

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology
of Egypt / Egyptology

STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE IN THE JOKES ABOUT THE INDIGENOUS
MANGYANS OF ORIENTAL MINDORO, PHILIPPINES

Jerwin M. Mahaguay

University of Rizal System-Pililla

jerwin.mahaguay@urs.edu.ph

Jerwin M. Mahaguay. Structural Violence in the Jokes about the Indigenous Mangyans of Oriental Mindoro, Philippines. – PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17(2), 480-492. ISSN 1567-214X

Keywords: Indigenous people, Mangyan, Jokes, Structural violence, Oppression.

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the jokes directed towards the indigenous people (IPs), particularly the Mangyans of Oriental Mindoro, Philippines. It aims to show that these jokes contain violent messages directed to oppress the Mangyans as a race structurally. Whether conscious or not, its speakers are engaged in transmitting violence that demeans the Mangyans. Iris Marion Young's theory about structural violence is the theoretical guide for this study.

INTRODUCTION

Indigenous People's (IPs) rights and heritage are recognized worldwide. The United Nations guarantees this. This is enforced in the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 2007*. Through this declaration, every member state is hereby given the task of developing laws in protecting the IPs (United Nations, 2007). The Philippine Government is faithfully addressing this cause that there is already Republic Act No. 8371 or commonly known as the "The Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act of 1997" before the United Nations declaration. This means that the government is affirming its inherent duty to protect every citizen, including the IPs. On the other hand, each citizen has the duty and responsibility to recognize their rights (Republic of the Philippines, 1997).

But even with this worldwide declaration on the protection of IPs and the national campaign in the Philippines, there is observable violence in the IP's communities, particularly the Mangyans, that no researchers are trying to explore. This violence is the inherent structural violence done to the Mangyans of Oriental Mindoro, which can be found in the jokes attributed to them, commonly known in popular culture as Mangyan jokes.

These jokes about the indigenous people have the prejudice that harms the group (La Fave, L., & Mannell, R., 1976), (Lowe, 1986), (Schutz, 1989). These have aggressive intent that demeans members of the group (Schutz, 1989). However, there are also positive points that these jokes might contain (Leveen, 1996). It can lessen the tensions in the workplace and the community (Oshima, 2000). Thus these jokes or humor about the minorities, ethnic or indigenous people are a concern everywhere. There is a comparative analysis in English speaking countries (Davies, 1990), (Apte, 1987). ; in Hawaii (Oshima, 2000) and; in Netherlands (Kuipers, G., & Van der Ent, B. 2016); in Russia (Draitser, 1998); in-jokes made by Eastern Europeans (Shifman, L., & Katz, E. 2005); in Persian jokes (Haghish, E. F., Heydari, A., Biegler, R., Pfuhl, G., & Teymooori, A. 2012). In the Philippines, there are studies conducted about jokes. Still, these are not about the IP's but political leaders (Ranada, 2018), about the jokes of the millennials in connection to democracy (Arao, 2018), about the jokes used by an author (Mallari, 2011).

Thus this study is the first of its kind in the country in analyzing the jokes about the IP's particularly the Mangyans of Oriental Mindoro. Specifically, this paper has one basic task: to expose the violence present in these jokes, Mangyan jokes.

Literature review

The mangyans

Mangyan is the general name used to refer to the IP's living on the island of Mindoro. The Mangyans have seven main tribes: Iraya, Alangan, Tadyawan, Bangon, Buhid/Batangan, Tao-Buhid, and Hanunuo (Postma 1988). They live in the mountainous areas of Mindoro. They were the first inhabitants of the coast of Mindoro and had strong trade relations with the Chinese. But due to the frequent attacks by the Moros, the arrival of the Spaniards, and the influx of people from neighboring areas, they were forced to retreat to the mountains.

In general, the Mangyans can be said to be civilized because they have their own: a) political structure, b) language, c) way of writing, d) literature, and e) faith. They always have a council of elders and a leader representing the tribe to the tribes' council. Some laws are followed from birth up to death. These laws are written as part of Ambahan compiled by Antoon Postma (Postma 1981). Ambahan is a collection of Mangyan poems about their way of life. They also have their language and way of writing. This is Surat Mangyan, which is similar to the Baybayin of the Tagalog. At the same time, each tribe has a system of faith. This can be seen in the article published by Padre Miranda in 1989,

which showed in his study that the Mangyans' God varies from tribe to tribe. For example, Alangan has *Ambuwaw*, *Mahal na Makakaako* for the Hanuno, *Apo Iraya* for the Iraya, *Afu Langit / Daga*, *Amang Tam* for the Tadyawan, and the Alangan is *Kapiyan* (Miranda 1989).

