



## PROCEEDINGS

### Third World Studies Center Thirtieth Anniversary

FEBRUARY 5, 2007  
BALAY KALINAW  
UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES-DILIMAN

**FRANCISCO “DODONG” NEMENZO JR.** (FOUNDER, THIRD WORLD STUDIES CENTER [TWSC]; FORMER PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES [UP], AND PROFESSOR EMIRITUS OF THE COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND PHILOSOPHY): Young faculty members, mostly veterans of the First Quarter Storm, showed interest in doing scholarly works along the radical orientation; but the existing departments were not always sympathetic to this unorthodox leftist thinking. So, as Dean of the UP Diliman College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) at that time, I saw the need for a new structure where they could pursue their best interest without eliciting the backlash of the dictatorship. But I did not know where to begin. It was Pres. Ferdinand Marcos himself who showed me how. When I was in UP Baguio to lecture on academic freedom, I read the latest speech of Marcos, outlining the four thrusts of his foreign policy. One of them was to develop closer ties with the Third World. I entirely revised my prepared lecture to announce that the CAS would undertake studies on the Third World in line with Marcos’s foreign policy. To my surprise, the next day, the *Daily Express*, the chief mouthpiece of the dictatorship, carried a front page editorial commending the CAS vision. I immediately called Prof. Randy David to brainstorm on this project. Since most of the Third World countries at that time were coming in with critical views on imperialism, some of them were leaning towards socialism. Marcos created a good opportunity that we should utilize. Randy responded with enthusiasm and so I asked him to take charge of the program. We had to immediately take the

opportunity while Marcos's wish was still fresh in the minds of his enforcers so that if we got into trouble, we could always argue that, "Isinasagawa lang namin ang layunin ng Presidente (We are just implementing the goal of the President)."

But there were no available budget, personnel, and facilities for this at that time, so we had to find a solution. The Dean had ample discretionary funds, and there was a vacant item for research assistant in the Dean's office. But the only available space was a room without windows in the third floor of the Faculty Center. This was how we started. It also happened that the newly established Soviet Embassy put up a book exhibit at the Palma Hall. The embassy also provided book shelves for this exhibit. After the exhibit, I asked the Soviet Ambassador to donate the books but to tell you the truth, I was only interested in bookshelves because all the books were in Spanish. Not knowing much about the Philippines at that time, the Russians must have thought that Filipinos are Spanish-speaking. Those books formed the nucleus of the Third World Studies Library. Soon the book collection had grown from donations. The biggest donation came from the progressive American scholar in Daniel Boone Schirmer.

The Third World Studies relied on the enthusiasm and the dedication of volunteers. Randy himself served without honorarium, only the research assistant was being paid. The small group discussions organized by Third World Studies were attracting students and faculty members; original papers have started coming out. Randy got a grant from the United Nations University (UNU) to study the banana industry. The UNU also commissioned Randy David and the Third World Studies to organize seminars for radical scholars in Southeast Asia and there was a representative of a little-known French foundation who just walked in to offer the publication grant.

At the height of the struggle against the Chico River Dam Project of Marcos, the Third World Studies went into business. Third World Studies's research assistant Max Garming brought a bag of coffee beans from the Cordilleras and asked an Igorot girl to grind the coffee in the traditional Kalinga way. The idea was to link the Kalinga coffee growers to the coffee lovers in Manila. All the profits would go to the campaign against the Chico River Dam. In a fit of poetic euphoria, Randy made a label describing the beautiful slopes of the Cordillera that the government allowed to be destroyed; of course, the business venture was a total failure. The other outlets refused to touch this crudely-packaged coffee with a subversive label. The Third World Studies had

to sell Max Garming's coffee to a few walk-in customers. At that time, I associated the Third World Studies office with the smell of Kalinga coffee.

The three classrooms in the fourth floor of the Palma Hall were converted into an office and a library to provide the Third World Studies with a bit of breathing space. With access to adjacent rooms, the Third World Studies started to offer short-term non-degree courses for student activists not only from UP but also from other schools. These courses became the recruiting ground for Bukluran para sa Ikaunlad ng Sosyalistang Isip at Gawa (Union of Filipino Socialists [BISIG]), a union of Filipino socialists which Randy and I also founded.

