). I choose Jackson because his conceptualization comprises the interplay between emotion, risk perception, environmental perception, worry and vulnerability. This can be helpful to produce a better analysis on the fear of crime. In addition, I choose Khruakham and Lee because they provided additional interesting factors, which could be interesting and important to measure the fear of crime in the Philippines, such as the citizens’ opinion on neighborhood disorder/crime.

First, I discuss Jackson’s (2005) article. To measure the fear of crime I use Jackson’s following constructs: worry about victimization; and estimate of the likelihood of victimization. Logically, these constructs need to be linked to the consequences of the war on drugs. Since Jackson measured the fear of crime in a quantitative way, I have to give it a qualitative twist.

**Worry about victimization**

The first construct set out by Jackson is ‘worry about victimization’. As an emotion component Jackson included ‘worry’ instead of ‘anxiety’ or ‘fear’, because ‘worry’ is more preferable for this component according to psychological theory (Jackson, 2005). Jackson argues that fear is a too intense word for many situations that people experience and anxiety is too vague. Worry, on the contrary, is a broader concept. It takes the emotion of a situation into account, the mental states, and the concerns about a possible danger. Worry is “a chain of thoughts and images about an unpleasant and uncertain outcome” (Jackson, 2005, p. 301). Since Jackson measured the fear of crime in a quantitative way, I have to give it a qualitative twist. Interesting questions that emerge from this are therefore: “do you feel safe in this neighborhood”; “did you ever experience something that you feel this way”; “what kind of crime are you most afraid of” and “did you had the feeling that you could not do certain things because of crime”. Hereby it is also important to ask whether this has changed since Duterte’s presidency.

**Estimate of the likelihood of victimization**

Another construct set out by Jackson is ‘the estimate of the likelihood of victimization’. What is the risk of becoming a victim of crime? As stated before, there is a difference between the actual safety and the perceived safety. Since this thesis focuses on perceived safety, it is important to ask about the estimate of the likelihood of victimization. This has to do with aspects of vulnerability and threat. One
can be worried about a possible threat, and the degree to which you feel vulnerable affects the likelihood of victimization. Hence, interesting questions that arise from this are: “how was your daily life influenced by crime before Duterte” and “did something ever happen to you”.

The other research that I have chosen in order to measure the fear of crime, is the research conducted by Khruačkham and Lee (2014). They argue that victimization is closely related to the fear of crime. In order to research this they include, among other things, the disorder/crime in the neighborhood. Since Khruačkham and Lee measured the fear of crime in a quantitative way, I have to give it a qualitative twist.

Victimization
Questions to measure the fear of crime that are related to victimization are the following: “how was your daily life influenced by crime before Duterte”; “did something ever happen to you, or around you, in the neighborhood” and “did you had the feeling that you could not do certain things because of crime”. Also here it is important to ask whether it changed since Duterte’s presidency.

Neighborhood disorder/crime
Another interesting thing to measure is the criminality in the neighborhood. As said before, the two concepts (perceived – and actual safety) are separate from each other, yet the two concepts can influence each other. Criminality in the neighborhood can be a significant determinant for the fear of crime (Khruačkham & Lee, 2014). Signs of neighborhood disorder can lead to an increased perception of risk and hence to more fear of crime. Interesting questions to measure this are: “what is the biggest form of crime is this neighborhood” and “what other kinds of crime do you experience in this neighborhood”. Hereby it is interesting to ask whether it changed since Duterte’s presidency.

3.2. Measuring Legitimate State Violence
For my thesis it is interesting to measure the extent to which Filipinos perceive state violence as legitimate, and why. State violence becomes legitimate as soon as people feel that they are protected by it. This mainly concerns the extent to which the state does its job well (Burkens et al., 2006).

Legitimate State Violence
To measure the legitimacy of state violence it is interesting to ask questions such as: “what do you think of the anti-drug violence performed by the state”; “is the violence by the state reducing the insecurities in this neighborhood”; “do you think the violence by the state is necessary for this problem” and “is the violence by the state effective”. Hereby it is also interesting to ask what other kind of solutions the respondents think are possible or desirable.
3.3. Measuring State Legitimacy

For this thesis it is interesting to measure the extent to which the government of the Philippines is considered as legitimate, hence the internal legitimacy. This is important because when a state is considered as legitimate by its citizens, there is more trust in political leaders (Bakke et al., 2014). This contributes to trust that violence by a state is proportional and justified. In addition, there is also more acceptance of state violence if a state is seen as legitimate (Jackson et al., 2013). As said, there is little consensus over what exactly makes a state legitimate or representative in concrete terms (Milliken & Krause, 2002). Hence, with this thesis I aim to contribute to the debate on state legitimacy by measuring what makes a state legitimate or representative. In order to measure this I use some of the factors posed by Bakke et al., (2014). As said, Bakke et al., made a distinction between state legitimacy, regime legitimacy and institutional legitimacy. In this thesis both the legitimacy of Duterte and the legitimacy of the PNP will be discussed.

State Legitimacy

Whenever a state is seen as legitimate, then this means that rules of the state are accepted by the population (Bakke et al., 2014). Citizens do not question its presence. The point is that the state has the right to exist. In addition, it is about the fact that the population ties in with the political entity of the state. It is a too broad question to ask whether people trust the state. Therefore this factor is omitted, hence only regime legitimacy and institutional legitimacy are included, which will be explained next.

Regime legitimacy

The second dimension is regime legitimacy. This is not about the state per se, but it is about the regime of the state. The point is that the people who have power are trusted. With ‘the people in power’ the president and parliament are meant. Bakke et al., explain the difference with state legitimacy. It could be possible that one does not approve or trust those who have power, even though they believe in the right of the state to exist. Hence, it could be that the rating for state legitimacy is high, while the rating for regime legitimacy is low, and vice versa. In order to measure regime legitimacy, Bakke et al., asked respondents whether they trust the ruling regime. Hence, for my thesis it could be interesting to ask: “what do you think of Duterte”; “do you trust him” and “what do you (not) like about Duterte’s administration”.

Institutional legitimacy

The last dimension, institutional legitimacy, is about legitimacy in institutions such as the policy or judiciary. Bakke et al., argue that for institutional legitimacy it is important to examine about people’s trust in permanent institutions, such as the police and the judiciary. Bakker et al., argue that whenever
people show confidence in an institution (or a person), then it is a good guideline for the legitimacy of the ruler’s right to rule. An interesting question would be something along the lines of: “do you trust the police”; “what do you think of their performances” and “what are your experiences with the police”.
4. Methodology
This chapter explains what exactly has been researched in this thesis, and how this has been done. First, I indicate which research method has been used and its advantages and disadvantages. Then I discuss the research instruments. I discuss when and where the research took place, and I explain what choices I made regarding the respondents. Finally, I explain which data analysis I have carried out.

4.1. Research Method
First of all, this research is a qualitative research. Qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. It is also possible to adjust the research question and method during the research on the basis of already achieved results.

On the contrary, there are also disadvantages of qualitative research. First, the research group is always smaller in qualitative research than in quantitative research. There is often a target group of twelve, fifteen or twenty people in qualitative research. This creates a limited and selected group, instead of a broad representation of the target group. One can wonder whether representative conclusions can be drawn from this. However, these numbers of respondents appear to be large enough to be able to draw conclusions. It turns out that after eight interviews one only hears a few new things. This means that there is ‘saturation’ in the answers (Scholl & Olivier, 2014). Another disadvantage is that the results of qualitative research cannot be processed statistically. The results are therefore at most indicative and not representative.

However, I nevertheless opted for a qualitative research. This is because little research has been done qualitatively concerning the topic of this research in the Philippines. By doing the research qualitatively I can provide deeper insight into attitudes, motivations and behavior, regarding the war on drugs; safety perceptions; the legitimacy of the state; and legitimate state violence.

To gather information I conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews. Via these semi-structured in-depth interviews I researched the concepts that belong to the fear of crime; state legitimacy and legitimate state violence. It is intended that through these semi-structured in-depth interviews it becomes clear how these three aspects are influenced. How these aspects are operationalized has already been discussed in Chapter 3 Operationalization. From this several research questions have emerged.

With the semi-structured in-depth interviews I will not only receive answers to my questions, but also the ‘why’ behind the questions. This will provide more detailed information. In addition, the personal in-depth interviews are more anonymous than group discussions. It could be possible that respondents do not feel freely to speak during a group discussion. Therefore it is better to conduct personal in-depth interviews. Also, during an interview, it is possible for the researcher to immerse him- or herself
in the respondent. The interviewer can adopt a flexible attitude in contrast to quantitative questionnaires. Also the interviewer can easily react into specific topics. In short, the interviewer can fully focus on the underlying view and can go deeply into certain questions if necessary. Another advantage is that the interview can take place anywhere, for example at the respondent’s house. A disadvantage of in-depth interviewing is that it is an intensive way of conducting research, because it takes a lot of time. Another disadvantage is that there might be an interviewer bias, this means that the respondent is influenced by the interviewer.

The research strategy used for this thesis is a case study. The reason why I chose this method, is because there is not so much time to conduct the research. In addition, the resources for this research are limited. The advantage of this method is that one is able to research a case in detail. However, the major disadvantage of a case study is that the results only apply to one case and often this cannot be generalized.

4.2. Research Instruments
As already mentioned, my prior tool to gather information were the semi-structured in-depth interviews. To conduct the semi-structured in-depth interviews a questionnaire has been drawn up. The complete questionnaire can be found in Appendix B. The questionnaire consists of fifteen main questions, where follow-up questions could arise, if necessary. However, the questionnaire was, of course, a guideline, and every interview has been different.

In addition to the semi-structured in-depth interviews, I also gathered a lot of information from small talk and the media, especially from digital newspapers. This too has become an important part of this research. To do this it was convenient that I went to the Philippines for almost three months. There I have hardly seen any tourist, so often I hanged out with the locals. Because of this I had a lot of time for small talk, and I have also been able to experience what it is like to live in a country under the war on drugs. Generally I did not notice anything about this war on drugs, but still there was a shooting incident on March 22, and there was a curfew set in San Jose. These incidents will be explained later in Chapter 5 Results.

4.3. When and Where?
San Jose is a town in the province of Antique. It is a fairly large town, subdivided into 28 barangays. In 2015, the town had over 62,500 inhabitants (Census of Population, 2015). The consequences of the war on drugs are fairly experienced in San Jose, this is partly because San Jose is a rather large town. From different conversations I have heard that in the small villages less change is felt since the implementation of the war on drugs.
As said before, I only interviewed people from San Jose and surroundings, this was because my 'house' was there. Unfortunately, I have not been anywhere else, this could have been interesting for the research, because perhaps in the capital Manila the opinions on the war on drugs are different. This is because in Manila there is much more crime, and the war on drugs is much more alive, so people in Manila might think differently about their safety perception, the legitimacy of the state and state violence.

The period I stayed in San Jose was from March to May. When I first arrived I had to finish my questionnaire, so in April I started with the interviews. This way I had enough time to conduct the interviews, and also I would have time left to do things differently, for example if I had run into problems. In addition, I also had enough time to amplify the results and to examine them with informants, who I will introduce in the next section. I also had enough time for small talk in this period.