Jokes as popular culture

The joke comes from the Latin word "jocose," which means to have fun, play, or spend time. It can be through words, sentences, or stories that can be written or spoken. There are two facets of giving or using a joke. The first is to hide the messages one wants to convey, and the second is to build relationships with others. The first face can be seen in Freud's statement saying that it has a deeper source. In his book "Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious," he says that it is a way of avoiding a person from inside and his external problem. He may be using a joke to tell things indirectly. The second can be seen in Cohen's article "Jokes: Philosophical Thoughts on Joking Matters" that instead of avoiding, the joke is a way of having a relationship with someone (Cohen, 2001). Because everyone wants pleasure, jokes serve as a bridge to get along and help to develop bonds to everyone (Vinton, 1989). Whatever reason one is employing, still to utter a joke is the safest way to cross issues that are acceptable or not, holy or rude (Hodson and McInnis, 2016) simply because if the joke is not accepted, it can be said as "just a joke." If it is accepted, it is the beginning of a good exchange of stories.

Theoretical framework

Structural violence means that social inequalities and oppressions are not the results of conflict between one person against another but because of social frameworks accepted in the society. Johan Galtung first developed this theory in his book "*Violence, Peace, and Peace Research*" (Galtung, 1969) but advanced by Iris Marion Young (Young, 2011) in her book *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. These social frameworks or mechanisms like church, literature, media, and laws and others lead to others' betterment while becoming an obstacle for others. Some groups become victims, and some groups become exploitative (Young, 2011). It means a person is poor not because he is lazy but because of the structures created by the ruling class or the upper part of the social structure. Thus it is essential to criticize or questions these structures to have a noble dialogue within democratic ideals (Young, 2001).

Structural violence, based on Young's reading, is divided into five aspects: first is exploitation, second is marginalization, third is powerlessness, fourth is cultural imperialism, and fifth is violence in the form of physical, mental, and emotional (Young, 2011). Each of these aspects revolves around the movement of capital in society. The social structure determines or sets the basis for a person to be an oppressor or oppressed. The first aspect is exploitation, which refers to a group members' inability to set the value of their property or work. It is clear from this aspect that the structure such as race, color, or organization to which one belongs sets the property's value, not the value of the property itself. It follows that the property or labor has no value in itself; instead, the owner's place in the structure sets the value.

The second is the marginalization, where a person is deprived of opportunity and rights because he or she is part of a group. In this aspect, it can be seen that a person is unemployed not because he has no effort but because he is part of a group. The third is powerlessness, which can be observed as the lack of capacity to do what he wants to do by being an individual group member. The result of the work is not recognized not because it has no quality but because the maker or doer is a part of society's lower structure. They are also not given skills, not because they are incapable but because of their affiliation. Fourth is cultural imperialism that considers the belief of mainstream or powerful as the right consciousness and standard of civilization. This aspect simply

means the ruling class's culture as the right and superior culture while that outside is inferior and weak. The fifth is **violence** that refers to physical harm, threats, or explicit violations of a group's dignity. It includes the blatant insult to the dignity of those belonging to a group.

This theory is used widely in topics related to oppressions and advantages in group dynamic such as in public health (Lewis, S., & Russell, A.2013), in food security (Johnson, K., Drew, C., & Auerswald, C. 2019), victims in the war on drugs (Khenti, 2014), in medical practice (Rhodes et al. 2012), in the reproductive health system (Mason-Jones, & Nicholson, 2018), and many more. At this point, this paper will try to show that jokes made by non-Mangyans that use Mangyans as characters are a form of structural violence because it prevents the promotion or improvement of the dignity of the Mangyans. This leads to discrimination against the Mangyans. So by destroying the dignity of the Mangyans through the jokes, the joker is also separating himself from the Mangyan and thereby saying that his status is far higher than that of the Mangyans.