The Third World Studies continued to depend on the Dean's discretionary fund because it was operating illegally without the approval of the Board of Regents (BOR). That was deliberate because Randy reckoned that to have it formally established by the BOR, we might invite Quezon Hall intervention. But the secret could not be kept for long. Two French scholars called then UP Pres. Onofre D. Corpus and asked if they could visit the Third World Studies. They had read some of its publications and thought highly of them. President Corpus did not even know it existed! So he rightly guessed that if such a thing exists in UP at all, it could only be in the College of Arts and Sciences. So I was forced to admit that there was indeed a Third World Studies Program and claimed that it did not require the BOR approval because it was nothing but a project of the Dean's office. I brought the cover story that it was inspired by the speech of President Marcos. Instead of reproaching me, President Corpus suggested that we would have it formally instituted by the BOR. I immediately asked Randy to prepare the necessary papers. Then he decided, indeed a very clever gimmick, to reproduce the foreign policy in the speeches of Marcos and attach the standard cover of the Third World Studies Program. I submitted that as a sample of Third World publications and the regents were duly interested. So the Third World Studies Center (TWSC) was officially established with its own budget and Randy became its Director.

The underground also attempted to intervene when the TWSC started gaining popularity among the students. A ranking cadre invited me to his hideout to complain that the TWSC was spreading the counter-revolutionary virus of dependency theory. He suggested that it be renamed the "Three World" Studies Center to propagate Mao Tze-

tung thought. I told him politely that the College of Arts and Sciences shall uphold academic freedom and individual scholars have the prerogative of using whatever theory they deem appropriate.

When I became the President of UP, I always cited the TWSC as a model. Each unit that wanted to be elevated as a Center was told by then UP Vice President Maria Serena Diokno to start as a program with a shoestring budget. Each must first produce results before applying for the status of a Center. If a unit fails, then we can abolish it without any administrative problem. I am proud that in 30 years, the TWSC has lived up to our vision and established an international reputation as a haven for radical scholarship.

**RANDOLF “RANDY” DAVID** (FOUNDING DIRECTOR, TWSC [1977-1992] AND PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, UP DILIMAN): Thank you so much Dr. Teresa “Tesa” Encarnacion Tadem, fellows, and staff of the TWSC for organizing this event to commemorate the founding of the Center in 1977 and for asking me to share my reflections on the role that the TWSC best performed in the life of UP and of the Filipino nation as a whole in the last three decades. I was thirty-one years old when the Center was founded and I stepped down when I was forty-six. I think I spent the most productive years of my life at the Center. I consider that as the highest point of my academic life. I think one of the best things that I did as director of the Center was to recruit Macaria “Caring” Francisco, Bienvenida “Bien” Lacsamana, and Ireneo “Erning” Francisco, they are truly the best persons here. Tesa was my research assistant and Ditsi [Carolino] was the Center’s first student assistant.

The founding of this organization or institution may be considered as a mirror of the times and the milieu where it took place. But it is something that becomes apparent to its participants only after some considerable time. We have to step out of the skin of the present to be able to see more clearly the act of founding as an integral moment in the life of the larger system of which it is a part, in this particular place, UP. Thirty years—they seem like a very long time but from where I am today at sixty-one, they are not. That was more or less how old the independent Filipino republic was in 1977. We were then still very much pre-occupied with settling old scores with our erstwhile colonial master, the United States of America. We were still asking how a sovereign nation should behave. The US military bases loomed large in our consciousness reminding us that the colonial times still persisted.

Four Filipino nationalists spoke at the colloquium that launched the Center in February 1977. They were Jose “Pepe” Diokno, Renato Constantino, Salvador P. Lopez, and Alejandro Lichauco. They were all civil libertarians as well as the most active proponents of nationalist development. Their presence at the launch signified UP’s critical outlook on the Marcos dictatorship. With the exception of Lopez, they had all been guests at Marcos’s prisons, Diokno being one of the most prominent detainees. In 1977, Martial Law was barely five years old. Although the regime had somehow by then begun to relax its iron grip, the University remained the favorite hunting ground of military spies. Many of our student leaders and young faculty had gone underground at that time. We were asserting our freedoms but we were also careful, as Dodong pointed out, not to call too much attention to the new center as a possible breeding ground of dissidents.

The Center was one of three non-degree programs that were initiated at the beginning of Dodong Nemenzo’s term as Dean of the UP Diliman College of Arts and Sciences. Apart from the Third World Studies, we had the Folklore Studies Program while the Extramural Studies Program. Folklore Studies Program had Dr. Damiana Eugenio from the humanities and literature as director and Extramural Studies Program had Dr. Ruben Umali from the natural sciences as director. I was director of the Third World Studies Program from the social sciences. The Folklore Studies Program was meant to stimulate research on Filipino values and indigenous concepts. The Extra-mural Studies was to serve as a mechanism to coordinate the extension lecture tours that the College organized in order to form a closer link between the UP faculty and the less endowed tertiary schools in the country, in particular the provincial colleges and universities. The Third World Studies Program allowed us to travel to provinces to give lectures.