4.4. Respondents
Since my research internship took place in San Jose, I decided to choose 'the population of San Jose' as my respondents. This is because I would live in this town, and therefore I had enough time to gather together a group of respondents there. I have chosen to interview the 'regular' people, because I was curious about the stories of everyone. From young to old, man and woman, and occupations in all shapes and sizes. After all, it is important for every individual that he or she feels safe.

Eventually, I interviewed eighteen respondents conducted over fourteen interviews, including two police officers and one government employee. The list of respondents can be found in Appendix A. However, after I had amplified all my interviews, I had a few striking results. That is why I did a fifteenth interview with three informants afterwards: a radio DJ and two political science students from the University of Antique. The interview guide with the informants can be found in Appendix C.

The reason that I have more respondents than interviews is due to the following. Some Filipinos are rather insecure and shy, but at the same time they really want to help you. For example, I had twice that people really wanted to do an interview, but they were a little too insecure and thus they wanted to do the interview together with their friends or family. This is also because they were too insecure about their English, and in this way the respondents could complement each other and support each other when necessary. Moreover, the respondents felt more at ease if they could do the interview together, and I also thought that it was better if the respondents felt at ease. Therefore I had twice an interview with three respondents at the same time (apart from the interview with the three informants). Previously I have already argued that personal in-depth interviews are more anonymous than group discussions. A disadvantage of these ‘group interviews’ is therefore that the respondents maybe not dared to say everything, because they did not feel free to speak in a group. However, the
respondents were family and friends of each other, so I assume they were comfortable enough to speak freely. After all, they suggested to do a ‘group interview’ themselves. Another disadvantage is that sometimes these ‘group interviews’ were a bit messy, because of three people speaking at the same time. I have thought about leaving these two interviews out of consideration for the results, however still interesting information came up that can be used just as well for the results. That is why I included the two interviews with the three respondents in the thesis.

As mentioned before, I was curious about the stories of all kinds of inhabitants. However, I had one condition, and that condition was that the respondents had to be at least eighteen years of age. Firstly, because this is the age at which Filipinos may vote, secondly because too young respondents may not know enough about the current program of the war on drugs. However, I also made one exception in this case. In one of the ‘group interviews’ I conducted, the daughter of a couple participated. According to the couple their daughter’s English would be the best, and therefore they preferred it if their sixteen year old daughter would participate in the interview. However, I do not think that this has caused any obstacles.

As mentioned, I interviewed people from San Jose and surroundings. Collecting the respondents was actually quite simple. Filipinos are very hospitable, sweet, and they really want to help you. The Filipinos always responded very enthusiastically and curiously to my research. I owe a few of the respondents to the staff of Let’s Care, because they knew some people who could be interviewed. Also, I owe a few respondents just by walking around and talking to people. Often I went everywhere by foot. I had a lot of people who approached me, because of my 1.77m and blonde hair. That made it easy for me to find new respondents. In addition, sometimes after an interview the respondent knew someone who could be interviewed, so through this snowball sampling method I also met some of my respondents. However, there are some disadvantages to the snowball sampling method. It can “create problems within the network if sensitive links between individuals are acknowledged, or if the researcher shares informational or opinions from one respondent with another” (Norman, 2009, p. 79). Another problem is that “the method can be problematic if hostile groups or authorities use researchers’ findings or follow researchers’ actions to identify networks or subgroups that they perceive as threats” (Norman, 2009, p. 80). Nevertheless, most of the times the interviews took place at my house or at the respondent’s house. Also a few of the interviews were taken at the office of Let’s Care.

Generally speaking, the Filipinos spoke quite a word of English, but most of the times not fluently. However, as mentioned before, a few of the respondents were sometimes a bit insecure about their English. Because of this combination of not speaking a language fluently, and also by being insecure
about it, this language barrier sometimes caused shorter answers, partly because sometimes they could not find the right words. Because of this some of the interviews did not last very long. Also, sometimes I had the idea that some of the respondents did not fully understand me, even after I had explained the question again. Sometimes this impeded the information from the interviews. Nevertheless, I still have the feeling that I have been able to gather a lot of important information from the interviews.

But in the end, what kind of respondents did I actually interview? Are my respondents from the upper class, middle class and/or lower class? In the Filipino society the class differences are very large. Much of the common people suffer from *sakit sa bulsa* or, in other words, poverty (Hauser, 2010). Similarly, also many of my respondents did not have much to spend. Nevertheless, my respondents consist of the middle class. However, the differences in income in San Jose are very large. There are a few big houses, with big cars in front of the door, behind high security gates. However, in the same street there live people in small self-built houses, with a lot of people together in one house, who have little to spend. During my research I lived in the barangay Comon, one of the poorest barangays in San Jose. Most of my respondents are therefore also from Comon, and indeed do not have much to spend. However, this does not apply to all my respondents from Comon. After Comon, most respondents come from the barangay San Fernando. San Fernando is generally seen as a somewhat wealthier barangay. The other three barangays are in terms of prosperity between Comon and San Fernando. Even though all my respondents are of the middle class, I can argue that they are representative because of the huge differences between them. In order to better interpret the answers, I also tried to pay attention to the different ages of the respondents. However, soon I noticed that there was no telling what could be expected.

In Chapter 5 Results the respondents will be represented as ‘Respondent 1’; ‘Respondent 2’; and so on. In addition, the two police officers will be ‘Police 1’ and ‘Police 2’. My informants will be ‘Informant 1’; ‘Informant 2’; and ‘Informant 3’. This has two reasons. Firstly, to guarantee the anonymity of the respondents. Secondly, presenting the names of the respondents has, in my opinion, no added value for the results. Nevertheless, every time a respondent is mentioned for the first time, some background information, such as age, barangay and occupation will be displayed in a footnote.

4.5. Data Analysis
After conducting the interviews I had to transcribe, code and analyze the results. I recoded all the interviews, with the permission of the respondents. By recoding the interviews and by making a transcript of it, I remained close to the reality while processing and analyzing the results. This ensures more reliability of this research. The next thing I did was coding the transcripts, this made it possible for me to make connections between different answers and draw conclusions from this.
5. Results
In this chapter the results of the interviews will be presented. This will be done by discussing the results of the interviews per sub-question. I will indicate what was often mentioned by the respondents and the notable sayings from the interviews. This will be presented in this chapter, among others things by means of the respondents’ quotes.

5.1. Sub-questions
The given sub-questions are as follows:

1. To what extent do people in the Philippines feel insecure?
2. What do they perceive as the major threats to their safety?
3. To what extent do they consider state violence as reducing these insecurities?
4. To what extent do they perceive state violence as appropriate/fair/justified and thus legitimate?
5. How does state violence contribute to state legitimacy?

5.1.1. Sub-question 1: To what extent do people in the Philippines feel insecure?
To the question if the respondents feel safe in their neighborhood, almost everyone indicates that they indeed feel safe. When I ask them why they feel safe, the majority of the respondents indicate that they live in a quiet environment. In addition, they feel safe because they all know the neighbors and all other local residents. For example, almost everyone lives close to other relatives. This is because family is very important in the Philippines and families really care for each other (Hauser, 2010). Almost everyone is surrounded by good people who do not use drugs. “I feel safe because I have been here for almost 36 years. I feel safe because I know all my neighbors and they are good people” (Respondent 15\(^1\), April 9, 2018). Another reason why one feels safe is given by Respondent 10\(^2\) (April 4, 2018). She indicates that she feels safe because there is a closed-circuit television (CCTV), or in other words, a video surveillance. “That is why [because of the CCTV] you can feel so safe even if you are outside of your house, because anybody can see . . . what is going on.”

There are also respondents who feel safe in general, but they do not feel a hundred percent safe. They indicate that they have already experienced the ‘war on drugs’. Two of the respondents (respondents 6 and 8) from Comon explain that their house is in a busy street, so before the war on drugs they often
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\(^1\) Male. 36 years old. Lives for 36 years in Comon, San Jose, Antique. Occupation: self-employed.
\(^2\) Female. 26 years old. Lives for 8 years in Comon, SJ, Antique. Occupation: housewife.
saw people outside, roaming around the street, taking drugs. This caused more crime, according to the respondents. Respondent 8\textsuperscript{3} (April 2, 2018) explains:

“I feel 80% safe. There is a doubt in safety. . . . Because of the fight over drugs and violence . . . . Two years ago it was really rampant in Comon. Drugs. Until midnight. . . . You can observe that people are not sleeping. Taking drugs. . . . They are roaming around, the street is not quiet.”

Another respondent (respondent 7) from Comon argues, on the other hand, that he feels safe because his house is not in a busy street. However, other respondents living in Comon, who also live in a busy street, do feel safe. It does therefore not apply to everyone that one feels unsafe when one lives in a busy street.

Most of the respondents indicate that it is more peaceful now in the country since Duterte’s presidency, because the crime has decreased. This is because of the following reasons:

A first reason indicated by respondents is that Duterte is disciplining the Filipinos to respect each other. For example, Duterte does not want people to drink alcohol outside on the street anymore. Some people were previously often drunk on the streets and then they started to cause trouble. “Duterte disciplines all the Filipinos to respect each other. . . . Duterte disciplines how to do good and wise to drink” (Respondent 2\textsuperscript{4}, March 30, 2018). To which Respondent 1\textsuperscript{5} (March 30, 2018) complements with: “Duterte said that people should avoid drinking behind the road or outside the house. For the children. No drinking outside, only inside the house. For their safety.” Also Respondent 14\textsuperscript{6} (April 8, 2018) explains how he notices the difference:

“I have noticed that most of the people are much more disciplined than the past few years. Maybe because of the program of the president, which is much implemented by making people disciplined. . . . I have noticed that the program, that the president, really makes the community much more peaceful. Because, as I have noticed, there is less crime than before. . . . Because before, everyday there were so many people drunk or drunk outside on the street. But today there are policemen roaming around or checking the street if there are people drunk.”

It struck me, during my interviews, that a lot of my respondents started to talk about the importance of ‘discipline’ and how Duterte’s program disciplines people. This is also reflected a few times later in

\textsuperscript{3} Female. 45 years old. Lives for 45 years in Comon, San Jose, Antique. Occupation: housewife.
\textsuperscript{4} Female. 54 years old. Lives for almost 6 years in Bagon Bayan, SJ, Antique. Occupation: Housekeeper/-wife.
\textsuperscript{5} Male. 54 years old. Lives for 10 years in Bagon Bayon, San Jose, Antique. Occupation: barker / dispatcher Anini-y.
\textsuperscript{6} Male. 26 years old. Lives for 26 years in Comon, San Jose, Antique. Occupation: government employee.
the results. Therefore I discussed this with my informants. They argued that discipline is very important in the Philippines. That is why the theme ‘discipline’ often appears in Duterte’s program and in his speeches: the police must be disciplined and the population itself must be socially disciplined. If the Philippines want to make progress, then discipline is apparently what the country needs. Hence, Duterte makes the Filipinos believe that discipline is important and the inhabitants take over/believe this. The respondents think that discipline contributes to a better safety perception, because through Duterte’s program people become disciplined, and this in turn causes, for example, that there are fewer people drunk in public who can cause problems.