METHODOLOGY

This is a philosophical paper that uses the mixed method of quantitative and qualitative research to strengthen its discourse, which follows that format of John Creswell in his book *“Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches 4th ed”* (Creswell, 2014). The quantitative part is utilized in gathering data in which purposive sampling is used. The researcher sends a communication to the participants to ask for jokes and answer some related questions. Jokes were gathered through electronic communication using free application-Messenger. The researcher only accepted the first one hundred jokes out of fifty-five respondents. After receiving, the same jokes are put together until only forty are left. These forty jokes become the subject of this study. Then the qualitative part employed the content analysis method in the transcripts of the jokes. In this scene, Iris Marion Young's (Young, 2011) concept of structural violence is used as the basis found in her work *Five Faces of Oppression*. To assess each joke fair, the researcher created a rubric about Young's work. This rubric also went through validation with the help of scholars familiar with the philosophy of Young.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Rubrik for the Assessment of the Structural Violence Present in Mangyan Jokes

Five Faces of Oppression of Irish Marion Young Violence	Signs of structural violence As a member of the group, one experience:
Exploitation	a) no control over the price of property and labor b) no protection in the working environment c) assigned to more dangerous and more challenging tasks
Marginalization	a) limited employment opportunities b) does not receive social services (medical, education, etc.) c) excluded from social and political activities
Powerlessness	a) skills are not recognized b) there is no opportunity to learn another skill c) does not receive recognition for a job done well
Cultural Imperialism	a) one's own civilization is always of low- quality b) the civilization of others is the basis of well-being c. no knowledge of the things and equipment of others
Violence	a) Physical aggression b) Intimidation or threat c) humiliation

Violence in Jokes

Based on the Five Faces of Oppression criteria by Young, the violence inherent in the jokes was identified through the rubric above. The table below shows the result.

Table 2: Inherent Violence in Jokes

Mangyan Jokes	Frequency	%
1. There is violence	37	93
2. No Violence	3	7
Total	40	100

Table 2 shows that out of forty (40) jokes, thirty-seven (37) of them appeared to be carrying violence. In contrast, only three of them can be said to be non-violent. A huge proportion of jokes carry violence. This is also the point in the article *Derogating Humor as a Delegitimization Strategy in Intergroup Contexts* (Hudson and McInnis, 2016). It is said that jokes carry bias and abuse against other groups of people. It shows the potential of jokes to connect people and can cause separation because of its violent messages (Ford, Breeden, Emma C. O'Connor, and Noely C. Banos, 2017).

But before delving into the topics of violence in-jokes, it is also good to see what the three (3) non-violent jokes are all about. What are the thoughts they are promoting? The first two jokes revolve around the logic and intelligence of the Mangyans. They are no different from anyone else's genius, while the third is a form of defense to the Mangyans. The first joke is about a teacher who tells his students that "they are like Mangyans" because they stood up when they saw a helicopter passed by. But one of the real Mangyan students says, "Sir, I am a Mangyan, but I never stood up." Here the teacher's statement shows the common understanding of Mangyans as ignorant. However, the student's response is a vindication to all the Mangyans against the teacher's accusation. It shows that this joke was uttered not to spread violence about the Mangyan instead of defending them from common sense violence. The second joke is about a jeepney conductor who renamed a Mangyan and gave the President of the Philippines' name. Instead of getting angry, the Mangyan laughed, and when he was asked to pay his fare, he said, "the president just boarded your jeep, will you not spare him of fare?" This scene shows the resistance to the violent naming of the Mangyans. The logic given by the conductor was only used by the Mangyan to show his mistake. While the third joke is the story of a handsome guy from Mindoro who, every time he introduces himself, keeps saying that he is a Mangyan. It is a way of giving positive propaganda for the Mangyans. These three only show that although there are many jokes about the Mangyans with violence, there are also jokes meant to defend them. This method of using jokes to combating violence can also be seen in an article entitled *Humor as a Serious Strategy of Nonviolent Resistance to Oppression* (Sorensen, 2008). This is also the view that Billingsley promotes in his article *Laughing against Patriarchy: Humor, Silence, and Feminist Resistance* where he says that jokes are one of the ways women can use to show strength against patriarchal society.

Types of violence in the jokes

In the five faces of Young's oppression, she stated that every time one of them was seen in an incident, it could be said to be a sign of structural violence. It is also possible that in one instance or joke, there are one or more faces of violence present. The next table shows the violence in each joke gathered through the rubrics, which can be seen in methodology.

Table 3: Violence in Jokes in Young's Five Faces of Oppression

Jokes Classified in the Five Faces of Oppression of Young	Frequency	%
1. Exploitation	1	2
2. Marginalization	2	4
3. Powerlessness	5	11
4. Cultural Imperialism	21	47
5. Violence	16	36
Total	45	100

Table 3 reveals the violence seen in the Mangyan jokes about the five faces of Young's oppression. Of the total forty jokes, the violence caused by imperialist culture has the most twenty-one (21) have it. The second most common is violence (physical, mental, and emotional), in which sixteen (16) jokes are present. The third is powerlessness, where five (5) jokes have it. Fourth is marginalization with two (2), and the last is the exploitation with only one (1) joke.