The Third World Studies was to be a place where unstructured discussions, patterned after the common room in the British universities, could be held. All we have in mind was actually to reserve a room so we could talk. It was not meant to offer a degree program or to coordinate existing ones. The Center was supposed to organize lectures, launch studies, put up publications, and build a resource collection that cut across disciplines and colleges. The Center’s natural clientele were the faculty and students in the General Education (GE) courses from the very beginning. The advantage of this arrangement was that this gave to the Center the tremendous latitude in the choice of activities. Its disadvantage was that it was not an academic structure in

any bureaucratic sense and, therefore, it depended entirely at the beginning on the unprogrammed savings of the College. For about two years, we have only one personnel item for research assistant. For a long time, there was no fixed budget for the tasks the Center was supposed to undertake. But the times were full of challenges, all we needed was a mimeographing machine which was our first acquisition, apart from the Russian bookshelves. So we already had a mimeographing machine, a room without windows at the Faculty Center, and a few chairs in which to hold lectures.

The charm of the Third World came with the novelty and exhilaration on new paths to emancipation and modernity and it immediately conjured for us the bigger community of ex-communists, wanting to chart their own path to development. Third World became a short-cut concept for all the problems that bug our own society: political repression, mass poverty, gross-inequality, corruption, cultural alienation, environmental degradation, marginalization of indigenous peoples, insurgency, and foreign indebtedness. Then it also became associated with the vision of development that sought to avoid the pitfalls and dangers posed by the Western capitalist model and the Eastern socialist style. In 1997, we were just ten years away from the upheavals that shook Eastern Europe and which eventually led to the implosion of the Soviet Union. No one could have foreseen these changes in the global landscape. There was a palpable need to comprehend our situation more carefully than either the Maoist framework or the modernization theories would allow. This need drove young scholars to forge links with people in other countries of the Third World starting with Southeast Asia, South Asia, Latin America, and Africa. Thus, we launched one of the first regional studies of the Center entitled "Transnationalization: The State and Peoples' Movements." For the first time in the history of the UP faculty, members of the academic community in UP Diliman started to travel to other Southeast Asian countries. Before that, we were mainly traveling to the United States. This project was funded by the UNU for five years. The yearly seminars that were organized under the auspices of this project brought many young academics of the UP to a sustained conversation with their counterparts in Southeast Asia. The Center assumed the role in the region that was not possible at that time in a more highly managed academic settings of Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia. Therefore, the TWSC became a clearing house for emancipatory ideas which were published either in the in-house

journal, *Kasarinlan* (Independence), or in the regional journal that was also edited by the Center. For some years, it was the journal of the Southeast Asian network entitled *New Asian Visions*.

Toward the end of my directorship in 1992, the problems and issues took a slightly different shape. The language which economic modernity came with tremendous currency, not just in the Philippines but all over the region. The dependency theory which had dominated our thinking in the late 1970s up to the early 1980s suffered a crisis on account of the strong showing of the region's economic tigers. Far from South Korea and Taiwan, Malaysia and Singapore seemed able to force ahead as newly industrializing countries (NICs) on account of their bold insertion within the circuits of the global economy. I stepped down from the directorship of the Center at the time when Fidel Ramos became the president of the country. Globalism was ascendant, there was an economic boom in the region. During this time, there were suggestions that the name of the TWSC be changed to "Center for Global Studies." I have no fundamental objection to this shift except that it seemed to me swiping the internal problems caused by the uneven development that was taking place under the auspices of globalization. With the Asian boom soon came an abrupt hole in July 1997 when the NICs in the region came crashing down beneath the weight of the hot money and the previous seven years of boom which flowed out in just two weeks as the financial crisis worked its way across the region. Once more, the problems we thought had been solved—mass poverty, corruption, insurgency, and mass indebtedness—became visible. Little had changed in the circumstances of the poor in the region.

It is interesting to sketch the history of the departments and centers like the TWSC because they offer us a glimpse of a social system of intellectual and political discourse that tries to understand itself even as it continuously maps and remaps returning to its environment. I have always said that the effective life of an institution is roughly about fifteen years. After that, the institution tends to prolong its life by inventing new terms and re-hashing old subjects and research agenda done by all academics, the UP included. Fortunately, TWSC did not focus much on structures and ornamental programs. It has been around for thirty years. It is almost incredible. That is twice the lifetime of any conventional institution. I look forward to its next fifteen years; then I hope to see the next thirty years of the TWSC.

