

Rethinking the Third World: A Roundtable Discussion

THE TWSC FORUM*

The first 20 years of the Third World Studies Center (TWSC) creates the opportune time to reflect on the key concept that has defined the Centers institutional thrust. The Third World of the 1970s wrestled with underdevelopment, political instability and neocolonialism. Since then, its member-nations have attained different levels of economic progress and state-building. Hence, the urgent need to reassess not only the concept of “third world” but also The TWSC’s orientation can no longer be ignored. The following is the transcript of the discussion held on 13 February 1997 at the CSSP Audio Visual Room, U.P. Diliman, Quezon City, in connection with the 20th anniversary of the TWSC.

Prof. Miriam Coronel Ferrer: This round table discussion is one of the activities in line with the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the Third World Studies Center. Its primary purpose is to reevaluate the concept of the “Third World” which serves as the underlying reason for the founding of the Center in 1976. In addition, through this activity we aim to bring together the people who, in one way or another, have been part of the development of the Center in all of its two decades of existence. For the opening remarks, let us hear from our Dean, Dr. Consuelo J. Paz.

Dean Consuelo J. Paz: Magandang hapon sa inyong lahat at maraming salamat sa inyo na nakarating ngayong hapon para ipagdiwang ang ika-dalawampung anibersaryo ng TWSC. (*Good morning to all of you and thank you for being here this afternoon to celebrate the 20th anniversary of TWSC.*)

Marami nang nangyari sa buhay nitong Sentro. Nakapaglabas ng napakaraming mahuhusay na pag-aaral tungkol sa mga bansa na di naisusulong ang pag-unlad, mga dumanas ng mga di-matatag na karanasang pulitikal at nahirapang kumalas sa gapos ng mga sumakop sa kanila. (*A lot of notable things have happened in the center. It was able to produce*

*The TWSC Forum¹ is a cover term for the former and present TWSC staff and fellows and other persons previously and presently connected with the Center in one way or another.

several excellent studies on countries which are underdeveloped, politically unstable, and unable to break free from colonial bondage.)

Naging tanyag ang library dahil sa malawak at mahalagang koleksyon at nitong kailan, nailipat sa mas malaki at maaliwalas na lugar. Ganito rin ang nangyari sa Sentro. Pero dahil so mga pangyayari sa mundo, ang pang-aakit ng konseptong bagong pandaigdigang kaayusan o globalisasyon at ang mabilis na paglapit ng ika-dalawampu't-isang siglo, napapanahong tingnan at pag-isipan ang oryentasyon at katungkulan ng Sentro. Mahalaga po ang input ninyo dito. *(Its library has been famous for its wide and rich collection and recently, it has been transferred to a more spacious and comfortable place. The same thing holds true with the Center. Given the recent world events such as the new world economic order or globalization and the forthcoming 21st century, it is timely to delve into and reflect on the orientation and role of the Center. Your input on this matter will be significant.)*

Malugod ko po kayong binabati at inaasahan kong magkaroon ng mayaman at malalim na diskusyon ngayong hapon para makatulong sa pagkonsepto ng pupuntahan ng Sentro. Kongratulasyon sa inyong lahat sa ika-dalawampung anibersaryo ng Sentro at sa inyong kontribusyon sa pag-unlad nito. Maraming salamat. *(I am conveying my warmest greetings to you and I am expecting that there will be a lively and serious discussion this afternoon which will help us in shaping the future of the Center. Congratulations to all, to the 20th anniversary of the Center and to your contribution to its development. Thank you very much.)*

Prof. Ferrer: As you have probably read from the flyers and invitation, and as Dean Paz pointed out, we intend to pick your ideas on rethinking the Third World as a conceptual category as well as the future role and direction of the Center.

Before opening the floor for discussion, perhaps it would be best to introduce the participants, so that the audience, mostly students who were not yet born at the time of the Center's founding, may know the so called founding fathers. And Prof. Randy David, as you will know in a while, is in the best position to introduce the participants.

Prof. Randolph S. David: I am Randy David. We, along with Maris Diokno and the rest of the people here, were the ones who founded the Center

then. Maris was an Instructor at that time. If I am not mistaken, it was 1977 when we held the first workshop. Temy was still behind bars. To be exact, it was 5 February 1977, a roundtable discussion-workshop like this one. Among our visitors then were Senator Diokno, the father of Maris, who had just been released from prison; and my later-in-law, Renato Constantino. It was very difficult to bring them together. Nineteen seventy-seven was only five years after Martial Law was declared. We had Alejandro Lichauco, Renato Constantino, Jose Diokno – these were the three people who helped us conceptualize the center of free dialogue.