The content of table 3 will be explained in detail in the discussion below. To illustrate the gravity of the violence present, and how these are transferred, the number of these jokes that were repeated or shared will also be given. At this point, it is good to explain again that these jokes were obtained electronically. Through Messenger, the researcher sent an invitation to the participants to send them Mangyan jokes they knew. The researcher chose the first one hundred received jokes. The consistency is combined and the only thing left is the forty (40) variants. After seeing the violence in these jokes, it is still essential to show how often these jokes are repeated. Only jokes repeated at least twice in each face of oppression will be explained below, except for the marginalization face with no jokes repeated twice, so these two will be explained instead.

Cultural imperialism

Table 4: Jokes with Cultural Imperialism

Jokes caused Cultural Imperialism	Frequency
1. Getting out from the jeep	6
2. Finding NPA's [New People's Army] (rebel) nest	5
3. Using tangled slippers	5
4. Opening the knot of ice-candy	5
5. Eating halo-Halo	3
6. Listening to radio	3
7. Taking elevator	2
8. Drinking alcohol	2
9. Imitating what others buy	2

Table 4 shows the jokes containing violence under cultural imperialism with a total of twenty-one (21). But only nine (9) jokes are included here. These are the jokes repeated at least twice. Joke # 1 was repeated six times and is about a Mangyan who doesn't know how to get out of a moving jeepney or ask the driver to stop, so he just went beyond where he was supposed to go. Joke # 2 was repeated five times is about a Mangyan who was asked if he knew NPA rebel's nest. The Mangyan thought that the NPA is birds, so he asked the color of their eggs. Joke # 3 was also repeated five times is about a Mangyan who bought a new pair of the slipper but failed to untie it, so he walked slowly and came home late.

Meanwhile, joke # 4, repeated five times, is about a Mangyan who doesn't want to by ice candy because he believes that untying its knot is very difficult. The repeated three times, joke # 5 is about eating halo-halo, which he says is getting delicious as it goes deeper.

Repeated three times, joke # 6 is about the Mangyan who destroyed the radio due to the person shouting inside. Joke # 7 that was repeated twice, was the amazement in the elevator. Joke # 8, which was also repeated twice, is about the sour taste of alcohol. The last one is joke # 9, which was repeated twice about Mangyan imitating everyone else buying, like a napkin, even though he does not know what it is.

These jokes are violent because they are explicitly suggesting the connection between ignorance and Mangyans by exaggerating simple things that are not necessarily true to all Mangyan. These topics: asking the driver to stop the jeepney, loosening the knot of ice candy, eating halo-halo, whether unknown at the beginning is easy to learn. So if it continues to be attached to the Mangyans is a sign of ignorance is unreasonable—the same with the jokes about being unfamiliar with new equipment or machines like elevators and radios. Everyone gets amazed at things that are new to the eye, not just the Mangyans. But the exaggeration of destroying the radio is no longer a description of amazement but of inciting and advancing the ignorance attached to the Mangyans. While the joke about the NPA's "nest" is an example of misunderstanding in the use of words, if only the true meaning were given immediately, confusion would have been avoided. Therefore, it is unreasonable to make it a joke and blame the listener alone instead of with the speaker.

It can be concluded that laughing at the Mangyans because they do not know something is not a sign of intelligent and advanced civilization. Instead, it is a sign of arrogance and structural oppression because it merely put the Mangyans in the disadvantaged position as a race. Those who have knowledge or skills on something should be guided and taught correctly rather than making them laughing stuff. On the one hand, there may be one or two Mangyans who did these ridiculous things in the past but attaching them to all the Mangyans is unacceptable. These jokes are forms of structural violence aimed at all Mangyans and not just a few individuals.

