

## **DEBUNKING THE TERM “BOBOTANTE”: THE EICHMANN PROBLEM AND THE RECURRING VOTERS’ BEHAVIOR IN THE PHILIPPINES**

Rodrigo Emil M. Carreon<sup>1</sup> and Queene Faye Loyola<sup>1</sup> and Franz Jude Abelgas<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Political and Legal Studies Area, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences,  
Colegio de San Juan de Letran – Manila

---

### **Abstract**

*It is circumstantial enough to merit that the Filipinos, even those who are educated seem to not to get out of the cycle of the conservative thought. The Filipino people elect politicians notwithstanding their wrongdoings and lack of accomplishments. This behavior is popularly connotated as “bobotante behavior”, to which this paper intends to prove otherwise. The Eichmann problem is a derivative of philosophy where it influences the morality and rationality of a political being, as such will be used in this opus as a framework for debunking the “bobotante phenomenon”. The researchers attempt to explicate reconciliation between the Eichmann problem and the minds and behaviors of the Filipino people in their political participation. This study thereby poses the debunking of the term “bobotante” as it subjects the phenomenon to a philosophical concept that shall be a contribution to the research on political theories.*

**Keywords:** *Bobotante, Eichmann Problem, Hannah Arendt, Political Participation, Voting Behavior*

---

### **Introduction**

The voting behaviors of people often are put on the line as this study tries to explain why such are behaving in that manner. The word “bobotante” seems to have gotten the notion that the Filipino electorate are either forgetful or turn a blind eye and then deliberately do not want to remember the wrongdoings one has done. There is a factor larger than that of forgetfulness that this study tends to prove. It is not sheer forgetfulness, but the sociological and cultural aspects that this position is at bay.

An analysis on the work of (Tayao, 2020) gave emphasis on the comparison of elected politicians then and now. This analysis would somehow lead to a path in which this study can see how the voters came to the decision of who to vote for by first examining the people they actually voted for. In that light, Tayao’s study explicitly said that the senators then such as, Senators Guingona, Tanada, Salonga, Defensor-Santiago and Pimentel Jr., are very hard to match compared to those of today in terms of their accomplishments.

Those senators were most known for debates and legislations that are fitting descriptions for a senator. According to Tayao people are not actually labeled as



“bobotante” since they in fact think on who to vote for, as the said senators are proofs that something fruitful came from the votes of the people.

In addition, Tayao remarked, the pattern of voting only for the popular, as per his study, came only on in the years 1992 – 1998. This is the time when people started to choose candidates who are prominent personalities seen on television. In his analysis, on that time people already tend to vote for the popular such as Senator Sotto, Revilla Sr., Webb, and Jaworski. Based on Tayao’s observation in his study, up to the early 2000’s, people came with a notion that candidates who have a multitude of television and media exposures, will surely have a huge advantage.

Tayao (2020) also highlighted elected officers who were not television personalities but then had a number of television appearances like that of General Biazon who was famous for defending the Corazon Aquino administration during the coup d'état and Sen. Panfilo Lacson, who had multiple exposures, due to the fact that he was the police chief at the time when people were ousting then President Joseph Ejercito Estrada.

The main objective therefore of this paper is to *ascertain whether there is such a thing as “bobotante” and how does this affect in any way the entire electoral system in the political sphere of the Philippines*. The notion of stringent general pronouncements may imply that the Filipino masses are not being rational when it comes to elections. As people vote only for candidates whom they think are physiologically appealing and is favorable to them by means of parasitism in the guise of apparent aid and political connections in the lightest form of quasi – nepotism

Therefore, to suffice the main objective of this study, the researchers further employ questions relevant to the main question for the objective, the said research questions are as follows: 1) *How is the issue of voting in light of the “bobotante” become moral more than merely political?* 2) *What may be the factors that cause the voters to qualify the action of voting as an act inferior to its very essence?* (e.g., ‘boboto lang naman eh’) 3) *What constitutes the action of recurring voting behavior, or is it even a behavior?* (e.g., ‘why does a typical Filipino voter, settle for a less worthy candidate, or even placing the bar far too low for the setting of expectations of the Filipino people’)

This study is limited only to discourse and expository as it is a discussion paper in nature. Therefore, extensive research may be needed to prove some points which will later be presented. In this regard, the paper, intends to be a threshold of idea conception as the researchers attempt to form a discourse on debunking the term “bobotante”. This term is characterized as someone who is not rational in voting.