Of course, Dodong Nemenzo was the dean at the time – the first elected dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Before Dodong's time, the dean was only appointed, as is the case today. Dr. Nemenzo himself had just come out of prison. Remember, many people were put to jail by Marcos, and they were just coming out of prison at that time. Fortunately, I was not imprisoned because was away during the time of political turbulence. The Third World Studies Center was one of the first projects of Dr. Nemenzo. But let us introduce everybody first. Let me do the introductions because I think I know everybody home.

Let's begin with Raul Pertierra. Paul Pertierra was a mathematician and now he's a sociologist. You don't know that. I know that because Raul has been a regular friend of the TWSC since I can remember. He's based today in the University of New South Wales, Australia. Is that right, Raul? He comes here often, and his doctoral dissertation was on religion and politics in the Ilocos region. He gave some lectures for the Center recently. He's also been here as a visiting professor.

Then we have Preachy Legasto. Dr. Legasto was a graduate student at that time working on her Ph.D. Dr. Legasto is now the Director of the graduate program of College of Arts and Letters and, in particular, is in charge of the doctoral program in Literature and Philippine Studies. She's one of our early contributors to the TWSC publication. Our publications then were not as good as those you see today. *Kasarinlan* was published in mimeographed form, precisely because mimeographed materials lent an air of subversiveness during that time.

And then, we have Buddy Malay, of course. Buddy Malay was also one of our earliest contributors to the TWSC papers. I think Buddy at that time was still a student at the Sorbonne University? No, he was already an

assistant professor at the Asian Center, but just a few years before he left for France to do his Ph.D.

Because there was free coffee at the TWSC, we were able to draw people. Our first room was in the Faculty Center. It was like a bodega (storage house) across the Political Science Department. The only thing we had was a coffee maker and a secretary and some shelves which were retrieved from a book exhibit of the Russian Embassy. They donated their first books to us; they were all the books of Marx and Lenin in Spanish because the Soviet Union had thought that we spoke Spanish in this country.

Next to Buddy is Dr. Tet Maceda. Tet at the time was still with the Ateneo de Manila University, but even so, she had been coming to the UP, particularly to the TWSC. It was a kind of sanctuary because she was doing her graduate work in the University of the Philippines. She was also one of our first contributors in the area of culture.

Then, we have Dr. S.V. Epistola. S.V. is one of our senior advisers at the Center. He would come for coffee to heckle our publications but, I think, more than S.V., the one who really helped us materially was his wife, Nieves Epistola. She donated the thick dictionary that we're still using. She also gave us her regular supply of coffee. And I think also mimeographing paper which, according to S.V., she bought from the English Department.

Beside S.V. is Dr. Emmanuel "Boying" Lallana. You cannot imagine how many people acquired their Ph.Ds in the last 20 years that the TWSC had been in existence. Boying was one of the early fellows of the Center. He was then an Instructor in the Department of Political Science. Alex Magno and Boying were contemporaries? No, Boying was a student of Alex. Jojo Abinales was also our mainstay. Before Jojo actually, our first research assistant was Rafael Baylosis who had just come out of prison. He was a ranking member of the Communist Party of the Philippines. So it was a considerable risk at that time to get him. He was in charge of our publications.

Then we had, after Rafael Baylosis, Dr. Nilo Ocampo of the Department of History And then we had Jojo Abinales. Behind Dr. Epistola is Dr. David Wurfel, a very, very old friend of the TWSC. He first came to look into the agrarian reform situation in the Philippines. He was a constant user of the

TWSC library which was growing at the time. He gave a series of lectures also for the Center. He can be considered as one of the most avid and most sensitive observers of the Philippine politics scene, and I'm very happy that he's here before he moves to his assignment as a visiting professor at the University of Hanoi where he would teach Southeast Asian politics.

I'm also very happy to welcome Karl Gaspar here. I know Karl very well. Karl had also come out of prison and he was in charge of the Mindanao Sulu Pastoral Conference (MSPC). The MSPC was based in Davao, and when we did one of our largest studies – the Banana Industry studies – the MSPC was our host. We were using their office and their telephones because we relocated the TWSC research staff to Davao to do the study. Karl was very, very gracious enough to lend the facilities to the MSPC to us. Karl has since joined the Redemptorist fathers.