Violence

Table 5: Jokes with Physical, Mental, and Emotional Violence

Violent Jokes	Frequency
1. Calling the driver to stop the Jeepney	6
2. Using the name Mangyan as an equivalent of ignorant	4
3. Accusing Mangyan has a tail	4
4. Giving a new name	2

Table 5 is about jokes with physical, mental, and emotional violence. Joke # 1 that was repeated six (6) times, is about a Mangyan who tried to stop the jeepney couple of times from trying if the driver will acknowledge him but the conductor told him that once he tries another one, he will be beaten to death. Afraid of the conductor, the Mangyan just look at his house as the jeepney passed by until he was brought far. In contrast, joke # 2, which was repeated four (4) times, is about using or substituting the name Mangyan to ignorant people. While joke # 3, which was repeated four (4) times, is about the allegation that Mangyans have a tail. The last joke # 4, which was repeated two (2) times, is about giving them different names.

Joke # 1, which is about the Mangyan, threatened to be beaten if he tries to stop the jeepney, is violent because it deprives the Mangyan of his right by intimidation. Mangyan seems naughty since he is always trying to stop the jeepney, but threatening is not a solution. Joke # 2, which is about using the name "Mangyan" as the equivalent of ignorant, is very violent because it is a direct violation of their dignity. The Mangyans are not naive. They have talents like everyone else. There are many Mangyan professionals. Joke # 3, which is about accusing Mangyans have to tail, is a direct assault on Mangyan's dignity. It lowers the level of the Mangyans in the hierarchy of creation and placing them

inferior to humans and close to animals. The Mangyans do not have a tail. This story may have started from those who see the Mangyan men's undergarment called "*bahag*" its use and design is the same as the brief but has simple uniqueness. It is also made out of little fabric to protect the men's private parts and tied in the waist by fabric or string. The essence lies in the fabric that protects the private parts because it has an excess fabric in the back and front. This extra fabric looks like a tail in the dark, but it is just a piece of fabric in daylight. This means that the accusation of having a tail is only a misinterpretation of the Mangyan attire. While joke # 4, which is about giving names to the Mangyans, is violently violating their sense of self. One's name is very important, and to change it without one's permission is a direct assault on one's wellbeing and dignity.

These jokes are truly structural because joke #1 deprived an individual's right and a threat to all Mangyan to be submissive to the demands of the non-Mangyans. Joke # 2, which substitutes Mangyan for ignorance, is truly directed to all Mangyans as a race. The same is joke #3, which accusing Mangyans have a tail, this is structurally oppressing the Mangyans. While joke # four is about changing one's name even done to an individual Mangyan, it is still structurally oppressing the entire Mangyan race because it was done to him by the virtue that he is a Mangyan.

Powerlessness

Table 6: Jokes showing Powerlessness

Jokes showing Powerlessness	Frequency
1. Mangyan Driver	16
2. Raising one's foot	4
3. Hanging on a jeepney	3

Table 6 shows the violence caused by powerlessness. Joke # 1 is about the Mangyan driver who was stopped by the police because he did not have a license but was still happy even though his plate number was taken. He was pleased because it was more complicated if the tire was taken. The joke was repeated sixteen (16) times. Joke # 2 is about a police officer looking for the missing money and suspecting a Mangyan stepped on it. The officer ordered the Mangyan to raise his left foot. When nothing was found, he also called to raise the other foot. The Mangyan disagreed because he said that he would fall if he raises all his feet. This joke was repeated four times. The last one is joke # 3 about a Mangyan riding on a jeepney hanging in the tail part and not stepping his feet on the floor as per agreement with the conductor. This was repeated three times (3).

Joke # 1, which is about the Mangyan driver, is very alarming because it was repeated sixteen times. The joke content suggests that probably all Mangyan drivers do not have a license, do not follow the rules of the road, and do not have enough driving skills. Perhaps there is indeed a Mangyan driver who does not have a license, does not follow the law of the road, and does not have sufficient driving ability, but to say that all Mangyans do not comply is a lie. And if the story is reversed, it is not just some Mangyans who do not have a license, do not follow, and do not have enough driving skills. Many non-Mangyans also commit the same violation, but why this joke is exclusively used only against them. This joke, therefore, is structural and meant to downgrade all the Mangyans' driving skills. Thus, it eliminates the opportunity and ability of other Mangyans to be eligible, simply because of the structure that they are Mangyans. Joke # 2, on the other hand, about raising Mangyan's foot, is a direct manifestation of Young's idea of an individual's powerlessness in controlling one's self, particularly one's body. The narrator tries to dictate what to do like a doll. It removes the ability of the Mangyan to think that after raising his left foot, it should be lowered before raising the other. Joke # 3 about hanging on a jeep without stepping one's feet on the

floor is also violent because it takes away man's instinct self-preservation and survival. The joke tries to suggest that Mangyans' minds cannot comprehend even common ideas like self-preservation. It reduces that Mangyan to a mere puppet in the story, which is so powerless.