## **Literature Review**

### *Filipinos being Forgetful and Forgiving*

In the work of (Sandoval, 2019), 15 of 22 local participants in an informal survey said, that Filipinos in most cases have the tendency to forget their past, while six said no and one said only occasionally. When asked if Filipinos themselves forgive the misconduct or injustice done to them, 15 said yes, five said no and two said not often, considering factors such as the existence, effect, and view of the case. Those interviewed come from the government and private sectors, academe, and unemployed whose ages range between 19 and 65 years old.

The finding is an implication that a percentage of the Filipino population will still be willing to pardon wrongdoings. This finding is not in the positive light; the common layman is afraid to step out of the status quo. Therefore, the status quo is the basis for forgiveness and not the act or even the circumstance is considered. However, the contention still remains that this is a visceral factor of a political being which is always susceptible to manipulation.

In the Philippines, political dynasty has a prevailing impact to an individual's memory. The image of a political party may be subjected to alteration by a political family, a national crisis, or a coup, and the emotions conveyed can impact decision making. Sandoval (2019) further explained that the 1986 People Power Movement subverted an autocratic regime that placed the first woman president of the Philippines, the wife of an assassinated senator, who was a prominent critic of the Marcos regime at that time. People power movements were not only coincidental.

The People Power Movement was also circumstantially political as it placed the confidence of the people as political beings in the political family rule. The implication of such event proved that the combination of transpiring events and the face value of certain political actors appeal to the masses. Therefore, reducing the caliber of intellect and discernment of political participation into sheer political media.

### *Political Manipulation of/ and the Underprivileged*

In 1986 EDSA Revolution, Ferdinand Marcos was thrown-out from power (Aban, N/D). In the 2001 EDSA Revolution, it was Joseph Estrada who stepped down from power. The analysis which (Aban, N/D) presented is that the underprivileged were enticed to be part of or assert a feeling of "belongingness" to a group. Moreover, the leaders of those movements made the people believed that they have the same roots.



The latter means that people who are trapped in poverty join political movements not primarily because of the common principle they had with the party but rather due to influence. The principle of people whether they are for or against the bureaucratic and political institutions are all colluded when being influenced by a political entity. An entity that has the strength and capability to at least match another rival political entity and has the command to claim that just like “the poor” they were also “poor”.

In the same manner that (Caprara and Zimbardo, 2004) contended that political manipulation especially of the underprivileged commences, when a politician exhibits personalizing politics. This strategy manifests closeness to the goals and aspirations of the people whom they target as voters, to gain their trust and confidence. It is explicit that the masses still dominate the populace, (Asian Development Bank, 2018) reported that an approximately 17 million people in the Philippines are below the poverty line, not to mention those within the poverty line.

Therefore, they are targeted by the politicians in winning their confidence, not because of their situation but because of their numbers. A hypothesis suggested that if their numbers may not be so significant, then political actors would be less likely to be close to their personality. The danger, therefore, of manipulation is not only because people are poor but because they are of great numbers.

### *Cultural Patronage*

Another aspect is the debt of gratitude of the politician for a benefactor and vice versa, and the other aspect is the debt of gratitude of the voters (Hutchcroft, 2020) The predicament of a debt of gratitude of a politician to a benefactor creates weaker institutions and political parties are established not for the sake of ideology but for the sake of the relationships among and between the beneficiary and the benefactor.

This scenario becomes a problem in establishing a stand on who to vote for since the predicament is no longer based on the political ideology rather on the face value of the relationship of those who are subject to the debt of gratitude. Therefore, the primary element for reelection is no longer the innate qualification of a politician but the machinery which they have created via cultural patronage. In this regard, an elected politician becomes biased to the benefactors in the name of good relationship and clientelism.

The same is contended by (Weiss, 2016), when the voters become prey to this dubious act, since a certain politician provided them with a certain solution to their specific problem, no matter how immaterial it might be, that then becomes the basis for voting. The recurrence of this circumstance as contextualized on a



situation of a person under the poverty line accumulates for a problem larger than its catalyst.

