

Abstract

By using Sidney Tarrow's ideas and theories on social movement and contentious politics, this qualitative case study was able to present the development of the indigenous movement in Maguindanao and its dynamics, and offer some explanations on the reasons behind the division in the movement and the impact of factionalism in their struggle. This study was conducted in 2012 and used primary and secondary sources, and print sources and interviews among NGO workers, indigenous leaders and community members, and government officials. This study was done because there is a dearth of scholarship on this particular case as a social movement. While the factionalism in the movement is known, this study examined the movement and its stake in the peace process using different aspects of a social movement. In doing so, it provided a more nuanced understanding of the causes of the factionalism based on the growth of the movement.

The development of the indigenous movement of the Teduray and Lambangian/Balig largely depended on opportunities, such as the change of regimes, and other available external resources, such as NGOs and civil society. These opportunities enabled them to shift their struggle from violent to peaceful means. Internally, armed with education and the discourse of their distinct identity, they were able to use these external resources in order to organize themselves and pursue their struggle in various arena. The force of the movement helped them attain gains in policies, elections, media, and the peace process. However, external threats still exist, such as competition with Maguindanaon politicians in elections and large-scale commercial logging. Internally, due to differences in ideology, socio-economic status, and notions of identities, factionalism has affected the movement's struggle in general and within the peace process. This issue extends to the solidarity of peripheral communities with the movement and its activities. In part due to factionalism, they are often not able to work together towards the full implementation of the IPRA in the ARMM nor come up with a unified position about their role in the peace process.