Marginalization

There are only two jokes included in this violence. The first joke is about giving a job to a Mangyan where he was asked to select which job condition he likes most: first is he will work with free lunch and 200 pesos salary, the second is he will work with no free lunch but with 250 pesos salary. But the Mangyan said that what he wanted is 100 pesos salary without work to be done and with lunch. This joke was repeated five (5) times. This joke has an implied message, suggesting that Mangyans only want money and food but do not want to work. This puts the Mangyans in the margin when it comes to the opportunity of receiving a job offer because the joke seems not only to entertain but also serves as hostile propaganda. Thus it is structurally oppressing all the Mangyans. The second joke is about a Mangyan who asked his son to loan fifty (50) pesos worth of rice from the store. He said that 1 kilo of rice causes only 40 pesos, so he should ask for a change of ten pesos from the cashier. This joke suggests that the debtor is so inconsiderate and thinks only of his desire to take advantage of the other. This seems to be just a common joke that can also be used by anyone who borrows, but the question is why Mangyan is still used. Thus it appears to be structural. It suggests that people in business should be vigilant in dealing with the Mangyans, especially in loans or debt matters. Again, the story might happen to a particular Mangyan, but generalizing it to all Mangyans is wrong. Mangyans are considerate, and they know how to pay the debt to their neighbors.

Exploitation

Violence under exploitation is connected to livelihood and property. Only one joke entered here, but it was repeated six (6) times. This is about a Mangyan who sold a pig in the market. Before he went down to the market, his father told him that the price should have a "thousand." Arriving at the market, he was offered seven hundred (700), eight hundred (800), and nine hundred (900), the Mangyan did not accept. When he was asked why he is not accepting the offer, he said that he wanted to have a "thousand" on the price. So he was offered half a thousand (500), which he immediately accepted. This joke is an exploitation of the weakness or ignorance of others. Instead of explaining the situation, the buyer took advantage of the weakness of the seller. It is not only an attack on an individual Mangyan but the entire Mangyan community as a whole.

Such exploitation also appeared in Mahaguay's research in his article "Re-evaluation of Values: Nietzsche and the Mining Struggle of Oriental Mindoro, Philippines." This article shows the abuse done by the multinational corporations to the indigenous Mangyans to let them agree to mine their Ancestor Land. They were given the wrong information to support mining in their ancestral land (Mahaguay 2018). These corporations are taking advantage of the indigenous people's lack of knowledge and lack of contact with the government.

LESSONS FROM YOUNG'S STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE AND THE VIOLENCE ON MANGYAN JOKES

A. Structural Violence inherent in the Jokes

Young is right in his view that any experience that enters into the five facets of oppression can be called a form of structural violence. Of the forty (40) jokes about the Mangyans, only three (3) of them are non-violent. It means that there is a high possibility that in sharing these jokes, violence is also shared. What is worse here is that it is

structural. It does not focus on just one person but on all the members of a particular group, which is the Mangyan in this aspect. It means that violence in these jokes is not just for one Mangyan but for every Mangyan.

It can also be seen in the structural aspect that when someone shares these jokes, the sharer separates himself from the Mangyan. The sharer places a gap between him and the Mangyans. While lowering the dignity of the Mangyans, the sharer is saying that he is not part of the Mangyans instead of part of a higher level. Martin (2007) also states that these poetic jokes elevate oneself and degrade others. Two events are happening here simultaneously, first is putting others' dignity down, and second is raising one's own. Even the silent listeners are part of this theater. Once the listeners laugh, they are already entering into the logic of detaching themselves from the Mangyans and raising themselves as part of a higher place in the structure. Their laughter is a symbol of the violence that can continue.

Since violence is observed in these jokes that encompass Mangyan lives' basic tenets, the violence of these jokes also violates the basic human rights of the Mangyans. Because of the jokes, their property is lost; they are not given the opportunity; their dignity is trampled. They are marginalized and are not allowed to reach their full potential. It can be deduced then that structural violence is a violation of human rights (Ho, 2007). This means protecting the Mangyans from these violent jokes is also protecting their basic human rights. Thus their security will be guaranteed, as Galtung says that human security cannot be achieved until structural violence (Galtung, 1969).