A second reason, why crime has decreased, often mentioned by respondents, is that because of the war on drugs many people are arrested. Hence now there are less people roaming around in the streets who often caused trouble before. Therefore the drugs users and - addicts cannot go outside anymore to cause trouble.

“[There is no more trouble anymore], because of the president Duterte against the drugs. Because those people who are taking drugs . . . the police came here and then conduct a Tokhang. That term Tokhang, they are going to kill people who are already on the list of the police, who is using drugs. That’s it” (Respondent 10, April 4, 2018).

A third reason is that there is more police patrol on the street. After my interview with Police 2⁷ (April 1, 2018) I had some more small talk with him. He explained that the police patrol in the street is called ‘police visibility’. It is meant to make people feel safer and also to bring the citizens and the state closer together. As a result, the respondents feel indeed safer, because they feel that someone is keeping an eye on them, this is also confirmed by a few respondents. “You can walk alone, all by yourself. . . . And I love what some of the policemen are doing, they are roaming around, you see the patrol cars” (Respondent 15, April 9, 2018).

A fourth reason why crime decreased, is because there is a program for drug addicts to surrender themselves, which in turn ensures that fewer drug addicts wander the streets. Apparently, some of the drug addicts do not want to get into trouble and are therefore trying to rehabilitate. This ensures that fewer drug addicts roam the streets, so therefore less of them have the opportunity to cause trouble.

“They [the PNP] have this program. . . . They come and they are knocking in the doors and then check if they have the records of who are the [drug] user, and they will ask you ‘please cooperate with us, we want to help you and then you can go and rapport in our office, and we
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will have a program for you to help you to surrender and then at least maybe forget using drugs.’ . . . They [the PNP] go together with them [the drug user] to the police station. I guess they have his monthly attendance, they have to report to the station. Then they are checked” (Respondent 98, April 4, 2018).

Several respondents indicate that these changes, since Duterte’s presidency, make them feel safer. This is especially true for the respondents from Comon, where they apparently notice the biggest change regarding crime. For example, several respondents from Comon indicate that it is now possible to walk in the street alone, and that this was not possible before. Some respondents indicate that ‘the plaza’ is much safer now. It is striking that this is only indicated by respondents from Comon. In San Jose there is a square in the middle of the town, ‘the plaza’. Previously there were often drug users and drug dealers roaming around at the plaza, and it was not safe for people to go there. Comon is really close to the plaza, only one street away, this could be a reason why only respondents from Comon mention the plaza. However, due to the war on drugs it is safe there now and people can go there and stay there all day. Respondent 129 (April 6, 2018), a woman from Comon, explains:

“When Duterte was not sitting as the president, the plaza itself, nobody could go there. Like for example, from six o’clock or seven o’clock you cannot just sit there and relax, or see people like that. Because the plaza is full of gangs or people and they are sometimes discretely selling drugs, something like that. But when the administration changed . . . they improved the plaza, they beautified it. And as well with the war on drugs with Duterte, now the plaza is peaceful already, and you can stay there until the morning, until late in the evening.”

Figure 5: The plaza after improving it. Source: own picture.
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8 Female. 37 years old. Lives almost her entire life in San Fernando, SJ, Antique. (in between in Manila) Occupation: recruitment officer / shipping agency.
9 Female. 31 years old. Lives alternately in Abu Dhabi and in the Philippines, Comon, San Jose, Antique. Occupation: none.
Most of my other respondents, who do not live in Comon, on the other hand, indicate that they did not notice so much crime in their neighborhood. Respondent 16\(^\text{10}\) (April 10, 2018), for example, lives in San Fernando, a barangay far away from the center of San Jose, he argues that:

> “Usually our place is a peaceful place. But here in the town [center of San Jose], during the times that illegal drugs were rampant, you should be afraid to go out, especially at night. But today . . . of course you have to take care, but there is the feeling that nothing can happen.”

In short, in general the respondents do not really feel insecure. Most of them do notice, however, some positive changes since Duterte’s presidency, and feel therefore safer. This difference is particularly noticeable in the poorer barangay Comon, where many people indicate that they noticed more crime before the war on drugs. They experienced more people roaming around in the street, more people taking drugs, it was impossible to walk alone in the street, and there were more drug dealers in the street. They also indicate that the plaza is much safer now since the war on drugs. In addition, the people outside Comon also feel very safe. Even though they notice less change in their own neighborhood, most of the respondents do know, however, that there are improvements related to crime in other parts of the town since the war on drugs. Hence, most of the respondents agree that the country is more peaceful now. Also in the rest of the country people feel safer since the war on drugs. This is shown by a study by Pulse Asia Research Inc. (Cabuenas, 2017). They asked respondents: “Compared to last year, I feel that it is less dangerous in our place because of the campaign against illegal drugs.” Evidently, 81 percent of the Filipinos felt safer because of the campaign against illegal drugs.

5.1.2. Sub-question 2: What do they perceive as the major threats to their safety?

When I ask the respondents what kind of crime they are most afraid of, the majority responds with ‘killing’. However, if I ask them whether they experienced many cases of murder, everyone actually answers with ‘no’. The number of murders in Antique is relatively low compared to other provinces in the Philippines. There is an interactive map and chart that show the drug-related fatalities reported since May 10, 2016, based on ABS-CBN’s independent monitoring of national and local news reports, and PNP Regional Office and PDEA press releases (ABS-CBN’s Investigative and Research Group, accessed on June 22, 2018). The killings are divided into three categories: ‘killed in operations conducted by law-enforcement agencies’; ‘killed by unidentified assailants’; and ‘bodies found away from the crime scene’. Through the chart one can see that most of the killings have taken place in Metropolitan Manila, that is 1760 killings. The second area is Central Luzon, with an amount of 1003 killings. The third area is Calabarzon with 490 killings. On the fourth place we can see the Central
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\(^{10}\) Male. 41 years old. Lives for 38 years in San Fernando, San Jose, Antique. Occupation: Driver.
Visayas with 387 killings. The fifth, sixth and seventh place contain respectively 221, 132 and 127 killings. When we take a look at Antique, we can see that ‘only’ eleven people have been killed there since May 10, 2016. One can see that this amount is very low compared to the other provinces. That is why it is likely that none of my respondents experienced any cases of murder around them. One of the reasons that most of the respondents do, however, answer with ‘killing’ could be because they often hear about cases of murder in the news. After all, one can see, using the interactive map, that the number of killings in the Philippines from the past two years is very high. In Metropolitan Manila, Central Luzon and Calabarzon alone, the amount of killings is already more than 3000. Moreover, this amount only includes drug-related fatalities. “I did not see that before [killing]. . . . Only in the news, but I never see actually what happened” (Respondent 16, April 10, 2018).

In Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework I argued that it is important to make a distinction between the actual safety and the perceived safety. What is described above is a typical example of why one should make this distinction. Apparently the respondents perceive murder as a major threat to their security, even though they have not experienced any cases of murder. In addition, the statistics show that drug-related murder does not often occur in Antique. I also argued in Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework that the main predictor of fear for an individual is not the actual crime rate. This statement also emerges from my interviews. It is important to emphasize this, because apparently one cannot improve the perceived safety by only reducing the crime rate. Therefore perceived safety needs to be improved in a different way, after all, it is still important for people to feel safe.
Although many respondents indicate that their neighborhood is safe and that they do not experience any crime, there were also respondents who could give examples of crime in their neighborhood, especially the respondents living in Comon. For example, Respondent 711 (April 2, 2018) from Comon indicates that drugs are sometimes sold in the neighborhood. Respondent 8 (April 2, 2018) from Comon tells me that adolescents sometimes get in trouble and use deadly weapons. Furthermore, respondents indicate in particular that there are cases of arguments between people, small fights and cases of small theft. This is because people have drunk too much, and therefore start to cause problems. However, some respondents also indicate that this is because people are under the influence of drugs.

In short, most of the respondents are most afraid of murder, however, they do not really experience cases of murder in their neighborhood. The majority of the respondents indicate that their neighborhood is safe and that they never really experience any form of crime. A few of the respondents are able to tell me that there are cases of arguments between people, small fights and cases of small theft in their neighborhood. Again, most of the times this is said by the respondents living in Comon.

5.1.3. Sub-question 3: To what extent do they consider state violence as reducing these insecurities?
All respondents agree that the state violence contributes to the reduction of insecurities. The respondents explain that the crime - and drugs rate indeed has been reduced since the war on drugs. “We had so many [drug] users here in our barangay before. Now it is already lessen. . . . It is because of the program on the war on drugs and the actions that the policemen do” (Respondent 9, April 4, 2018). Respondent 15 (April 9, 2018) explains why the crime - and drugs rate has decreased since the war on drugs: “they [the drug dealers and users] are afraid of what is happening right now. . . . If they will still continue to use drugs, and if they will still continue to sell drugs, probably there will be buy-bust operations and they might be killed.”

The majority of the respondents therefore believe that the country needs some sort of ‘ruling hand’ to tackle this drug and crime problem. Respondent 14 (April 8, 2018) explains:

“Filipinos are not disciplined enough to follow the rules. So in my opinion, we really need a politician or president which is a political power to discipline these people. So that Filipinos will be much more disciplined to follow the rules. . . . Before, people did not really follow. Not just like today that everyone follows. Maybe not everyone, but more people follow than before.”

When I asked Respondent 14 why people in the Philippines follow the rules now, and why they did not follow the rules before, he answers as follows:

“Maybe because of their knowledge that Duterte came from Davao City . . . he always possessed the power to discipline people. He always makes sure that those people who cause trouble will suffer, suffer from the consequences of not following the rules. Even in doing small crime, or even in less trouble. Then after that he send those people to the police station for some warning.”

It is striking that Respondent 14 says “he always possessed the power to discipline people.” Earlier in this chapter I have already indicated why so many respondents bring up the importance of discipline. This seems to be a good example of how people take over things they hear on the television, radio or in Duterte’s speeches.

The program of the war on drugs is therefore, among almost all the respondents, widely supported. The majority of the respondents indicate that they do not know what will happen once they have a new president. If the next president does not continue this program on the war on drugs, most respondents assume that the drug- and crime problem probably will return. “If we have a new president again, I do not know what will happen. . . . Maybe drugs will come back with a new president” (Respondent 612, April 2, 2018). Respondent 15 (April 9, 2018) therefore thinks that the next president should continue the current program:

“They really need to continue the war on drugs. Because, if this will stop, then drugs will probably continue, and then lots of crime may happen. So it would be better if the campaign of Duterte, after his term, the next president probably should continue the program of our current president. . . . Yeah, probably they [drug dealers] will come back. They would say ‘oh Duterte’s term has ended already, so let’s go back to our business.’”

In short, the war on drugs thus helps, according to most respondents, to reduce the crime and drug problem. Most of them also think that the country needs this ‘ruling hand’ for this drug problem. Without this program on the war on drugs, most of the respondents are afraid that the crime and drugs will come back. I asked my informants whether this opinion about the ‘ruling hand’ also applies to the rest of the country. They immediately agree, and also start talking about that they had to suffer for so long already. “It has been years already. And the problems are rooted in the system, so we needed someone with a hard hand . . . to implement the law” (Informant 2, May 5, 2018). However, not all
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12 Female. 28 years old. Lives for 10 years in Comon, SJ, Antique. Occupation: housekeeper.