**ALEXANDER MAGNO** (DIRECTOR, TWSC [1992-1995] AND PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, UP DILIMAN): The thing I recall during that time was *Kasarinlan* finally made money by publishing political pornography, which were the internal debates within the communist movement. That was probably the high point of that period. Anyway, I just realized that the TWSC is already thirty years old and I realized as well that I have been with the UP Department of Political Science for 31 years. My teaching post vastly became more endurable and enjoyable because the TWSC provided a comfort zone where prohibited ideas can be discussed; if TWSC was not there I might have ditched teaching.

The TWSC from 1992 to 1995 was predominantly engaged in the intraleft critique in terms of the *Kasarinlan* publications and the public fora that we organized. We organized two seminars on Marxism in the Philippines. During this time, we also had policy dialogues mainly dealing with ideas and policy issues concerning the ratification of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which would lead to the establishment of World Trade Organization (WTO). And that time, I supported the ratification of GATT but the Center opposed its ratification. The treaty also was the final break in the short friendship I had with Filemon "Popoy" Lagman because he wanted me to be the figurehead in some sort of anti-GATT coalition, but I told him that I supported GATT. That period was mainly dominated by the concept of globalization efforts and rules. And then there was an intense and eventually violent disagreements within the Philippine communist movement. I think those were the issues that engrossed us. And during my stint as director, I basically moved paradigms.

I took up two consultancies after that, one at the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) and the other at the Department of Finance (DOF). At DTI, I contributed to policymaking relating to trade and investment attractiveness, while at DOF, I was involved in a privatization program. Both of which were in a sense counter-Third World. But the TWSC continued to be a forum for alternative ideas and I must say that the Center should exert more effort through engagement in the policy debate.

My non-governmental organization activities in the last twelve years were sort of in the other side of the spectrum. From 1996 up to the present, I am the president of the Foundation for Economic Freedom, which advocated and mounted campaign for economic

reforms—the need to create a market-friendly environment. The best campaign was for the liberalization of the Retail Trade Act.

In a sense, the Third World intellectual episode was a chapter in my own journey and I have basically reviewed and relented many ideas that I took so dearly. There are also policy disagreements between Tesa and myself. I basically do not understand her language and she could not understand mine. And I see on the program that I am supposed to talk about globalization and I knew before that I do not understand that term. But what I do understand is that there is a theater for policy debate and a theater for policy engagement and the theater is won by the superior policy alternative. And this would mean a good grounding in research. So let me end my point, I am still involved as a development banker and my main concern in the last four years has been building the nautical highway, the Roll-on, Roll-off (RORO) project, which involves studies of local economies. I have been developing a cadre of barefoot bankers to make RORO lines viable and to facilitate heavy investments in the RORO lines. In the past two years, the most satisfying event that has come into my life is to be involved with the government. And I think that is the direction I am going.

**MARIA SERENA DIOKNO** (DIRECTOR, TWSC [1995-2000] AND PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, UP DILIMAN): The debate that Randy has talked on, whether the TWSC might be renamed the “Global Studies Center” or whether the Third World is still valid as an intellectual concept, is in part, a function of the new postcolonial thinking that sort of ripped the College of Social Sciences and Philosophy (CSSP). And I think it was because the previous administration of the College was very focused on Pilipinolohiya/Filipinolohiya that the whole relationship between CSSP and the TWSC came into the frame.

I was thinking maybe at some point, perhaps in the next fifteen years of the Center, when we are all gone, interesting work might be done on the intellectual history of those who have led, taken part, and participated in the TWSC. I think this because last week in Cebu, we launched a book of Resil Mojares entitled *Brains of the Nation*, and he speaks about people like Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera and Pedro Paterno at the turn of the century. I mean, it is interesting to take a look at how we ourselves have travelled over the years.

In any case, that was the atmosphere when I entered the TWSC and I decided to plunge directly into working and be part of a project on citizenship and democracy funded by—horror of horrors—the United States Agency for International Development. And I figured that if the founding father of the Center could use Marcos’s speech to his advantage, to our advantage, then so too would I use American money, to examine the concepts that were very close to our hearts. This project consumed two years of my term and it took us and the staff traveling around the country and consulting different sectors and communities. That was a very interesting experience because we were told that we have liberty in designing the project and we were trying to look at the multiple layers of identity that engulfed our political culture. The subject that easily came to mind was the one with the Muslims because they say that they are truly Filipino, but it is just the word they put down when they are asked of their nationality. And it is the last layer of their identity; first is the clan, second is the ethnic group, third is Muslim, fourth is Bangsamoro, and fifth, only if necessary, is Filipino. We were getting into these kinds of studies which were really interesting.