B. There is a conscious anti-violence Effort

The three jokes related to the genius and logic of the Mangyans are up-and-coming models. These jokes aim to recognize and be proud of the intelligence of the Mangyans. These jokes simply proved that jokes with Mangyan topics and with no inherent violence are also possible. They are nothing less compared to those with violent content. Like other jokes, these are also funny but not violent and serve for a group's greater good. These are examples of counter-consciousness against violence. These jokes should be told to friends, passed on to family members, written in newspapers and other media. Only positive, conscious action is needed to combat unconscious violence. Education then is what is required to combat this violent culture. Values formation is an integral part of education (Mahaguay, 2018), (Abenes, R. D., & Mahaguay, J. M. 2017).

CONCLUSION

A significant percentage of jokes about the Mangyans have inherent violence. According to Young, of the five faces of oppression that signals the presence of structural violence, it appears that the violence caused by cultural imperialism is the most prevalent, second is violence centered on physical, mental, and emotional harm. The third is powerlessness, the fourth is marginalization, and the least is the violence caused by exploitation. While it can also be observed that there are Mangyan jokes that do not carry violence and these jokes show the natural intelligence or logic of the Mangyans.

It is essential to pay attention to the jokes which have no inherent violence instead show the natural talents and logic of the Mangyans. These jokes can be potential models for counter-violence. This paper aims not to punish those who are transmitting these violent jokes but to educate them and help them realize that there are other positive ways to have fun.

References

- Abenes, R. D., & Mahaguay, J. M. (2017). Dekolonisasyon para sa Diwang Pilipino ni Emerita S. Quito: Isang Pagpupugay. *KRITIKE: An Online Journal of Philosophy*, 11(2).
- Apte, M. L. (1987). Ethnic humor versus “sense of humor” an American sociocultural dilemma. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 30(3), 27-41.
- Arao, D. A. (2018). Notes (and “Jokes”) on Millennials and Democracy. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Danilo_Arao/publication/326849579_Notes_and_Jokes_on_Millennials_and_Democracy/links/5b696e1645851546c9f695a8/Notes-and-Jokes-on-Millennials-and-Democracy.pdf
- Billig, M. (2005). *Laughter and ridicule. Towards a social critique of humour*. London: Sage.
- Billingsley, Amy. *Laughing against Patriarchy: Humor, Silence, and Feminist Resistance*. https://pages.uoregon.edu/uophil/files/Philosophy_Matters_Submission_Marvin_Billingsley.pdf
- Cohen, T. (2001). *Jokes: Philosophical Thoughts on Joking Matters* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press).
- Creswell, John W. (2014) “Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches 4th ed” SAGE Publications, Inc.: Los Angeles, USA. Retrieved from. From: http://fe.unj.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Research-Design_Qualitative-Quantitative-and-Mixed-Methods-Approaches.pdf
- Davies, C. (1990). *Ethnic humor around the world: A comparative analysis*. Indiana University Press
- Draitser, E. (1998). *Taking penguins to the movies: Ethnic humor in Russia*. Wayne State University Press.
- Ford, Breeden, Emma C. O'Connor, and Noely C.Banos, (2017). *Jokes and Humor in Intergroup Relations*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication Retrieved from. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330968372_Jokes_and_Humor_in_Intergroup_Relations
- Freud, *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*, 286–87.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6, 167-191. Retrieved from: http://www2.kobe-u.ac.jp/~alexroni/IPD%202015%20readings/IPD%202015_7/Galtung_Violence,%20Peace,%20and%20Peace%20Research.pdf
- Ho, Kathleen. (2007) *Structural Violence as a Human Rights Violation*. *Essex Human Rights Review* Vol. 4 No. 2 September 2007 Retrieved July 9, 2020: <http://projects.essex.ac.uk/ehrr/V4N2/ho.pdf>
- Hobbes, T. (1640). *Hobbes tripos in three discourses: Human nature*. In W. S. Molesworth(Ed.), *The English works of Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury*. Vol. IV. 183 -945. London:
- Hodson, Gordon and Cara C. MacInnis. (2016) *Derogating Humor as a Delegitimization Strategy in Intergroup Contexts*. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science* © 2016 American Psychological Association 2016, Vol. 2, No. 1, 63–74. Retrieved from. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/features/tps-tps0000052.pdf>
- Johnson, K., Drew, C., & Auerswald, C. (2019). Structural violence and food insecurity in the lives of formerly homeless young adults living in permanent supportive housing. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 1-24.
- Khenti, A. (2014). The Canadian war on drugs: Structural violence and unequal treatment of Black Canadians. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 25(2), 190-195.
- Kuipers, G., & Van der Ent, B. (2016). The seriousness of ethnic jokes: Ethnic humor and social change in the Netherlands, 1995–2012. *Humor*, 29(4), 605-633.
- La Fave, L., & Mannell, R. (1976). Does ethnic humor serve prejudice?. *Journal of Communication*.