An elected politician renders clientelism so that confidence will still be won from the constituents making the latter subject to political machination. The people are practically helpless against the system of clientelism and patronage politics, since their qualification for voting a certain person is not the credentials or meritocracy but on personal experience. Nonetheless, the subject of the contention is how those in power are not only choosing to be in power through the system but somehow, they too have been subjected to the perverted system.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The Eichmann problem deals with a perverted notion of executing an act regardless of its end. It assumes that an individual does not see the fundamentals of morality; giving credit to performing a duty that is bestowed upon someone, with the idea of indifference to the end of the said goal. Thus, a culpable action done by the mere fact of omission. It is not a simple moral factor of being indifferent or a case of immoral commission or omission. The threshold idea is that one is not mindful of the end and sees no wrong in whatever means it may be regardless of the end (Shapiro, 2020).

To have a vivid background as to how this problem may be interconnected to the study, the researchers shall have a clear insight on how this problem was even coined and to whom did the realm of philosophy attribute this case. Karl Adolf Eichmann was a transportation and logistics officer during the Second World War and served the Nazi party under Adolf Hitler. In doing such, Eichmann was not primarily the mastermind or even an enabler in the grand scheme of genocide by no less than Adolf Hitler.

Eichmann portrayed himself as an obedient bureaucrat who merely carried out his assigned duties. Eichmann maintained that he had not violated any law and that he was the kind of man who cannot tell a lie (Barenbaum, 2014). Denying responsibility for the mass killings, Eichmann said, "I couldn't help myself; I had orders, but I had nothing to do with that business." Eichmann even professed personal discomfort at hearing about the workings of a gassing installation: "I was horrified. My nerves are not strong enough. I can't listen to such things—such things, without them affecting me."

Hannah Arendt, a political contemporary philosopher, attested that while hearing the case of Adolf Eichmann in the Israeli courts, she was able to draw a structure of ideas that centered on the moral implication of Eichmann as a person, though not justly condemned but deserves condemnation after all, as what is explained in previous paragraphs as illegal but legitimate acts.

In analyzing Eichmann's obtuse reliance on cliches, Arendt (1963) stressed that one is not speaking only of the isolated phrases but of entire plots that impose a



spurious order on human lives. In that light, though Eichmann was condemned by the Israeli government through the Mossad Israeli Secret Service, it was obviously biased since politically, he was arrested without even going through due process and that the Israeli government was not established at the time.

As examined by Arendt, the controversial part of this assessment is when she called the actions of Eichmann as banal rather than notorious or demonic in its kindest light, as Eichmann was considered to be a war criminal and a Holocaust enabler. Arendt's analysis came as though Eichmann's actions though warranted greater punishment because of their lack of proactive action to combat the impending crime, instead did his task as logistics and station master.

*Fig. 1 The Eichmann Problem*



## Methods

The data presented for this study were taken from various published academic articles, statistical particulars, and research. They are as follows: (1) *In Numbers: How PH Voted in the Last Two Midterm Elections* by Addie Pobre in 2019. This specific data presentation is a direct analysis on voter turnouts and the hypothesizing as to how this came to be the result. The raw data are admittedly quantitative in nature, however when already interpreted, they become qualitative due to the nature of the framework employed which is philosophical in nature.

The same is also applied in second data reference which is from (2) *The Data Analysis of Votes, Voters, and Winners of the 2019 Election* by The Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism in 2019 which employed the explication of the statistical division of voters per region and interconnected them with the



results of the vote with contention to the political situation of the specific locus. Lastly (3) *Voters' Practices in The Philippine Election* authored by Glenn Velmonte which used a purposive and descriptive design centered in the province of Cebu.

The study adopted secondary datasets by which analysis will be deployed within the premise of a qualitative study. Thus, drawing its conclusion from the interpretation of the data. The secondary use of datasets offers prospect in the discovery of underlying issues, whilst being associated with the sphere of interest of the study. These utilizations allowed the researchers to create an academic discussion regarding the prevalence of recurring voters' behavior auxiliary to ascertaining the sufficient answer for the main question of this study.

## **Findings And Discussions**

### *Voter Turnout and the Political Machination of Dynasties*

The Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism (2019) showed that in the 2019 election the percentage of voter turnout is measured at approximately 75.81% or 46, 937, 139 voted out of 61, 843, 771 registered voters. The researchers also check on the voter turnout percentage of previous elections, as presented by Pobre (2019), that the 2016 elections boasted a whopping 81.95% voter turnout, 2013 approximated a percentage of 77.31%, 2010 then gives us a 74.99% and finally on the list of election backtrack, the year 2007 gives us 73.10% of voter turnout.

To analyze closely, the midterm elections (years 2007, 2013, and 2019) have a much lower voter turnout count than that of presidential elections. One possible hypothesis for that is people are more into presidential elections for so long a time and the masses always put emphasis on the two highest positions in the government.