That was also the time when we moved the office to the lower ground floor of the Palma Hall which is much larger; on top of it is the library. Dr. Consuelo Joaquin-Paz was a very supportive dean. She gave us a huge space. That was also the time when the Board of Regents elevated the TWSC to the status of Center primarily because of the Center’s pretty good track record. In a sense, I was spoiled because Randy was the institution builder, Alex followed of course. And of course I followed but I did not really have to do much in training the staff. I knew all stories about Randy, how strict he was. But I was so happy because I did not have to do any extra work. They were really well-trained and that was great help for me. We kept up the series of trainings and we got visiting professors and lecturers and, of course, we opened the Center as a refuge to all political activists, including Burmese political refugees.

In closing, looking back at the period especially in the light of today, I have no doubt that the Third World is still a valid concept even if President Arroyo insists we are no longer in the Third World and that we are in “Enchanted Kingdom” as she prefers to call it. I suppose, in my own way, I have a certain perverted sense of gratitude towards her because the smoke machine remains there and we will continue to be in the Third World. The Center will continue to have a reason for

pursuing its interest in the problems of our society. So it was a good three years. I would like to thank the staff. We could not have done any of the work if we did not have such a dedicated staff. You are the strength of the Center.

**MIRIAM CORONEL FERRER** (DIRECTOR, TWSC [2000-2004] AND PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, UP DILIMAN): The eve of the twenty-first century held both a promise and a curse for the world including the so-called Third World. New discourses and new social movements were transformed in the priorities and norms of people. Many countries underwent democratic transitions but many countries as well fell apart as based on contested identities. States failed their people, worse states failed.

Today, fifteen minutes of world news would tell us that political violence remains the hallmark of our worldly existence. The use of violence to exact leverage and suit political needs and interest is available for everyone—states, non-state, anti-state, and pseudo-states alike. Sure there are some blessings to count, for one the number of conflicts supposedly decreasing in 2006, notably in sub-Saharan Africa, and all battle-related deaths and displacements have gone down. The dangers posed by the premises of preventive war have been unmasked by the clash of disruptive conflict era, also US invasion. There is also an emerging consensus that wars of oppression are at the center. The use of terrorist methods, those acts that violate the norms of international humanitarian law is generally condemned because political violence is repulsive. Nobody, not even the most guilty, would openly admit responsibility. Despite these trends and emerging counter norms to violence-driven world, the realities still hurt. Ongoing wars have been lethal. Most past and present aggressor-states continue to defend their policies and back these up with the surge of more troops. The label terrorism has become a catch-all phrase to all threats to the all powerful states or to the dominant world order. Worse, it has stigmatized all the followers of Islam. Non-state terrorism, meanwhile, is drawing attention on the states' role.

The university has played a role in discerning all these developments. People in their confusion or exasperation become disinterested and desensitized. I am afraid that this is the present state of many Filipinos. In the Netherlands, a rightist politician was killed and attacked, and citizens went to streets in a non-partisan protest against the assassination. In Turkey, one journalist was killed and thousands joined the funeral.

Several hundreds of journalists, lawyers, activists, and politicians have been killed in the last five years in our country. Why is there no groundswell of people coming out to say, "We do not tolerate all these violence?" Instead, condemnation of political killings has become highly partisan. It matters only if the victims come from the North's camp.

The TWSC, as a university center, must keep its academic credentials solid through cutting-edge research and timely publications. Equally important, it must serve as a living, vibrant venue for engagement to debate and analysis. The first arena where the Center must play this role is the university itself, especially among the students. There is an apparent slack in unorthodoxy in the student movement today. For most parts, there is a highly visible well-organized national democratic constituency. There are equally idealistic sections of the studentry that are looking for alternatives, including alternatives to UP's traditionally dominant alternative. If you want the ranks of the critical and passionate citizenry who will stand up against political violence to expand, we have to invest once more in our students. Our generations are advancing in age and yet so much remain to be done. My proposal, of course, does not mean that the Center should not remain connected to the rest of society and the state. But there is a need to reach out and harness the UP students' interest and participation in sociopolitical issues. The war or peace question is a key policy issue, so are social, cultural, economic, political, gender, and environmental questions. The Center should be at the center of a dialogue process that could discern this question. Growing interest in social movements can open up a discussion on the role or impact of ethics of violence on or in social movements. Through the Center, the students can examine, defend, and contest discourses and narratives involving diverse positions, their premises about humanity, their notions of the state and society. From these engagements, new strategies and tactics for social and political change can emerge. The energy that could be generated by a critical and revitalized student movement in UP will reverberate in the rest of the society and into the future. I believe that because war has defined our human existence, the only radical option is peace. Otherwise, there is only the past introducing itself in the present. The past condemned to be repeated because leaders are trapped in their orthodox ways and thinking. Orthodoxy is a formidable opponent.