13 Female. 29 years old. Student in Political Science.
the respondents agree with the way in which the war on drugs is implemented. But more about this later.

5.1.4. Sub-question 4: To what extent do they perceive state violence as appropriate/fair/justified and thus legitimate?

As argued in Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework, state violence becomes legitimate, as soon as people feel that they are protected by it. So how do my respondents perceive state violence?

As mentioned before, most of the respondents argue that the war on drugs is indeed necessary to reduce the insecurities. Otherwise, the respondents are afraid that the drugs and crime will come back in the country. However, most of the respondents prefer a different implementation of the program. Some of them want that the state does not use violence for this drug problem. Other respondents do agree with the violence, but do not agree with the killing. Just a few respondents believe that the killing is allowed. Nevertheless, all the respondents agree that the innocent people should not be killed.

Respondent 7 (April 2, 2018) who lives in Comon, and notices a big change since the war on drugs, argues the following: “It is okay the killing. ... but only drug addicts, not good man or innocent people, they should not be killed. ... But for me it is not a problem when they kill, because there are so many people taking drugs.” In addition, many argue that it ‘depends on the situation’, whether violence is allowed or not. It depends, for example, on whether the suspect is fighting back or if the suspect is not cooperating.

“I think if they [the suspects] surrender in a good way, we can handle them in jail also, but if they want force and violence, then we will give them. ... Just like that. If they are bad, then we will be bad to them” (Respondent 314, March 30, 2018).

Most of the respondents, however, think that people should not be killed, but shooting and paralyze the criminals, for example, could be an option. Killing is often seen as unfair by the respondents, because perhaps the suspect has already changed in a good way.

“Some of the drug users feel that they need to change, but some of the police officers just kill them. ... It is unfair. ... I think shooting is okay, but killing them no. ... Yeah, [shooting them] in the knee. Yeah, that’s it” (Respondent 415, April 2, 2018).

Some of the respondents think it is allowed if the suspects are killed by the police, but only when the suspects fight back. They believe that the police have the right to defend themselves, because otherwise the police can be killed, hence it is self-defense. “If I am the police, I would just kill that

14 Female. 16 years old. Lives for almost 6 years in Bagon Bayan, SJ, Antique. Goes to Antique National School.
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person. . . . Self-defense. Rather than you will be killed by that person, right? . . . If you are fighting the police, then the police will kill you, then that is your fault actually” (Respondent 15, April 9, 2018).

“The story on news is always that the suspects fire back to the policemen, so it is self-defense. . . . Maybe the policemen are also scared that they will be killed, so maybe instead of giving the suspect a chance they shoot the suspect” (Respondent 14, April 9, 2018).

One of the respondents thinks that the violence is necessary, but wrongly implemented. He thinks that the kingpins (drug lords) should be killed, not the drug addicts. He argues that it is not the fault of the drug addicts, but that the kingpins cause the problems. He also thinks that the problems should be solved according to the legal system, rather than short-cutting the legal system.

“Those that should not be given a chance are the ones that are pushers and kingpins. These are the ones, and sad to know, these are the ones that got free. Because they have the money. That is unfair. . . . It is the kingpins . . . these are the people that you kill, not the ordinary people, they are just the victims of this, they should be rehabilitated . . . the chance to give them a better life, give them shelter, give them work . . . give them better education.”

“They should solve it according to the legal system. . . . Rather than a way of short-cutting the legal system. . . . The drug problem should be solved in a legal way. One in which you respect the rights of every person. . . . Other countries, even countries that are at the top level of the economy, they also have a drug problem. US, Canada. They have a drug problem. . . . But how to control it, not by destroying the rights of people, that is the problem. We should do it in a legal way whereby we can control it. If our legal system is not adequate, then we should make a legal system. So that you can run after these people, not by killing people. Do something about the law. . . . Do something! Improve it! Change it! Reorient it!” (Respondent 11, April 5, 2018).

Others argue that the violence is not necessary for this drug and crime problem. They argue that there are other solutions. They want this problem to be resolved peacefully. A first solution that is often mentioned is rehabilitation. They think that drug addicts should not be killed, but should be put in a rehabilitation center, because not all the drug users are necessarily bad people. “Maybe some people need rehabilitation. Give them another chance to change themselves, change their point of view. Because not all people who are using drugs are bad, right?” (Respondent 10, April 4, 2018).
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However, a few of the respondents were able to tell me that rehabilitation is already being offered, but that this is very expensive. That is why they think rehabilitation should be free. Then the poor drug addicts can also be rehabilitated.

“Other programs? I guess free rehabilitation. I worked in rehabilitation with drug addicts before. . . . It is a private rehabilitation. 11,000 pesos, that is around 200 plus dollars. So if the ordinary people do not have the money, they cannot support the expenses. Maybe the government can do free rehabilitation” (Respondent 9, April 4, 2018).

A second solution that is mentioned by respondents, is that jobs have to be made available. This is because drugs are usually an easy way to make money, so if people can get a job in an easy way, then maybe they no longer need to sell drugs.

“They [drug users] need some help. Most especially by giving those people a job. Because for me, they are really using drugs because of hunger. . . . So maybe instead of finding ways to have food to eat by finding a decent job, what they are doing is, finding money by becoming a runner on selling drugs. Easy money. . . . So for me they should be given a job that would compensate their daily needs” (Respondent 14, April 8, 2018).

A third solution, according to some respondents, is that the drug addicts and - dealers have to be arrested and sent to prison. The respondents find this a better solution than shooting the drug addicts and - dealers dead, because in this way there is still justice.

“I think, in prison is okay. Because, at least, while you are in prison you are alive, and the trial is still there. But if you are already killed, then there is no justice for that. Then you do not have the chance to undergo trial” (Respondent 12, April 6, 2018).

In addition, this is also a way to reduce crime, because the drug addicts and - dealers will be locked up in prison.

“If they [drug users and - dealers] are still committing crimes and using drugs, then maybe it is good that if they would not be killed in an operation, then they should be jailed. That is the proper way. If I would be asked, then that should be the proper thing to do to those people. Because for me, they should not exist in the community, because they are really affecting the lives of people who are good” (Respondent 14, April 8, 2018).

A fourth solution that can help with this problem, instead of using violence, is education. “Educate people that drugs is not good, for their health as well. And at the same time, rehabilitate them” (Respondent 15, April 9, 2018). “Solution is maybe: education to the family. Maybe they can implement
it in school, about the effects of drugs. So that people have knowledge, and know what the effects are” (Respondent 9, April 4, 2018).

I have just discussed some reasons why violence should or should not be applied according to the respondents. In addition, some solutions of the respondents were discussed for the crime problem such as rehabilitation and education. However, it is also important to know why certain people accept state violence, and when they perceive it as legitimate. As said, state violence becomes legitimate as soon as people feel protected by it. Something that can also contribute to the acceptance of state violence is a feeling of insecurity. This can be caused, among other things, by mouth-to-mouth stories. A number of people in San Jose told me that mouth-to-mouth stories in this town sometimes end differently than how they started. In other words, stories are sometimes verbally exaggerated.

A first example of such a story was told to me by a Let’s Care employee. Before I arrived in the Philippines there had been an attack by the New People’s Army (NPA) in Sibalom, a little town close to San Jose, on November 22. From the word of mouth that started to spread apparently 22 people had already been killed. An acquaintance was in the hospital at the moment of the attack. Here the story was that there were already ‘three deaths on arrival’. However, what turned out afterwards: ‘only’ three people had been injured by the attack. Another story is about whether or not there is a curfew in San Jose. The first time I heard about this curfew was after a shooting incident on the 22th of March. People told me that after the incident a curfew was set in town, it was strongly advised not to go outside after ten o’clock in the evening. However, soon, during small talk, I already heard a lot of different stories about this curfew. I decided to ask a few of my respondents about this curfew. However, I received several answers: one denies the curfew, the other indicates that the curfew is only for minors, yet another indicates that the curfew is for everyone. Therefore I decided to ask about the curfew in my interviews with both of the police officers, since I assumed that they should know about this curfew. Police 1 told me that the curfew is for minors only. Police 2 told me, on the other hand, that the curfew is for everybody. Even the police officers told me different stories. I went online to find news items about the possible curfew. I could not find anything specific about the curfew in San Jose or in Antique, so I am still not sure what the truth is. The most recent news item I could find about a possible curfew is the following: “PNP chief wants curfew for minors nationwide” in The Manila Times. This article was published on the 21th of February, 2018. The article states that National Police Chief Ronald “Bato” de la Rosa wants to implement a curfew to prevent the youth from getting involved in crimes. In short, these two stories, about the attack and the curfew, show how the
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information provision is not completely transparent, one can wonder if this has any influence on one’s sense of security. Unfortunately I did not discuss this with my respondents during my interviews, but for further research it would certainly be interesting to include this. Nevertheless, if one constantly hears different stories, one does not know what to believe anymore. This could lead to more fear, the impact of fear is that it has an influence on how people perceive politics and needs. This can lead to securitization. Securitization, in turn, can ensure that measures such as state violence become legitimate, because people are afraid and they think that they need to be protected.

In short, the respondents are divided regarding the use of violence. Unfortunately, I have not spoken to people who themselves have experienced violence or experienced violence within their own social circles. Nevertheless, the respondents do notice that there is less crime in the neighborhood. In addition, they hear about state violence and they see it happening in the neighborhood. After all, in San Jose people have been murdered because of the war on drugs and the inhabitants talk about this. The war on drugs and the additional violence is therefore noticeable in San Jose. However, the results are as follows. Some of the respondents think that killing is allowed, especially when the police has to defend themselves, as long as the victims are not innocent people. However, the only respondents who indicated this live in Comon, the barangay where the respondents suffered the most from crime. Other respondents think that violence is allowed, however they do not want killing. This is said by almost all the other respondents from Comon, and only a few respondents from other barangays. Some of them argue therefore that it depends on the situation whether violence is allowed or not. It depends on whether the suspect is fighting back or not. Finally, there are some respondents who think that violence is not necessary for this problem, they believe that there are other solutions, such as free rehabilitation, send the suspects to prison, education or the providing of jobs. Nevertheless, it is striking that most of the respondents from Comon believe that violence is allowed. They are also the ones who noticed most of the crimes before the war on drugs. It seems that they therefore believe that violence may be used for this drug- and crime problem. As argued before: “state violence becomes legitimate, as soon as people feel protected by it.” One could argue that this is also the case for the people in Comon. They feel protected by the state violence, because they experience less crime now. I also presented this outcome to my informants. They argue that this outcome makes sense. The killings from the government ensure that there are less drug addicts or - dealers, so the crime has already decreased. And if the people witness that there is less crime because of the war on drugs, and they feel therefore safer, then my informants think it makes sense that the people in Comon believe that the violence is allowed. My informants assume that this also applies to the other parts of the country. In addition, due to the non-transparent information provision, securitization could also arise. This, in turn, can ensure that measures such as state violence become legitimate.
5.1.5. Sub-question 5: How does state violence contribute to state legitimacy?