Though researchers may be knowledgeable enough to say that the midterm elections are of paramount importance as well as the presidential ones, they may analyze that this may also be a fruit of political machination in regions designated as "territory" of the candidates. Unlike the midterm elections which will divide the Philippine voters into choosing the senators, the presidential election poses a material for regional campaigning and that makes the dynastical discrepancy and probably a problem in the supposedly ethical electoral system.

According to Pobre (2019), in example, the regional territory of the north specifically Ilocos is under the Marcoses and Singsons. Thus, if these families run for a senatorial office and oppose each other, ultimately voters in the area will be split into camps. However, unlike presidential elections, should they both convene on who to support, the territorial region of Ilocos will be focused on one candidate and eventually people would want more of that rather than be split into two camps.



The percentage will prove that a region of mind – exploited voters are only partly to be blamed, since the instigator of the political machinery is the ultimate source as to why the people tend to come out voting. This is in the light of mass opinion but subjected to the higher and much stronger voice, and this now becomes fanaticism.

Bialakowsky (2018) analyzed the works of sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu. According to Bourdieu the “higher voice” has the ability to intervene, or abstain, in the “precise moment” according to the intersection between the definitions agents possess, that of which is possible and impossible and those which are established by a certain social space.

### *Perverted Public Opinion*

The situation in the Philippines with regard to this predicament has become an ordinary factor. Therefore, the goodness that should come out of elections have been corrupted since the treatment of the people to the said event is already plain. The best applied term to such is *corruptio optimi pessima*, (the corruption of the good is the worst). One factor in voters’ behavior in the Philippines is the presence of surveys and prediction months prior to the election date or the penultimate pre – election phase.

The work of Hedman (2010), explicated that the democratic system in the Philippines is figuratively depicted as one that is based on factionalism and clientelism; in such light, political power has been fought through and through by the same names that one which is a feud between political families. In addition to that the political competition is also based on a very superficial claim of patronage that eventually turns into clientelism.

This is the simple exploitation of the needs of the masses, will turn politicians into saying “only I can provide such.” Therefore, voters would likely vote for someone who in their capacity will attempt to give what is “needed” by the voters where in fact they have been exploited. This is in fact a detriment of voting in good faith, the factor of clientelism and factionalism tarnished the voice of the people to vote, though public opinion is explicit.

The question now is that whether public opinion is clearly exhibited by the public, or has it become a nuance covered under the panoply of ill intention and the false promise of providing for a something that is exploited to the electors, in the guise of public opinion? Moreover, public opinion in Philippine politics seems to have been perverted both in its definition and practice.

As bandwagon immediately follows, in the previous statements the researchers drew a premise that a voter votes for one that can provide for their needs, in which the latter is an exploited good by the same person they voted for. Eventually, the support of one voter will spread to their socius and proximities,



testifying that candidate X provided them something and therefore, the other person should also be voting for candidate X.

Fickle mindedness is a factor in perverted mass opinion not by sheer dumb voters, but rather the context of “utang na loob” or abiding gratitude, as explained by Pacopia (2016), which again the researchers shall highlight that the need provided for a person to have such gratitude is an exploited good and in turn they are exploited as promoters of the candidate. Thus, the vote becomes a personal gratification token and no longer an act for the common good.

Hedman (2010) further explained that public opinion in the Philippines is also shaped by surveys and predictions released in the pre-election day phase. This concept is in fact a travesty at least in the Philippine setting as this promotes bandwagon and defiance of the autonomous mind of the voter. In the epistemological sense, this circumstance is an interference of freedom itself, as this promotes flowing of ideas based on popularity and political branding.

Therefore, such circumstance gives a restricted mobilization of the voter themselves as the actor of mobilization is not the voter rather the candidate. The proliferation of political contenders, parties and coalitions in the post-authoritarian period and the practice of “polling” has also gained increasing traction. One example of this strategy is the number and frequency of public opinion surveys conducted for wider dissemination by an expanding field of specialist outfits such as the Social Weather Station.

The condition of voters therefore depends on the surveys as a machinery that will precondition them in the forthcoming elections. It is likely that individual candidates commission survey firms hypothetically and then come up with a political branding. The political branding system, at least in the interpretation and analysis of this study is when a candidate creates a strategy to market their political scheme, which may either be in good faith or not.