Certainly, the Center can play a role in imagining this alternative peace-oriented future. What would make up a peace-oriented economy,

not arms production, blood diamonds, or the array of services servicing the needs of the military camp. A peace-oriented economy provides essentials for life. It ensures human dignity through meaningful work and distribution of wealth through various mechanisms such as taxations, subsidies, laws against monopolies, and the like. It is committed to the elimination of the violence of poverty.

A peace-oriented society is one where well-being, peaceful coexistence, and cultural diversity have teased the violence of exclusion and oppression. The schools, the mass media, families, and other social institutions promote among children and adults skills, dancing, instead of fighting, dialogue and not monologue.

There should be no illusion that economics will solve politics as most people assume about the nature of armed conflicts. Only a peace-oriented politics can bring about a transformed society and can ensure equitable and sustainable development. A peace-oriented politics is one where there is free, fair, and open contestation of ideas, leadership and policies. Power is not from physical or material advantage but from the force of vision and integrity. The wisdom comes from the lessons of history and the capacity to act. Power is shared, not monopolized. All are aware of their rights as they are of their responsibilities.

In these and other quests for understanding and articulation, the Center should mobilize the expertise of various departments and colleges and the perspectives, concepts and methodologies offered by different disciplines. New methods for cultural, social, and political analysis in the fields of literature, psychology, and anthropology are breaking new grounds in understanding better what appears to be given and unchanging.

I remember in 2003, the Center documented the teachings and demonstrations in the university against the war in Iraq and the military offensives in Central Mindanao. These main events had once more shown to us how our leaders have managed to keep our politics in tangle with that of the United States. Today, the huge cost and failure of the two policies are clear to more people. In Mindanao, the peace process between the government and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front is sustained by the advocacy of various peace groups and peace-building initiatives. In the US, Bush has been increasingly pushed into a corner, unable to find a graceful exit from Iraq. On January 27, 2007, actress Jane Fonda said before tens of thousands of people in Washington, DC, "Silence is no longer an option." I am proud to say that consistent to the needs of the time, silence was never an option for the TWSC in the last thirty years.

**TERESA S. ENCARNACION TADEM** (DIRECTOR, TWSC [2004-PRESENT] AND PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, UP DILIMAN): Contentious politics has always been an underlying key to the activities of the TWSC—research, publications, and forums, among others. The Center has always viewed itself as part of the academic activist network that seeks to comprehend conflicts of interest that exist in our society as well as the challenges posed by foreign circuit power structures. The struggle has generally taken place out of formal arenas of contestation involving non-state actors and more importantly, the bias is for the poor.

It is quite understandable that the Center was formed in 1977, as mentioned by Dodong Nemenzo, five years after Martial Law was declared. It established itself as a Center, which is undertaking research and organized formal and informal discussions and has struggled against imperialism and authoritarianism. The Center's focus, however, is not only on the political but also on the socioeconomic. It provides a forum for critical and interdisciplinary perspectives on the Philippines and the Third World with special reference to political economy. It is important, therefore, that its research and advocacy embody a substantive critique of the more dominant paradigms.

It is in this light that the Center was a pioneer in the academic community in doing fieldwork, e.g., Randy's research on the banana industry in Davao and the impact of multinational corporations in the country. The results of these studies provided one of the bases by which social movements could challenge the development model promoted by the World Bank-International Monetary Fund and supported by the Marcos government.

The United Nations University's three-year project "Transnationalization: The State and the People's Movement" brought together three major concerns of social movements during this period. One was the adverse effects of an economy which was vulnerable to external forces. Another was the role of an authoritarian state in perpetrating such a situation through militarization and repression. And most importantly, it examined the role of people's movements in challenging the status quo and in formulating alternatives. This project was a regional undertaking, as mentioned by Randy, as the Center collaborated with institutions such as Chulalongkorn University for Social Research in Thailand and the Consumer's Action of Penang in Malaysia. For the Center, it was important to learn from the experiences of other social movements in the region, which were also engaged in

struggle against dictatorial regimes. Such a network became only one of several networks which the Center cultivated in the region that brought together academic activist through collaborative research work and advocacy campaigns. Another example of such a network was the Asian Regional Exchange for New Alternatives, which was formed with the participation of TWSC fellows and staff. The Center continued its research on transnationalization. The Center's major research work aims to give social movements a better understanding of the nagging issues and concerns so that they could formulate strategies of action for change.