As argued in Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework state legitimacy is about the acceptance of a political authority by a population. The question is now to what extent the state violence contributes to this. As argued in Chapter 3 Operationalization Bakke et al., (2014) made a distinction between state legitimacy, regime legitimacy and institutional legitimacy. Therefore, I will discuss both the legitimacy of Duterte (regime legitimacy) and the legitimacy of the PNP (institutional legitimacy). The meaning of regime- and institutional legitimacy has already been explained in Chapter 3 Operationalization.

Duterte

When I ask about President Rodrigo Duterte the opinions of my respondents are quite divided. Some do not like him as a president, other respondents think he is a good president and the rest thinks his program is good, but not the way how he implemented his program.

Many people, not necessarily my respondents but Filipinos in general, voted for Duterte because they felt that the country really needed a change, and Duterte would be the man who could make that change. They needed a change in crime, corruption, poverty and inequality in the country. Previous presidents did not succeed in making this change. “For me, I really do not favor some points of mister president. But then, of all the presidents that passed, people love Duterte, because he has the will to change, regarding the crimes” (Respondent 9, April 4, 2018). Some respondents mention that they had confidence in Duterte because of what he had shown as a mayor in the city of Davao. As said before, Duterte turned that city from one of the most dangerous cities into one of the safest cities in the Philippines. During the elections Respondent 12 did not vote, because she was not in the country at that time, however she tells me the following:

“So if I voted, definitely I will vote for him [Duterte] at that time, because during the elections you can see that he is the only sincere candidate, and his advocacy is good. And apart from that, his record, you can see like before in Davao, when he was the mayor there . . . you can see that he was really capable of running the country. So during that time, during that campaign, if I was able to vote, definitely I would vote for him also” (April 6, 2018).

If you ask the respondents what they like about Duterte, the responses differ. A first thing that the respondents like about Duterte is that he is seen as a fighting man who disciplines the population, and that there have been so many positive changes in the Philippines since his presidency. Again, it is striking that the notion of discipline is mentioned here. I will discuss this later in this section. “I believe in president Duterte, because he is a fighting man. He fights the not so good people or persons here in the Philippines. For me it is okay for Duterte to be president” (Respondent 2, March 30, 2018). Respondents emphasize that he just wants good things for his people, and that he also wants good
things for the future of the youth. After all, this is his goal of the war on drugs: Duterte wants to create safety for the ‘good’ citizens. To do this he is fighting against the ‘bad’ citizens, the ones who use/deal drugs and commit crimes. A second thing that the respondents like about Duterte is that they notice the difference since his presidency. They notice that there is less drugs and that there is less crime. In addition, they do not know what will happen with the drug- and crime rate when they have a new president. These are also some of the reasons why people in the Philippines voted for him. “For me, I would vote him. . . . Because if you vote someone else and then you will not know what will happen again. . . . Maybe the crime comes back” (Respondent 6, April 2, 2018).

Other aspects that respondents like about Duterte are the following. Duterte makes positive changes for education, he has ensured that more than one hundred state universities and colleges have free tuition. A number of respondents also mention that Duterte wants to protect his own employees. The government employee (Respondent 14) tells me that Duterte has finally raised the salaries of his employees. This did not happen for a long time during the previous presidents. In addition, Duterte does not only take care of the employees in his own country, a number of respondents also mention that he promotes employment abroad. For example, Duterte would foster the lives of overseas Filipino workers (OFWs) by granting them permits. Another thing is that OFWs are often abused by their employer, and Duterte wants to put an end to this. Duterte also wants to put an end to corruption in the country. One of the respondents indicates that since Duterte’s presidency the Philippines have become a more attractive country for foreigners to invest in, this would be good for the economy of the country. One of the respondents also mention that since Yolanda (very devastating typhoon in 2013) Duterte was finally the right man to put things in order. Where the previous presidents did not succeed, Duterte’s administration was finally fast-tracking the Yolanda recovery. It seems that Duterte’s efforts in other fields have positive consequences for the appreciation of the implementation of the war on drugs.

However, some of the respondents also mention the disadvantages of Duterte as a president. As argued, many respondents agree with his goal to fight drugs and crime, however many do not support the way how he wants to achieve this goal.

“For me, it is a nice man [Duterte], only the drug thing is not an appropriate solution, no. . . . Don’t vote Duterte. Vote another president, who is not fond of killing. Duterte is a great person, but he thinks that with the killing he can solve the problems, but I think it will not. I will say that I hope that this killing episode will end” (Respondent 5\textsuperscript{18}, April 2, 2018).

\textsuperscript{18} Female. 38 years old. Lives for 14 years in San Fernando, SJ, Antique. Occupation: Program Manager.
In short, the responses about president Duterte are divided. Some like him, because he is the man who is finally giving change, and now there is less crime and drugs in the country. Others do like his program, but they do not like the way how he implemented the program. Those respondents like it that finally the crime and drugs is reducing, however they do not support the violence and the killings to reach that goal. There are only a few who do not agree that Duterte is a good president. They do not like how Duterte wants to solve the drug problem. It is striking that these respondents, who do not agree with Duterte, live in Comon. They are the ones who notice a positive difference since the war on drugs regarding crime. Despite these positive changes, they still do not agree with the way how Duterte wants to solve the drug- and crime problem, because they really do not like the killing.

**Philippine National Police**

The respondents’ opinions that the PNP sometimes uses violence are quite divided. Especially with regard to the killing of criminals. Some of the respondents find the killing unnecessary, and think that there are other options, like shooting a suspect in the leg, paralyzing the suspect, or simply not using violence at all and put the suspects in prison. “Maybe some of the policemen abuse their authority. . . . It is not fair [to kill the suspect]. It should be caught in the act. Maybe that person already changed right. . . . You can paralyze that person, not kill” (Respondent 5, April 2, 2018). However, some of the respondents argue that the killing of the suspects is justified, but only when the suspects fights back. In this case it would be self-defense for the police officer. “When the person to be arrested shoots back, they [PNP] have this order to also defend themselves. So, I mean I guess the officers have no choice. They have to defend themselves or they will be the ones to be killed” (Respondent 9, April 4, 2018). However, everyone agrees that it must not concern innocent people.

Nevertheless, all the respondents agree that not all police officers can be trusted. This has to do with the following things. Sometimes the PNP frames people: they conduct a buy-bust operation and then they put shabu (slang term for the drug methamphetamine) in the suspect’s pocket. The respondents indicate that these kinds of incidents are unfair for the suspect. In addition, all the respondents also know that some of the PNP are involved in the drug circuit, they make business out of drugs. Also, some of the PNP protect the drug users.

“You cannot trust them [the PNP]. . . . They are the ones who protect the drug addict or pusher. Some are good, but some of the policemen protect the addicts. . . . The ordinary people are confused who to trust, because of their image as a policeman. Some of them are protectors of drugs, everybody is aware of that. Planting the drugs, it is really unfair. They do it to make it convincing. . . . Our family witnessed how they do it. But my family is afraid to give the statement, because the policemen are threatening us” (Respondent 8, April 2, 2018).
In short, all the respondents agree that not all of the police officers can be trusted, because some of the PNP are involved in the drug circuit, and sometimes the PNP frames people by planting shabu (methamphetamine) in someone’s pocket. The respondents’ opinions that the PNP sometimes uses violence are quite divided. Some respondents think that the killing of suspects is unnecessary, they believe that you can also paralyze a person, or use no violence at all and put the suspect in prison. Other respondents believe that the killing is justified, but only when it is self-defense and as long as it does not concern innocent people.

Almost everyone knows that not all the police officers can be trusted. Is it then the task for Duterte to put that in order, or is it the task for the PNP itself? Hence, do the respondents blame this on Duterte or on the PNP? This is interesting to investigate with regard to legitimacy. This is because someone may disagree with the behavior of the PNP, but still supports Duterte’s program of the war on drugs. For example, the Filipinos may feel that it is not Duterte’s fault that the PNP does not always do the right thing. In that case one could say that Duterte is seen as legitimate and that the PNP is not seen as legitimate.

Firstly, as already mentioned, the fact that violence is used is perceived differently by the respondents. A few respondents indicate that the police officers simply follow the order of their higher chief and Duterte. In that case, Duterte is ‘wrong’. “The police is sometimes good, sometimes bad. They are just under Duterte. . . . They are just following Duterte. . . . Sometimes they are aggressive. But that is what Duterte wants” (Respondent 13, April 8, 2018).

Other respondents indicate that it is not Duterte ‘his mistake’, Respondent 3 (March 30, 2018) explains: “You just always have people who do not want to follow. You have people who follow and other people who do not follow.” Hence, according to those respondents it is the PNP who is ‘wrong’. In addition, if the PNP makes a mistake, then Duterte will talk to their leader. For example, this article “Duterte warns cops involved in drugs trade: I’ll kill you” in Rappler shows that Duterte seriously warns police officers who are still involved in the drug trade. “If you are still involved in the drug trade, I’ll have you killed. Don’t take this as a joke. I’m not trying to earn laughs. Son of a bitch, I’ll really kill you.” It is clear that Duterte does not support his policemen if they go beyond the law and therefore he wants to tackle this. One could say that this provides more legitimacy for Duterte.
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“He [Duterte] disciplines the police. He says bad things like: ‘you should set an example to your men.’ I like him because he speaks in words like: ‘Fuck the men who do not follow the rules, fuck the police who did not follow. You should go to school, learn, policy… but you are also the one who did not follow our police. What kind of police are you? Fuck those men’” (Respondent 3, March 30, 2018).

It is striking that once again it is about the importance of discipline. As mentioned earlier, some respondents find Duterte a fighting man who disciplines the population. The population takes over / believes this discourse about discipline. This could be a way for Duterte to legitimize the violence because, in this case, the violence is necessary to discipline the population. In short, the legitimization of violence can be a sales pitch by Duterte by emphasizing the importance of discipline.

In addition, if someone of the PNP is doing something wrong, than this person will sometimes be relieved from his post. Coincidentally, during my time in the Philippines, a controversial incident had occurred in San Jose by the PNP, on the 22th of March. Two suspects were shot dead, but the question is whether this action was legitimate. Respondent 9 explains:

“I read a report on Facebook, that the policemen and the civilians had a fight in one of the bars here in San Jose, and then they hit the policemen and got his gun, but then they ran away. And then when they went home, they decided to report to the police station. But then the policemen already received the message of the incident. And then they implemented the operation. . . . Then they came across on the street and they had this encounter of shooting each other. . . . Maybe the police also did not know that they were going to return the firearms” (April 4, 2018).

As a result, eight police officers, including their chief of police, were relieved from their posts. The following news article in the Philstar is about this incident: “Eight cops in Antique relieved from posts”. They were relieved, because the legitimacy of their action was called into question. Their supervisor wants to know what happened during the incident, and then they will decide what will happen to the policemen. In short, this incident shows that the police cannot do everything with impunity. This ensures justice for the ‘regular’ population.