If surveys are commissioned to do such, then firms would release the results of the survey not only for the benefit of the candidate but also other politicians who they may want to endorse, eventually the surveys will have an effect to the people. If the latter decides not to be “agere contra” or against the tendency, then the likelihood of one commissioning survey firms may conspicuously win.

In its ethical means, when survey firms give results conceived upon ill intention and influence public opinion in its negative sense of weaponization and exploitation as elucidated by Bourdieu (1979). The concept becomes an artefact whose function is to dissimulate the fact to the state of opinion at a given moment and becomes a system of forces, of tensions.

#### *Statistical Analysis on Voters' Practices*

Once more, another proof that Filipino voters should not take all the blame in the grand scheme of the electoral system, is that the existence of a “bobotante” has a low to nonexistence. The data are taken from research statistics that is



concerned on the voters' practices in the Philippines. Though the paper will not highlight all the data from the previous study, the findings of this paper will be substantiated by a program of data analyses coming from the voters of Cebu.

The question may be why Cebu? First, the only data analyses paper that is concerned with voter behavior which the researchers used as resource is one concentrated in Cebu. Second, the researchers also took into consideration the voter turnout rate; and inevitably, Cebu and the Visayas turned out to have a large amount of voter turnout rate in the 2013.

As presented by Pobre (2019), Cebu had a *premium percentage of 83.45% voter turnout*, the highest so far. The region in which Cebu is under, is considered a place for critical voters and an ideal nutshell model for the Philippines. Cebu is diverse with *approximately 44 political parties claiming parts of the said territory to have supported such*, according to the Commission on Elections statistics as interpreted by Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism in 2019.

The chart from the data of the research of Velmonte (2020), which will be presented, will not include other factors that are already out of the bounds of this study. Though, the chart will only focus on factors that affect voters' behavior, it will prove sufficient as to the requisites of this paper. The chart will give emphasis on the five municipalities of Cebu that are clustered into classes according to their regional ranking and capacity to earn income (Velmonte, 2020).

**Table 1.** Cebu Municipalities according to Class

MUNICIPALITY	CLASS
Minglanilla	First Class
San Fernando	Second Class
Cordova	Third Class
Sogod	Fourth Class
Ronda	Fifth Class

To have it justifiable as possible and not a replacement for the statistical report for the entire country, but at least presenting a non-frivolous analysis worthy of interpretation in this paper, the chart will be represented by the average numbers which will show the hierarchy of problems voters face during the pre-election phase.



**Table 2.** *Voters' Practices in The Philippine Election*

<b>Variable / Indicator</b>	<b>MUNICIPALITY BY CLASS AS CLUSTERED</b>					<b>Overall Mean</b>
	<b>1st</b>	<b>2nd</b>	<b>3rd</b>	<b>4th</b>	<b>5th</b>	
Partisanship	3.57	2.7	3.2	2.77	3.2	2.97
Vote Buying	3.13	2.25	2.47	2.25	2.66	2.55
Pol. Dynasty	2.7	2.8	3.0	2.42	2.85	2.86
Nepotism	1.6	2.3	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.24
Debt.	1.6	2.5	2.3	2.0	2.1	2.16
Gratitude						
Bribery	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.3	1.7	1.33
Nuisance	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.63
Candidate						

It is a little surprising that vote buying was not the first one, but rather partisanship which is a factor that is to be addressed. A hypothetical assessment on such may come from the notion that allegiance to one who is in power is proven to best serve the interest of the voters individually and not collectively as it ought to be.

This result would also bring up a concept that the root of all other factors is partisanship, just like in the earlier assumption that clientelism is based on such. This concept according to Abocejo (2014), however may be true to the public choice theory which explains that the voters act as an individual. Though an individual considers the community, the primacy is given not on the common good but on the interest of the self and their proximities.

In that light, gone are the days where nepotism reigned supreme as the top factor on how malicious practices are committed. It is then, converted into a higher class of nepotism which is partisanship, the action is still correlated to the culturally bound Filipino, as family and affiliation are still enabling factors for one to achieve power. The cited paper concluded that the Filipino public are not actually irrational, in fact the evil act is banal, and the voter is aware of it. This also is a factor to which we debunk the term "bobotante" as mirrored in the very title of the study.