The term "transnationalization" has been replaced by globalization, which subsequently became the major concern of the Center's research work. Social movements continue to address the issues of underdevelopment and the perpetuation of the gap between the rich and the poor. It is within this context that the Center, funded by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), undertook its research on civil society and globalization. This was followed by another UNDP project on state-civil society relations in the context of globalization. This research project analyzed the relations between the Philippine state and selected civil-society actors in the context of globalization. The empirical research focused on four sectors: telecommunications, agriculture, vegetable and swine, and garments, which had been adversely affected by economic liberalization. The research investigated two aspects of state-civil society relation: first, the civil-society actors engaged in official state agencies through various formal and informal strategies of dialogue, negotiation and bargaining; and second, the extent to which civil-society actors have been able to influence government policymaking. As Alex pointed out earlier, there is a need to engage policymakers through substantive research. But these studies never brought out how civil society can actively intervene in decisionmaking, where it is locked out by the very nature of political institutions under a neoliberal democracy, i.e., political institutions that are insulated from social pressures, particularly when decisions are made solely by the executive, the international financial institutions, and trade bodies like the World Trade Organization (WTO). The effects of globalization are pertinent considerations in trying to comprehend social movements and contentious politics within the context of local and global struggles and how these two levels of struggles interface with one another. That is, how local and global social movements link-up with each other.

With this in mind, the Center became part of the project of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) on global civil society movements, dynamics and international campaigns, and its national implementation. This study of selected civil society movements sought to understand the dynamics of social movements in both international- and national-level contexts. Such dynamics was examined not only in terms of actual initiatives and campaigns but also in terms of the structures and processes underlying the interactions of local, national, and transnational context of movements. In this project, five contemporary civil society movements were examined: (1) campaigns for debt relief focusing on Freedom from Debt Coalition; (2) the movement to change international trade rules and barriers focusing on the Stop the New Round Coalition; (3) the global taxation initiative or the Tobin tax; (4) international anti-corruption movement focusing on Transparency Accountability Network; (5) and the Movement on Fair Trade. With the exception of General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, these movement organizations are in the struggle against neoliberalism. This UNRISD research project broadened the Center's academic activist network as it worked together with project counterparts from Bolivia, Argentina, Senegal, and Turkey.

Contentious politics in an era of globalization was the underlying concern as the Third World Studies Center undertook its policy dialogue series. We felt it was important to undertake studies on the impact of decade-long membership of the Philippines in the WTO in agriculture, trade and services, and intellectual property rights. A major concern in all of these was the extent to which social movements were able to impact on decision-making processes in all these endeavors. Thus, one important highlight of the policy dialogue series was the discussion of the Philippine negotiating strategy during the WTO Hong Kong Ministerial Meeting. The policy dialogue series sought inputs not only from social movement players but also from academics and government functionaries.

The theme of contentious politics also found itself in the Center's Marxism in the Philippines Lecture Series. This lecture series, which was started during Randy's time, was the Center's attempt to examine Marxism as a framework for analysis of Philippine political economy and its relevance to political praxis. The lectures delivered for the series, which was initiated in 1983, came out in two publications. The first, which came out in 1984, was called the Marx Centennial Lectures. It

looked into dilemmas confronted by social movements in that period of dictatorship. This also included topics such as the mode of production debate, the millenarian populist aspects of Filipino Marxism, Marxism and Maoism, Marxism and its strategy, and Marxism and the peasantry. The 1988 publication of *Marxism in the Philippines* continued to look at the similar topics but this time it focused on how social movements were grappling with the transition from authoritarianism to democracy. The Marxism in the Philippines Part II lectures series and publications, therefore, looked on issues such as the left and other forces, the nature and dynamics of pre-1986 coalition politics as well as the situation of the Filipino left at the crossroads.

The Marxism in the Philippines Lecture Series was revived in 2005, as the TWSC returned to this concern once again in light of different contemporary challenges such as the continuing poverty and socioeconomic inequalities, the resurrection of the politics of modernization, the continuing difficulties of the country as it grinds through globalization, and the absence of any forward-looking analysis and prognosis. The Marxism in the Philippines Lecture Series was also an occasion for scholars and activists to reexamine Marxism and its Filipino variant in the light of the growing importance of alternative perspectives. The topics that were discussed in this lecture series were Marxism and ideological strategies, Marxism and the Chinese question, the Peasantry and agrarian revolution in the Philippines, and Marxism and civil society. The lecture series has been renamed the Daniel Boom Schirmer Memorial Lecture Series on Marxism in the Philippines.

