

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the way the Philippine government frames its different action to similar attacks in different years. Government statements collected after the Davao Bombing and Butig clash in 2016, as well as Marawi siege in 2017, shows that the perpetrators, symbol, and degree of severity of the attacks are similar. However, those attacks prompted different responses. In 2016, the government denied the presence of ISIS and only implemented the Proclamation 55 or State of National Emergency on the Account on Lawless Violence without necessarily suspend the privilege on the writ of habeas corpus. Differently, in 2017, the government said that the terrorist group is ISIS and enacted martial law or Proclamation 216. How the government portrays and justifies the different responses are of interest here. The research found that although the similar problems prompted different responses, the Philippine government was able to make a smooth transition to the hard approach of martial law through the early establishment of frame before the enactment of martial law. Diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frame were used to justify the tougher measure that is controversial in nature.

Keywords: *martial law, ISIS, frame*