## CONCLUSION

The Eichmann problem reaches a paramount moral argumentation, that is to carry out a daily task. In fact, a task to be carried out is therefore presumed as duty, and by virtue of the office he holds, it is then rightful for him to be on the side of duty. However, the moral debate here is whether his duty was the right



thing to do at the given moment, when he knew fully well that he was an accomplice to commit a crime against humanity.

Eichmann's actions when dissected can be seen in this view; the so-called duty in which he was in a predicament to, entails the property of self-serving interest. One aspect of his predicament was, it was branded as an illegal but legitimate act, as it was done in full consciousness and rationality to the extent of even having the will do such.

However, the responsibility of Eichmann in the light of moral obligation has been neglected, as he turned a blind eye on the crime to be committed. As described by moral philosophers in politics such as Hannah Arendt; Eichmann was a normal human being doing his task, however what made it very controversial is that; though he could not have done anything to such; he could have at least stood for what was right.

In a transcendental vantage point, Eichmann was surviving the day per day's circumstance, and did not think of the ends that will occur as properly cited in the explanation of what the Eichmann case is. The lack of remorse did not come from evil intention but rather from non-intention at all. "The Banality of Evil" as called out by Hannah Arendt is when moral evil is no longer seen as evil but rather ordinary.

The voting behaviors in the Philippines, may be likened to such, as the person in good faith decides autonomously but is derived by the many factors which includes exploitation by the ones in power and the deprivation of necessities which is manipulated in such light. However, one has the ability to even decide in good faith even if presented with these factors, but truth be told that a risk of suffering individually for the good of everyone is not something one desires to take.

The voting behavior poses a very huge commonality with the Eichmann problem, where people tend to think thoroughly, of the day's survival and not the common good. It is in fact a legal but illegitimate action, though practiced in bad faith but necessary for the day's survival.

The action of such immorality which is to vote according not to the decision of common good but for the apparent and conspicuous good of the present is an action that is not taken into consideration by the common fellow. In view of transcendentality, it has now become common to be in the practice of vote buying tolerance, and the immediate appropriation of thought is merited not to the individual actor but to the society to which this kind of behavior exists.

It was indeed pride and ego that drove Eichmann to say that he did nothing wrong, for he believed that he was only carrying out his duty (self-serving interest). That is the same mind frame that voters who, if we may so quote who have been under the age of government malpractice and the non - political involvement, are explicitly manifesting.



It is substantiated that people are not being fickle minded as they still prefer to become followers and recipients of misinformation. People freely act as "activist-initiator" or leader on political issues themselves but fail to verify the facts and fall straight to the fallacies. These fallacies result to a mixture of verified and unverified information that tend to easily switch people's political opinions and beliefs. Therefore, the act of malpractices in voting have eventually become banal.

In the apparent problem of voting behavior, the voters actually think of their choice but have chosen to vote for someone who can solve a problem instantaneously even if it is not a long-term solution. The formulation of this conclusion is based not in the manner to which the researchers attempt to condemn the voters but instead to relate it to the experience of Eichmann. The wrongness of the idea is therefore cited as ordinary and is no longer disturbing for society. It is in this very nature, that this research tends to open avenues to at least start to amend the Eichmann problem of society.

Therefore, the voters do not totally possess freedom, as they want to bet their votes to another more worthy candidate, however, the situation simply does not allow them to decide. The most unfortunate part is that people are becoming fickle minded due to such bandwagons. This element becomes a factor for candidates to exploit the goods that are deprived from the masses and use this strategy to disguise the fact that a candidate is doing them a favor or the very concept of "*quid pro quo*" or a favor for a favor.

The weaponization of the system, most especially that of the survey firms attempt to dissuade the public from having liberal thought. This concept is the same with that of Eichmann where he was imprisoned for his thought of the banality of evil. Eichmann had a choice to exit the system, but had he done it; it would not have cost him anything meritorious, the same situation which voters are in right now.

In the end, the Eichmann case must be a jumping board for the researchers to further see what the problem is. It is not sheer dumbness of the people, since the researchers were able to find and analyzed articles and were able to prove that voters are not "*bobotante*". The likelihood of this situation falls on the predicament that Filipinos are underdeveloped simply because, like the candidates; the voters become passive of long-term development and in turn politically participate under the thought of damage control.

The voters then are curtailed by the freedom and autonomy of thought because the circumstances do not permit them to choose wisely the candidates. The Eichmann case is a conspicuous case of moral combat to which one must always be on the side of the common good. Students, workers, and Filipino voters in general, are always a promising generation of political activists who can but will never change to voice out their aspiration to elect representatives who will protect their values, political aspirations, and hope.