- Leveen, L. (1996). Only when I laugh: Textual dynamics of ethnic humor. *Melus*, 21(4), 29-55.
- Lewis, S., & Russell, A. (2013). Young smokers' narratives: Public health, disadvantage and structural violence. *Sociology of health & illness*, 35(5), 746-760.
- Lowe, J. (1986). Theories of ethnic humor: How to enter, laughing. *American Quarterly*, 38(3), 439-460.
- Mahaguay, J. M. (2018). Ang Pilosopiya ng Edukasyon ni Emerita S. Quito/The Philosophy of Education of Emerita S. Quito. *Malay*, 30(2), 1-19.
- Mahaguay, J. M. (2018). Re-Evaluation of Values: Nietzsche and the Mining Issue in Oriental Mindoro. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Vol II*. Lyceum of The Philippines University Batangas City 2018
- Mallari, J. C. (2011). Avowing Ethnicity through Versified Jokes. <http://ipedr.com/vol20/6-ICHSC2011-M00017.pdf>
- Martin, R. A. (2007). *The psychology of humor: An Integrative Approach*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press
- Mason-Jones, A. J., & Nicholson, P. (2018). Structural violence and marginalisation. The sexual and reproductive health experiences of separated young people on the move. A rapid review with relevance to the European humanitarian crisis. *Public health*, 158, 156-162.
- Miranda, Dionesio. (1989). Sa Harap ng Mahiwagang Loob. *DIWA*, Vol. XIV, 1 and 2: Philippines, pp.38-57. 1989
- Oshima, K. (2000). Ethnic jokes and social function in Hawai'i. *Humor-International Journal of Humor Research*, 13(1), 41-58.
- Postma, Antoon (1988). *Annotated Mangyan Bibliography (1978-1988)*. Panantayan, Mansalay, Or. Mindoro: Mangyan Assistance and Research Center/Arnoldus Press, 2015
- Postma, Antoon (1981). *Treasure of the Minority, The Ambahan: Poetic Expression of the Mangyans of Southern Mindoro, Philippines*. Manila: Arnoldus Press, Inc., 1981.
- Ranada, P. (2018). Duterte Jokes: Why Not Make Philippines a Province of China?. *Rappler*. June, 28.
- Republic of the Philippines. (1977) Republic Act No. 8371s "The Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act of 1997". Retrieved from: <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1997/10/29/republic-act-no-8371/>
- [34] Rhodes, T., Wagner, K., Strathdee, S. A., Shannon, K., Davidson, P., & Bourgois, P. (2012). Structural violence and structural vulnerability within the risk environment: theoretical and methodological perspectives for a social epidemiology of HIV risk among injection drug users and sex workers. In *Rethinking social epidemiology* (pp. 205-230). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Schutz, C. E. (1989). The sociability of ethnic jokes.
- Shifman, L., & Katz, E. (2005). "Just call me Adonai": A case study of ethnic humor and immigrant assimilation. *American Sociological Review*, 70(5), 843-859.
- Sorensen, Majken Jul. (2008) Humor as a Serious Strategy of Nonviolent Resistance to Oppression.. *PEACE & CHANGE*, Vol. 33, No. 2, Peace History Society and Peace and Justice Studies Association Retrieved. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1468-0130.2008.00488.x>
- United Nations. (2007) United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 2007. Retrieved from: https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf
- Vinton, K. L. (1989). Humor in the workplace: It is more than telling jokes. *Small group behavior*, 20(2), 151-166.
- Watson, Katie. 2011. Gallows Humor in Medicine. Retrieved from: https://www.loyolamedicine.org/sites/default/files/u406/gallows_humor_in_medicine.pdf

- Young, I. M. (2001). Activist challenges to deliberative democracy. *Political theory*, 29(5), 670-690.
- Young, I. M. (2011). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton University Press.
- Young, Iris, Marion (2004). "Responsibility and Global Labour Justice" (PDF). *Journal of Political Philosophy*. 12: 365–388. 2004
- Young, Iris Young, Iris (2011). *Responsibility for justice*. Oxford New York: Oxford University (2011). *Responsibility for justice*. Oxford New York: Oxford University