As Alex pointed out, the *Kasarinlan* issues which sold the most were those dealing with the struggle of social movements in general and the Philippine left movement in particular under a new political dispensation. These included issues on revolutions, democratic transitions, and social movements. The Center considers this as an indication of the need for further analysis and examination of the role which social movements play in the country and the challenges they confront.

The recently initiated Social Movements in the South Lecture Series seeks to pursue further the points raised in the Marxism in the Philippines Lecture Series. The series focuses on movements in the South using a variety of cases of recent national and cross-border mobilizations and protests. The series seeks to address the following questions:

1. Are social movements in the South agents of democratization?
2. How do these social movements contribute to or hinder the democratization process in various fields: local, regional, and transnational?
3. How do deepening inter-state relations affect social movements?
4. What role do Southern social movements play in the wider global political arena?
5. Are social movements in the South always engaged in contentious politics?
6. How do they interact with the boundaries of institutional politics?
7. Given the present historical conjuncture, what lies ahead for social movements in the South?

A format which the Center has also adopted after the 1986 People Power Revolution is to bring government officials, members of the academe, and civil society to come together to discuss, debate, and challenge each other on ideas and strategies in confronting societal problems. Fidel Ramos, Solita Monsod, Miriam Defensor-Santiago, Romulo Neri, and Raul Gonzales came when the Center invited them to the Academe Meets Government Series. The recently concluded Third World Studies Center's Policy Dialogue Series on Human Security also brought together government officials, the academe, and civil society in the attempt to examine human security as a policy framework of government by bringing in the experiences of the people from the grassroots like those affected by the mining activities in their areas and the armed conflict in the Bondoc Peninsula. The objectives of this endeavor was to come out with an alternative framework in policymaking and the implementation of initiatives on peace-building, conflict prevention and development, and to come out with mechanisms in adopting human security as a policy framework for the pursuit of national development and peace-building roles.

These are just some of the examples by which the Center has attempted in its small way to provide a range of activities as well as the inputs to its research, publications, and forums for social movements to shape their goals, frame their purpose, and examine their strategies and paradigms in challenging the status quo.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Rationale for A Third World Studies Program (1977)

In recent years, much attention has been focused on the situation of those nations newly-liberated from colonial domination. Their colonial history has left them too poor, in terms of the necessary capital, to launch an industrialization program, and grossly incapable of rescuing their predominantly rural populations from the terrible backwardness of their agricultural production systems. The persistent deprivation that characterizes the lives of the masses of the people constitutes a dagger in the conscience of the advanced industrial nations. But what is important is that these former colonies of the underdeveloped world are beginning to discover each other and consequently to find common cause in each other's development. Today, they have become an articulate moral if not a political force in the community of nations. They are the so-called Third World—the underdeveloped nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Because it shares with these nations the common disabilities of undercapitalization, technological backwardness, a colonial history, and continuing unequal exchange with the transnational corporations based in the rich countries, the Philippines shares the Third World's fundamental aspirations for self-directed and balanced development, and is therefore a part of this emergent community.

A basic problem of this emergent community is to continually define the contours of a just and desirable relationship with the rich advanced nations. There is much concern and wide disagreement on correct courses of action to take with respect to this problem. Forums like the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development become the arena for the resolution of such conflicts. But whatever the outcomes of such congresses might be, what concerns us here is this: that the changing circumstances of global politics, as expressed in regional grouping and regrouping, in detente, in militant producer blocs, and recently in the new thrusts of some countries within the communist bloc, be reflected in the ongoing discussions of the academic community. It is suggested that there is an urgent need to establish a stable forum for the critical analysis of such issues, and that

such a forum can be most meaningful if it is woven into the existing fabric of academic courses.

The importance of such a Program cannot be overstressed. An increasing number of our University graduates are being absorbed by the various agencies of the civil service. In these public bureaucracies, they are frequently enlisted to prepare studies and position papers on matters that require a critical understanding of the intricate connection between national interest and the interests of key actors in the international political and economic order. It is primarily in relation to such work that a Third World orientation is felt to be most valuable. The humanizing dimension of a University of the Philippines general education must therefore be complemented by an intelligent assessment of the often brutal realities of international politics and the requirements of a people-oriented program of national survival. ❁