“President Duterte is much faster to cater those reports, if his policemen did not do the implementation properly. Then, on the news many policemen who committed the misimplementation of the program are already being subjected to investigation. Then some of them are already rejected from the police agency. . . . It is the mandate of the president that if the policemen did not do it properly than they should be gone” (Respondent 14, April 8, 2018).
“The police need to get their own proper trial as well. Like if they do something wrong, like beyond of what is the call of their duty. I think they need to be relieved as well from their position, and undergo a proper trial. . . . So sometimes it is also good that people can see that . . . so that people can also see justice. For example me, I can also say that there is still justice, because the justice serves for every citizen, like for the normal people, but also if you are sitting on the higher position in the police” (Respondent 12, April 8, 2018).

So the opinion about the influence of violence on the legitimacy of Duterte and the PNP is rather diverse. Most of the respondents believe that Duterte is a good president and that it is not Duterte’s fault that certain people do not follow. In addition, Duterte wants to discipline these people and he relieves people from their position. Respondents from different barangays share this opinion, so not just respondents who suffered more from crime. Despite the fact that the police chief himself relieves the cops from their posts, it is striking that the respondents think positively about Duterte. Hence, the respondents do not think positively about the police, because it is thanks to Duterte this process of replacement happens faster than before.

In sum, most respondents agree that the violence is necessary for this problem, because the crime rate did decrease since the war on drugs. Especially the respondents from Comon notice the difference. In addition, most of the people outside Comon did not experience a decrease in crime themselves, but they do notice a decrease in crime happening in other barangays or cities. As said, violence becomes legitimate as soon as people feel that they are protected by it. In this case, people feel more protected by it, hence one could say that the violence is considered legitimate, as long as no innocent people are killed. But again, if innocent people are killed, then this is not always Duterte’s fault. So in general, despite the use of violence, Duterte is seen as legitimate. What also seems to contribute to Duterte’s legitimacy, is the fact that policemen are sometimes removed from their posts when they did not act within the law. There are only a few respondents who do not like Duterte as a president. It is striking that these respondents live in Comon, who suffered more because of the crime before the war on drugs. Nevertheless, they still do not agree with Duterte. The respondents’ opinions about the PNP, on the other hand, differ a lot. However, everyone agrees that not all the policemen of the PNP can be trusted and sometimes the violence is wrongly inserted. In addition, the PNP occasionally abuses their authority. Moreover, the cases of framing, and the fact that some of the PNP are involved in the drugs circuit, do also not really contribute to the legitimacy of the PNP.
5.2. Perceived safety despite the violence

What is also important for answering the main research question is by discussing how the Filipinos experience their safety even despite the violence of the war on drugs. After all, the main research question is: ‘What impact does Duterte’s ‘war on drugs’ have on the perceived safety of Filipino inhabitants and how does this impact the regime’s legitimacy?’ As mentioned before, the war on drugs ensures less crime and less drugs, however violence is used by the state to achieve this goal. So how does the war on drugs affect the perceived safety of Filipinos despite the violence by the state?

As already mentioned before, a lot of respondents notice a (positive) difference since the war on drugs. There are less people roaming around in the streets, hence there is less trouble now. Therefore it is now possible to walk alone in the streets and also the plaza has become much safer. However, violence is used by the state to tackle this problem and not everyone agrees with this state violence. So how does the war on drugs affect the perceived safety of Filipinos despite the violence by the state?

The responses of the respondents to this question are quite different. First, the majority of the respondents indicate that they really feel safer since the war on drugs, especially the respondents living in Comon. Respondent 12 and Respondent 15, both living in Comon, explain the following:

“As a normal citizen, I am not afraid, because I am not doing anything against the government or like that. But in general, it is not good to use violence to create safety, but most of the people now, in the Philippines, they feel safer living in the Philippines. . . . They feel safer now because they know that when they walk, even at midnight, there will be no drug addict that can harm them, that could kill them, that could rape them. Yeah, like that. So, I think in general it is safer to life now than before” (Respondent 12 April 6, 2018).

“You can walk alone now, all by yourself. . . . They [PNP] look after the drugs, the drug pushers and the users. And I love what some of the policemen are doing, they are roaming around, you can see the patrol cars” (Respondent 15, April 9, 2018).

Secondly, some respondents indicate that they feel safe because they are not a drug addict. I asked my informants why people would say things like this, because I wondered if people just adopt this as a policy discourse. My informants tell me that this is probably just an observation of the people themselves. This is because of what they see happening around them: they witness that drug addicts, drug dealers and drug users are the ones who get arrested and shot. Therefore they are not afraid to become a victim themselves, because they do not do anything ‘wrong’. My informants tell me that this is not necessarily something that Duterte promotes, but that it is the observation of the people themselves, hence apparently this is how they experience it. “For me the safety is the same, because I am not a drug addict” (Respondent 7, April 2, 2018). Also Respondent 5 (April 2, 2018) explains how
she feels about this: “If you are a drug addict then you are not safe at all, especially in Manila. But here in Antique, for me . . . I feel safe, because I really am a good person. I have nothing to be afraid of.”

Thirdly, respondents indicate that they feel safer in general, but that they still do not completely trust the police. “Yes, we are safe, but sometimes we are not safe because of the police. Sometimes the police is also the one who starts fighting. This makes me feel less safe” (Respondent 13, April 8, 2018).

Fourthly, one of the respondents indicates that he does not feel safe, because he is not sure what is going to happen. He explains that it depends on how the war on drugs will continue:

“I do not feel safe. . . . All tough it may not affect us here in Antique now, if this goes on and = on... whatever affects the Philippines, will affect us. . . . This will create fear among the residents. And if you have fear and do not trust the government, something will happen. We will make another group or people will be joining other groups that are against it. So the rebellion will raise again, because people are not safe with this kind of government. . . . Because they cannot give us the safety that we need” (Respondent 11, April 5, 2018).

And finally, there are only a few respondents who are afraid that they themselves, or someone they know, will be the victim of the war on drugs. This makes them feel nervous. It is striking that this is only said by respondents who do not live in Comon, after all these are the respondents who experience little or no crime in their neighborhood. All my respondents from Comon indicate that they feel safer, even despite the violence. Only Respondent 13 from Comon indicates that she sometimes feels less safe because of the police, but in general still feels safer. This is probably because the people in Comon immediately notice the positive difference since the war on drugs, and thus suffer less from crime now. So because of the violence by the state they have less trouble with crime, hence they feel safer than before. Of the other respondents, who do not live in Comon, only two of them indicate that they also feel safer since the war on drugs, even despite the violence by the state. The other respondents indicate that they feel less safe because of the violence. Of this, the majority indicates that they are afraid of becoming a victim of the war on drugs, or that people who are close to them will become a victim. I have discussed this outcome with my informants and they concluded the following. Probably because the respondents who are more afraid of becoming a victim of the war on drugs, have not noticed any positive change in their neighborhood since the war on drugs, because their neighborhood was already safe. A neighborhood that is already a safe place, a place with no crime, will, if it changes, probably change in a negative way. Therefore these respondents may be afraid that the violence will affect their neighborhood negatively, even if they see many positive changes around them. Informant
20 (May 5, 2018) assumes that it is because of the sensationalized news that those respondents are now afraid of becoming a victim. People hear about certain incidents in the news, via television and social media. There is a lot of rampant fake news, and this scares people. So people who already felt safe, feel less safe now, because they hear a lot about the sensationalized incidents in the news. The people who already experienced crime, on the other hand, they feel safer, because they actually notice the positive difference themselves. They know that the violence of the state contributes to create more safety, and that is why they feel safer now, even though the violence by the state.

In short, the perceived safety of the respondents since the war on drugs varies. The majority of the respondents indicates that they feel safer since the war on drugs, because there is less crime now. Some of them indicate that they feel safe, because they are not a drug addict, and the drug addicts are the ones where the PNP is after. Others explain that they feel safer in general, but still do not completely feel safe because of the police. And finally, there are only a few respondents who are afraid that they themselves, or someone they know, will become the victim of the war on drugs.

---

20 Female. 19 years old. Student in Political Science.
6. Conclusion and Discussion

In this chapter the research question will be answered. The research question is as follows: ‘what impact does Duterte’s war on drugs have on the perceived safety of Filipino inhabitants and how does this impact the regime’s legitimacy?’ A qualitative study was conducted for this among the residents of San Jose, Antique. In addition, this chapter will discuss the academic debates and the societal- and scientific relevance of this thesis. After that the limitations and recommendations will be discussed. Finally, this thesis will conclude with my own learning experiences.

In the Philippines there is a lot of crime, corruption and poverty. President Rodrigo Duterte wants to put an end to this. Drugs is a major cause for all crime and that is why the drug problem needs to be tackled, according to Duterte. This is why Duterte introduced the Oplan Tokhang, or the war on drugs, as soon as he became a president in May 2016. His goal was to create security for the good citizens by protecting them against crime, poverty and corruption. The country already experiences less crime since the war on drugs, yet there is a lot of criticism of Duterte’s approach. This is because the war on drugs is accompanied by the violation of many human rights. Critics think that Duterte’s war on drugs is morally and legally unjustifiable, and there is also a lot of international criticism on Duterte and his policy. In addition, there is also a lot of criticism on the approach of the Philippine National Police. The PNP is accused, among other things, of being involved in the drug circuit, of the protection of drug lords, and of the use of unnecessary violence. Therefore it is interesting to research the effects of the war on drugs on the perceived safety of Filipino inhabitants and on how this influences the regime’s legitimacy.

6.1. Main Research Question
After having interpreted the results in Chapter 5 Results, it is now time to answer the main research question: ‘what impact does Duterte’s war on drugs have on the perceived safety of Filipino inhabitants and how does this impact the regime’s legitimacy?’ As mentioned before, the war on drugs ensures less crime and less drugs. However, violence is used by the state to reach this goal. So how does the war on drugs affect the perceived safety of Filipinos despite the violence by the state and how does this impact the regime’s legitimacy?

The perceived safety of the respondents since the war on drugs varies. The majority of the respondents indicate that they feel safer since the war on drugs, because there is less crime now. This is especially mentioned by the respondents living in Comon. Some of the respondents indicate that they feel safe because they are not a drug addict, and the drug addicts are the ones where the PNP is after. Finally, there are only a few respondents who are afraid that they themselves, or someone they know, will become a victim of the war on drugs. This makes them feel nervous. It is striking that this has only been said by respondents who do not live in Comon. These respondents, outside Comon, indicate that
they notice little or no crime in their neighborhood. All my respondents from Comon, on the other hand, indicate that they feel safer, even despite the state violence. Only one respondent from Comon indicates that she sometimes feels less safe because of the police, but in general still feels safer. That the respondents from Comon feel safer, is probably because they immediately notice the positive difference since the war on drugs, and thus suffer less from crime now. So because of the violence by the state they have less trouble with crime, hence they feel safer than before. Of the other respondents, who do not live in Comon, only two indicate that they also feel safer since the war on drugs, even despite the violence by the state. The other respondents indicate that they feel less safe because of the violence. Of this, the majority indicates that they are afraid of becoming a victim of the war on drugs, or that people who are close to them will become a victim. This is probably because they themselves have not noticed any (positive) change in their neighborhood since the war on drugs, because it was already safe in their neighborhood. Maybe they fear that the violence will affect their neighborhood negatively, even if they see many positive changes around them.