## REFERENCES

- Aban. A. (n.d) The Poor and the Politics of Manipulation. *bulatlat*. [www.bulatlat.com/archive1/013poor.htm](http://www.bulatlat.com/archive1/013poor.htm)
- Abocejo, F. (2014). The Veracity of Vote Buying: Perspective of the Philippine Electoral System. *International Journal on Graft and Corruption*, 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7719/ijgc.v2i1.301>
- Arendt, H. (1963); Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of evil. The Viking Press  
New York. [https://platypus1917.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/arendt\\_eichmanninjerusalem.pdf](https://platypus1917.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/arendt_eichmanninjerusalem.pdf)
- Batalla, E.V.C. (2020), "Grand corruption scandals in the Philippines", *Public Administration and Policy: An Asia-Pacific Journal*, 23 (1), 73-86. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PAP-11-2019-0036>
- Barenbaum, M. (2014). Adolf Eichmann German Military Official. *Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Adolf-Eichmann>
- Bialakowksy, A. (2018). Daily Life and Sociological Reclassifications According to Giddens, Bourdieu and Luhmann. Universidad de Buenos Aires-Conicet, Argentina. *Convergencia Revista De Ciencias Sociales*, (77), 125-147. <http://doi.org/10.29.101/crcs.v25i77.4456>
- Biswas, B., Ingle, N. Roy M. (June 2014). Influence of Social Media on Voting Behavior. *American Research Institute for Policy Development*, 2, 127-155. [http://jppgnet.com/journals/jppg/Vol\\_2\\_No\\_2\\_June\\_2014/7.pdf](http://jppgnet.com/journals/jppg/Vol_2_No_2_June_2014/7.pdf)
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). Public Opinion Does Not Exist. B. Bourgeois ideology: Public Opinion. 124-131. <https://is.muni.cz/el/fss/podzim2019/POLn4102/um/blok1/Bourdieu PO Does Not Exist.pdf>
- Caprara, G. V., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2004). Personalizing Politics: A Congruency Model of Political Preference. *American Psychologist*, 59(7), 581-594. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.7.581>



Hedman, E. (2010). The Politics of “Public Opinion” in the Philippines, in: *Journal of Current*

Southeast Asian Affairs. *SAGE Publications Ltd*, 29(4), 97-118  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/186810341002900405>

Hutchcroft, P. (2020). Strong Patronage, Weak Parties. *Australian National University*, 224.

<https://doi.org/10.1142/11616>

Pacopia, C., (2016). Cultural Norms that Shape Vote Buying in the Philippines ; (cited Bava

1998). *Academia*.

[https://www.academia.edu/40529177/CULTURAL\\_NORMS\\_THAT\\_SHAPE\\_VOTE\\_BUYING\\_IN\\_THE\\_PHILIPPINES](https://www.academia.edu/40529177/CULTURAL_NORMS_THAT_SHAPE_VOTE_BUYING_IN_THE_PHILIPPINES)

Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism (2019). Data Analysis of votes, voters, and

winners. <https://pcij.org/article/3034/data-analysis-votes-voters-and-winner>

Pobre, A. (2019). In Numbers: How PH Voted in last two midterm elections; *Rappler*.

<https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/iq/voter-turnout-elections-philippines>

Sandoval, L. (2019). What the Philippines Election Tells the World. *Inside over*.

<https://www.insideover.com/society/philippine-elections-and-what-it-tells-the-world.html>

Shapiro I. (2020). Lectures on the Eichmann Case and the Problem of Illegal but Legitimate

Acts. Yale University.

<https://www.coursera.org/lecture/moral-politics/the-eichmann-case-and-problem-of-illegal-but-legitimate-acts-EAFN1>

Tayao, E. (2020). OPINION: Analyzing Philippine Electoral Behavior; Ateneo de Manila

School of Government. *Abs-cbn news*. <https://news.abs-cbn.com/blogs/opinions/01/23/20/opinion-analyzing-philippine-electoral-behavior>

Velmonte, G. (2020). Voters’ Practices In The Philippine Election. *Journal of Critical Reviews*.

(7), 8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31838/jcr.07.08.200>



Weiss, M. (2016). Chapter Eight: Patronage Politics and Parties in the Philippines: Insights from the 2016 Elections. *World Scientific.* [https://doi.org/10.1142/9789811212604\\_0008](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789811212604_0008)