Thus, the respondents from Comon feel safer because of the violence by the state and most of the respondents who are not from Comon feel less safe because of the state violence. So how does this impact the regime’s legitimacy? As already mentioned in Chapter 5 Results, most of the people in Comon agree with the violence. They are the ones who noticed most of the crime before the war on drugs. It seems that they therefore believe that violence may be used for this drug- and crime problem. They feel safer now, because of the violence by the state. Most of my respondents outside Comon feel less safe. They are afraid that they themselves, or someone they know, will become a victim of the war on drugs. Most of them indicate that the violence is not necessary for this drug- and crime problem, they believe that there are other solutions, such as free rehabilitation, education, the providing of jobs or by sending the suspects to prison.

In sum, it seems that the respondents who were more troubled by crime before the war on drugs feel safer now. This is partly due to the violence by the state, because now there is less crime. Therefore, it seems that this is a reason why they accept the violence. For these respondents, the state violence therefore does not appear to have a negative influence on the legitimacy of the state. After all, state violence becomes legitimate as soon as people feel that they are protected by it. The respondents who were already less affected by crime, on the other hand, are now more afraid. This is probably because of all the negative news. In addition, they also indicate that they do not consider the violence of the state necessary for the drug – and crime problem. Therefore, it seems that for these respondents the state violence does have a negative influence on the legitimacy of the state, after all they do not feel protected by it.
6.2. Sub-Questions
For convenience, the sub-questions are again, but briefly, answered in this chapter. The extensive answers can already be found in Chapter 5 Results.

Most of the respondents experience positive changes since Duterte’s presidency and feel therefore safer, this is particularly noticeable in the poorer barangay Comon. In addition, most of the respondents indicate that they are most afraid of murder, even though they do not really experience any cases of murder in their neighborhood. Moreover, most respondents agree that the war on drugs helps to reduce the crime and drug problem, most respondents think therefore that the country needs this ‘ruling hand’ for this drug problem. However, the respondents are divided regarding the use of violence: some respondents believe that killing is allowed, other respondents believe that there are other solutions such as free rehabilitation, send the suspects to prison, education or the providing of jobs. Finally, the respondents’ opinions about president Duterte are divided, but in general Duterte is seen as legitimate, even despite the use of violence. The PNP, on the other hand, are seen as less legitimate because they often abuse their authority, frame people or because they are involved in the drug circuit.

6.3. The academic debates
6.3.1. Fear of Crime
In Chapter 1 Introduction and Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework I stated that I wanted to contribute to certain academic debates. Regarding ‘fear of crime’ I wanted to contribute to the definition of the concept by getting a better understanding of it. A lot of research about the fear of crime is quantitatively measured. Through conducting qualitative research I tried to generate a better understanding of which aspects are important to include in the concept. This is because qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. In addition, I mentioned that little research has been done about this topic concerning the Philippines, so what does the fear of crime mean in the Filipino context?

What has emerged from this thesis, regarding the fear of crime, is that it is indeed important to make a distinction between the perceived - and actual safety. This was shown by the fact that many people see ‘murder’ as their biggest security threat, even though the statistics and the experiences of the people themselves show that murder hardly occurs in their neighborhood. However, this does not mean that the actual and perceived safety have no influence on each other. This fact was also reflected in my results. People experience positive changes in their neighborhood: they experience less crime and there are fewer people who roam around in the streets. This contributes to the fact that people feel safer now. That is why it is important to take the difference between the actual – and perceived safety into account. As mentioned, it is important for people to feel safe. This is because the fear of
crime has an influence on personal well-being and the quality of community life. For the Filipino context this means that if the government wants to improve the Filipino’s personal well-being and their quality of community life, the government must not only improve the actual safety, but also the perceived safety needs to be improved. The government could do this, for example, by conducting campaigns in which the safety of the ‘good’ citizens is guaranteed.

6.3.2. Legitimate State Violence

Regarding ‘legitimate state violence’ I also wanted to contribute to the definition of the concept by getting a better understanding of it. A lot of research about legitimate state violence is quantitatively measured. Through conducting qualitative research I tried to generate a better understanding of which aspects are important to include in the concept. This is because qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. In addition, I mentioned that little research has been done about this topic concerning the Philippines, so what does legitimate state violence mean in the Filipino context? In doing so, I also wanted to explore the role of state violence in contributing to state legitimacy.

To the question when state violence becomes legitimate, two aspects emerged from this thesis. First, ‘fear’ has an impact on the extent to which people perceive politics and needs. This results is also reflected in my research. This leads to securitization. This, in turn, leads to the notion that extreme measures such as state violence are allowed, because people are afraid and they think that they need to be protected. Secondly, state violence becomes legitimate as soon as people feel that they are protected by it. This mainly concerns the extent to which the state does its job well (Burkens et al., 2006).

This research also showed that once people feel protected by state violence, state violence indeed becomes legitimate. In the results one can see that the respondents from Comon, who were more affected by crime, are more willing to accept that the state uses violence to tackle this problem. Now they experience less crime than before. In their eyes the state does its job well and they feel protected because of the state violence. For the Filipino context, this means that the state must ensure that its inhabitants do not feel afraid, but feel protected by the state violence instead. This should ensure that the state violence is seen as legitimate. The state could do this by campaigning. The state has to show that they carry out their tasks well and that with their (violent) actions they want to guarantee safety for their residents. This helps to ensure that the state will receive more support from its inhabitants. It appears that in the Philippines violence is an important way to create legitimacy, especially when the situation is uncertain, as was the case in Comon.
6.3.3. State legitimacy

Finally, I also wanted to contribute to the academic debate about state legitimacy. There is little consensus over what exactly makes a state legitimate or representative in concrete terms (Milliken & Krause, 2002). Hence, there is a lot of disagreement about how to define state legitimacy, so I expect to contribute to this debate with this thesis. In addition, a lot of research about state legitimacy is quantitatively measured. Through conducting a qualitative research I tried to generate a better understanding of which aspects are important to include in the concept. This is because qualitative research can provide deeper insights into attitudes, motivations and behavior. In addition, I mentioned that little research has been done about this concerning the Philippines, so what does state legitimacy mean in the Filipino context?

An important point that emerged in this thesis is that the state is not a unitary actor. This thesis shows that the influence of state violence on legitimacy varies. This thesis shows that Duterte is generally seen as legitimate. Some Filipinos like him because he is finally giving change in the country, and therefore there is less crime and drugs now. This is one of the reasons why some Filipinos accept the violence. Another reason why Duterte is considered legitimate is because of his political discourse. However, this is to the detriment of the PNP, who are not really accepted and recognized. This is because the experiences and perceptions of people contradict to the role expectations of the police. This ensures that a lot of respondents agree that not all the police officers can be trusted. Their violence is not always seen as legitimate, because the PNP occasionally abuses their authority. Moreover, the cases of framing and the fact that some of the PNP are involved in the drug circuit also do not really contribute to the legitimacy of the PNP. Since state legitimacy is important for the state to receive support from its inhabitants, the Filipino state should ensure that the PNP is also seen as more legitimate. This in turn can ensure that the violence by the PNP is also perceived as more legitimate.

6.4. Societal relevance

This thesis was of societal relevance because of the importance and influence that the fear of crime has on daily human life. The fear of crime has a demonstrable influence on individual behavior and the degree to which the quality of community life is experienced. Therefore, it is important to know whether people actually feel safe. Other reasons why this thesis was of societal relevance is because it is interesting to find out whether the policies of Duterte work and to what extent human rights organizations are rightly concerned.

First, the results have shown that, in general, a lot of people feel safer since the war on drugs. They experience less crime, and there are fewer people who are roaming around in the streets to cause trouble.
However, there is a striking difference between Comon and the other barangays. In Comon a lot of people feel safer since the war on drugs, because they experience less crime now. In the other barangays, where the respondents experienced little or no crime, most of the respondents feel more afraid now, this is especially noticeable in the barangay San Fernando. This is probably because a lot of people hear a lot of rampant fake news, and therefore they become afraid. This could be why people who used to feel safe, feel less safe now, because they hear a lot about the sensationalized incidents in the news. The people who already experienced crime, on the other hand, they feel safer now, because they actually notice the positive difference themselves. They experience that the violence of the state has contributed to the creation of more safety, even despite the violence by the state. This is again a clear example of the difference between the actual- and perceived safety. The importance of this difference has already been mentioned in this chapter.

Secondly, this thesis has shown that Duterte’s policies do work. As stated in the results, most respondents experience less crime since the war on drugs, and also the statistics show that the crime rate has decreased. In addition, there are also other advantages to Duterte’s policy. For example, Marawi is declared free of IS-rebels (NU, 2017), Duterte wants to completely eliminate internet gambling in the country (NU, 2016b), and Duterte has ensured a law that more than one hundred state universities and colleges in the Philippines grant free tuition. In addition, the respondents indicated in their interviews that Duterte protects his own employees, that he has increased some of the salaries, that he has granted permits to OFWs, and that finally he was the right man to put things in order regarding the Yolanda recovery. However, all these positive points do not necessarily mean that everyone in the country feels safer now, not even in spite of the fact that the crime rate has decreased.

Thirdly, as reported in Chapter 1 Introduction there is a lot of international criticism of Duterte. Are these concerns necessary? Quite a few respondents mention in the interviews that there are innocent victims. This is against human rights, and the international community can indeed criticize this. In addition, the newspaper articles and the incident on March 22 also show that in particular the PNP does not always do everything by the book. Apart from that, the killing of drugs addicts and dealers is of course also against human rights. So although the crime rate may be decreasing, human rights are still being violated, and the international community is rightfully concerned about the situation.

6.5. Limitations and recommendations
There are, however, some limitations to this research. Perhaps there is a bias. This means that external factors have a negative influence on the results of the research. It could also be that the researcher missed something important that could affect the results, because of the choice for a particular research design.
There are different forms of bias. In this thesis there could be a combination of response bias and interviewer bias. This can be caused by a direct interview between the researcher and the respondent, and since face-to-face interviews have also been carried out in this research, this bias may exist. Perhaps some respondents did not dare to answer completely honestly, because this research concerned a political sensitive topic, and maybe therefore some respondents responded with socially desirable answers. This is because maybe they did not dare to express themselves negatively about the current political program, perhaps they were afraid to get into trouble with that. However, this social desirability could also be the other way around. Perhaps some respondents did not dare to admit to me that they were perfectly in agreement with the killing of the drug dealers and users. I tried to solve this problem as much as possible by making clear that the respondents were absolutely not obliged to participate in the research, and that they only should participate if they felt completely at ease. In addition, I also tried to solve this problem by guaranteeing anonymity for the respondents.

Another form of bias is that the respondents may take over a particular discourse. For example, in the interviews a number of respondents mention the importance of discipline. Perhaps this is a policy discourse by Duterte that is taken over/believed by the respondents. This can affect the results because now, for example, it often appears that the respondents consider ‘discipline’ to be important. However, maybe the respondents have never thought of the importance of ‘discipline’ themselves, but now they have taken over this discourse from Duterte. That is why it is important that the researcher takes this into account.

As mentioned in Chapter 4 Methodology, I also collected some respondents through the snowball sampling method. However, there are some disadvantages to the snowball sampling method. It can “create problems within the network if sensitive links between individuals are acknowledged, or if the researcher shares informational or opinions from one respondent with another” (Norman, 2009, p. 79). Another problem is that “the method can be problematic if hostile groups or authorities use researchers’ findings or follow researchers’ actions to identify networks or subgroups that they perceive as threats” (Norman, 2009, p. 80). Another disadvantage is that the ‘nominated’ respondent usually looks a bit like the ‘already interviewed’ respondent (Bijleveld, 2013). Luckily I managed to prevent this as much as possible by having different ‘starter-respondents’.

Another limitation of this research is that sometimes the respondents were a bit insecure about their English, because some of them did not speak it fluently. This sometimes led to limited answers, partly because the respondents could not find the right words. Because of this, some of the interviews did not last very long. Sometimes this impeded the information of the interviews. Nevertheless, I still have the feeling that I have been able to gather a lot of important information from the interviews. A
recommendation for further research could be to work with a translator. However, a translator also has its disadvantages.

Another disadvantage is that this research only took place in one town, San Jose. It could be interesting to also carry out research in, for example, Manila, the capital city of the Philippines. There is much more crime in Manila. Especially before the war on drugs, the crime in Manila was very rampant. It is interesting to know how the people in Manila think about the legitimacy of the violence, the state and their own security. However, due to lack of time and resources, I could not go to Manila to conduct research there. Recommendations for further research could therefore be to include more cities, such as Manila, in order to research whether the inhabitants of those cities think differently.

Figure 7: Demonstration against the war on drugs in Manila. Source: Washington Times.

In addition, my research did not deal with the degree of police intervention. Perhaps the police action in Comon is much more brutal than in, for example, San Fernando, or the other way around. It could be possible that this affects the results. If one sees, for example, a lot of violent actions by the police, it could be that the police, or the state, is considered less legitimate. Recommendations for further research could therefore be to also take the degree of police intervention into account.

Moreover, it could be interesting to look at how many innocent victims have fallen. My research only indicates that respondents did not want innocent victims. But my research has not dealt with the extent to which there actually are innocent victims, or the extent to which respondents have experienced this themselves. If someone experiences that there are many innocent victims, this could have a major influence on the legitimacy of the state, or the legitimacy of state violence. That is why it is a recommendation for further research to also include this topic.
In addition, it could have been interesting to talk to (ex)-drug addicts themselves, how do they perceive their safety? Some respondents now indicated that they felt safe ‘because they are not a drug addict’. That is why it is interesting to interview (ex)-drug addicts too, did they stop using drug, or are they trying to stop? How do they experience the war on drugs, do they get help with stopping? And most importantly, what do they think of Duterte’s program for less crime by tackling the drug problem?

Finally, as already mentioned in Chapter 5 Results I did not ask about the influence of the lacked information provision on one’s sense of security. Therefore it is interesting for further research to also include this.

6.6. Own learning experiences

In advance I thought that the Philippines would be quite dangerous, because, briefly simplistic, people are shot down, just like that. How can that be safe? And even more important: how can Filipinos feel safe because of that? However, as soon as I went deeper into this topic, and especially when I arrived there, I realized that so many people feel safer since the war on drugs. Moreover, apparently I was not the only one who thought this way. I have spoken to many tourists during a small trip, who were surprised when I told them about my results. In addition, I also spoke to tourists who had talked to Filipinos about the war on drugs themselves, and also these tourists were told that many Filipinos experience less crime now. In short, a lot of people, including me, had not expected in advance that Filipinos would feel safer. Especially not when you see all the documentaries / news items about the many (innocent) deaths and about the overcrowded prisons. This is probably a typical result of what we hear through the media and how we are influenced by it.

In addition, it was quite an experience to temporarily live in a country under the war on drugs. The way people continue their daily lives, while the war on drugs is a much discussed topic. It is impressive to see how people deal with it, despite the fact that there are many deaths across the country. In addition, it was very nice to get to know the Filipinos: how they are always happy, genuinely nice, and how they always welcome you with open arms. It has been very interesting and informative to temporarily be a part of this amazing culture.
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Appendices

Appendix A  List of Respondents

**Respondents (R)**

**Interview 1: March 30 2018 (their home)**


(R2) Female. 54 years old. Lives for almost 6 years in Bagon Bayan, SJ, Antique. Occupation: Housekeeper/-wife.

(R3) Female. 16 years old. Lives for almost 6 years in Bagon Bayan, SJ, Antique. Goes to Antique National School.

**Interview 4: April 2 2018 (Let’s Care Office)**

(R4) Female. 22 years old. Lives for 22 years in Caramangay, Hamtic, Antique. Occupation: Facilitator

**Interview 5: April 2 2018 (Let’s Care Office)**

(R5) Female. 38 years old. Lives for 14 years in San Fernando, SJ, Antique. Occupation: Program Manager

**Interview 6: April 2 2018 (neighbor’s house)**

(R6) Female. 28 years old. Lives for 10 years in Comon, SJ, Antique. Occupation: housekeeper.

(R7) Male. 36 years old. Lives for 36 years in Comon, SJ, Antique. Occupation: Fisherman

(R8) Female. 45 years old. Lives for 45 years in Comon, SJ, Antique. Occupation: housewife

**Interview 7: April 4 2018 (her house)**

(R9) Female. 37 years old. Lives almost her entire life in San Fernando, SJ, Antique. (in between in Manila) Occupation: recruitment officer / shipping agency

**Interview 8: April 4 2018 (her house)**

(R10) Female. 26 years old. Lives for 8 years in Comon, SJ, Antique. Occupation: housewife.

**Interview 9: April 5 2018 (Sta Romana- Yson Memorial Hospital)**

(R11) Male. 60 years old. Lives for 60 years in Pogo, Bugasong, Antique. Occupation: Medical doctor.
Interview 10: April 6 2018 (my house)
(R12) Female. 31 years old. Lives alternately in Abu Dhabi and the in Philippines, Comon, San Jose, Antique. Occupation: None.

Interview 11: April 8 2018 (her house)
(R13) Female. 34 years old. Lives for 34 years in Comon, San Jose, Antique. Occupation: Houswife.

Interview 12: April 8 2018 (his house)

Interview 13: April 9 2018 (my house)
(R15) Male. 36 years old. Lives for 36 years in Comon, San Jose, Antique. Occupation: self-employed

Interview 14: April 10 2018 (my house)
(R16) Male. 41 years old. Lives for 38 years in San Fernando, San Jose, Antique. Occupation: Driver.

Police Officers (P)
Interview 2: March 31 2018 (Dalipe Market)
(P1) Male. 42 years old. Lives for almost 16 years in Pantalan, SJ, Antique. Occupation: Police officer

Interview 3: April 1 2018 (neighbor’s house)
(P2) Male. 55 years old. Lives for 55 years in Comon, SJ, Antique. Occupation: Police Officer

Informants (I)
Interview 15: May 05 2018 (Radyo Kaabayan, Sibalom)
(Informant 1) Male. 27 years old. Occupation: Radio DJ.
(Informant 2) Female. 29 years old. Student in Political Science.
(Informant 3) Female. 19 years old. Student in Political Science.
Appendix B  Interview Guide

Hello, I am Iris. I am here to do a research about the impact of Duterte’s ‘war on drugs’ on the perceived security of Filipino’s in the neighbourhood of San Jose. Also, I am interested how this has an impact on the regime’s legitimacy. Thank you for your cooperation.

A. Gender: Male / Female

B. Age (18+): . . .

C. Barangay: . . . . . . .

D. Occupation: . . .

E. Number of years living in this neighbourhood: . . .

F. Date: ... / ... / ....

S.Q. 1. To what extent do people in the Philippines feel insecure?
   - Do you feel safe in this neighborhood? If not: Did you ever experience something that you feel this way? If yes: Any idea why you feel safe?
   - How was your daily life influenced by crime before Duterte? Did something ever happen to you? Or around you, in the neighbourhood?
   - Did you had the feeling that you could not do certain things because of crime?
   - Did this feeling change since Duterte? How come? How do you experience that; what is different now?
S.Q. 2. What do they perceive as the major threats to their security?
- What kind of crime are you most afraid of? Is that also the biggest form of crime in this neighbourhood? What other kinds of crime do you experience in this neighbourhood?
- Did it change since Duterte? In what way? How do you experience that, what is different now?
- How do you think crime will be in the coming years? Less, more, different? Why do you think so?

S.Q. 3. To what extent do they consider state violence as reducing these insecurities?
- What do you think of the anti-drug violence performed by the state?
- Is it reducing the insecurities in this neighbourhood? How do you notice this, what is different now?

S.Q. 4. To what extent do they perceive state violence as appropriate/proportional/fair/justified and thus legitimate?
- Do you think the anti-drug violence by the state is necessary? Why? Did you ever experience something that you think this way?
- Is the anti-drug violence effective? Is the violence too much, or fair?
- Do you think there is another solution to the drug problem, or the crime? If no: why not? If yes: what kind of solution do you think would help? Why?

S.Q. 5. How does state violence contribute to state legitimacy?
- What do you think of Duterte? Do you trust him? Did you ever experience something that you think this way?
- Do you trust the police? What are your experiences with the police? What do you think of their performance? Why?
- Do you feel safer now that the state uses violence to create safety?
Appendix C  Interview Guide Informants

Hello, I am Iris. I am here to do a research about the impact of Duterte’s ‘war on drugs’ on the perceived security of Filipino’s in the neighbourhood of San Jose. Also, I am interested how this has an impact on the regime’s legitimacy. I have some questions regarding my results. Thank you for your cooperation.

- In my results, a lot of people indicate that they feel safe because they live close to relatives. Is this everywhere in the Philippines?
- How about the big cities, such as Manila and Quezon City? Do people here also live close to relatives or friends? Or more among unknown people?

- I noticed that a lot of people came up with the importance of discipline. Do you have any idea why? Is ‘discipline’ important in the Philippines?
- Some respondents say things like: “Duterte disciplines the population” and “duterte always possessed the power to discipline people” How come? Do people say things like this, because they hear it from someone, or something else? Is this a policy discourse by Duterte? Does the media say a lot about this?

- Also, some respondents indicate that they feel safe “because they are not a drug addict” Why do they say this? Does politics tell you this, and do people therefore say this as well?
- Also, people think that “as long as you do nothing wrong, nothing will happen” Why do people think this? Is this also told by politics?

So now I am also wondering if my results overall are a little bit representative for the rest of the country.

- A lot of my respondents indicated that they believe that the country needed “a ruling hand” for the drug problem. Do you think that in the Philippines in general a lot of people think this way? Do you think that in certain areas people think different about this? Why?

- I also noticed that especially people who experienced more crime, believe that the violence by the state is allowed. Does this corresponds to the rest of the country? Any areas where you think this would be different? Why?
Also, in my research it turned out that people who experienced less crime, are more afraid to become a victim of the war on drugs, or someone they know becomes a victim of the war on drugs, than people who experienced more crime. For example, I all my respondents in Comon, most of them experienced crime. Now, they feel safer, even though the violence by the state. The people who did not experience crime, are now more afraid to become a victim, because of the violence by the state. Do you know why? And do you think this is also the case in the rest of the country? Or some parts where it is different?