Next to Karl is one of the pioneers of the TWSC. Of course, when we formed it, he was still in jail. Top ranking member of the party, Dr. Temario Rivera. He was then an Instructor of Political Science. He practically lived in the Faculty Center. I think when Martial Law was declared, he was brushing his teeth in one of the toilets on the third floor of the FC. He lived there, which is the reason why the FC was also called the Faculty Center Hilton because so many people were living there. And Temy. when he got out of jail, joined the Center as Senior Researcher or Deputy Director. A Senior Researcher, we deployed him to Davao so he won't create trouble here. We sent him to Davao, together with Jojo Abinales and (Cuca Rizabal) to do the study on bananas which was our first big study. So Temy lived in Davao just across the Apo View hotel, in a crammy dormitory behind a beer garden in Davao City. Ed Tadem was also there but he was based in Davao. (Oliver Teves who joined Fuji News was also one of the researchers in *Kyodo News*.)

Then, we have Connie Paz. Connie was also a regular guest of the TWSC. I think she also gave us many reams of mimeographing paper. It came from the Linguistics Department. She chaired the Department at that time.

Then, of course, we have Maris. No matter if Maris looks young today she was our youngest coordinator of the TWSC at the time. There were (three) coordinators, Maris Diokno, Eugene Demegillo, who is now a banker, from the Department of Philosophy. These were the people who

set up the Center. Maris has since gone to the University of London to do her Ph.D. on Burma, and I'm very, very happy that she's now the Director of the TWSC. Before Maris, of course, was Alex Magno. Alex was the Deputy Director of the Center for a long time. He probably thought he would never become the Director because I probably overstayed as Director. I think I was director for 12 or 13 years which was very bad; 15 years, actually—that's really very bad. I gave up the directorship I think because one time, Andre Gunder Frank was visiting us and he told me that the effective life of any organization was only 10 years. I said: "You mean organizations in the third world or organizations as a whole?" He said organizations as a whole have an effective life of only 10 years. 'After that what happens?', I said. He said they had to metamorphose in order to continue operating, otherwise, they should die. I said: "Well, I'm nearly 10 years as director." He said: "You better give up." So Alex became director as a result of that.

Then, we have Miriam Coronel. I think Iye was a high school student at the time at Philippine Science High. We had been sending the Philippine Science High School library our publications. The Science High was one of our first clients. Because what we were doing since we could not publish openly was to publish what looked like underground papers in mimeographed forms and then, we sent these out to high schools that could be centers of subversion in different parts of the country and to high school and college teachers in the provinces. The whole idea was just to taunt Marcos.

The Third World Studies Center, we called it Third World because we could not name it an anti-Marcos Center which was the real intention. Third World at the time was a very, very safe term and Marcos was projecting himself as the leader of the Third World. And he was competing with Mahathir in the Southeast Asian region and in the Third World region. He was competing with Khadafi as the leader of the Third World. Of course we got into trouble around about 1978 or 1979 because Khadafi was visiting the Philippines. And then O.D. Corpuz who was President of UP told Marcos that we have a Third World Studies Center in UP. "Oh really," sabi ni Marcos. "Then, we should bring Khadafi there. And tell me more about this center. Why don't we give it a building," or something like that. Neither O.D. Corpuz nor Marcos knew that it was just a small room. Anti-Marcos pa. So O.D. Corpuz sent for Dodong Nemenzo and me and said: "Okay, what do you need because we have to put up a center that really looks like a center by the time Mohamar Khadafi comes to visit Diliman." And that really was a dilemma for Dodong and me because I had wanted a building for the

Center but not at the expense of credibility as being used as an exhibition site, a showcase by Marcos to please his visitor Khadafi. I think we deliberated on it and in the end, we decided not to be pragmatic. That's why for a long time, it remained in the *bodega*, first, in the Faculty Center, then upgraded to the fourth floor of Palma Hall which had been vacated first by the Department of Mass Communications of Gloria Feliciano. that was the first office of the Institute of Mass Communications, now the College of Mass Communications. After the College of Mass Communications vacated it, the Department of Volcanology and Oceanography occupied it. Then, they got tired of the building because there was no water; the electricity was unsteady and they moved out and nobody wanted to occupy it, that's why they gave it to us. The Third World Studies remained at the fourth floor on a long, long time. I think, to a greater extent, that's where most of our foreign guests knew where it was. It was not just a third world, it was a fourth world, precisely because it was on the fourth floor.

I'll tell you more about the ideological perspective that we had at the time. I'm just telling you the personal aspects of it. My wife and I have four children. I have always considered the Third World Studies Center as our fifth, my fifth. I have never belonged to an organization that succeeds. All the organizations I've joined so far have failed. And I'm so pleased that the Third World Studies is singular in its apparent success as an institution but that's probably because I've given up the directorship after more than a decade.

So Sheila Coronel at that time was one of our first fellows. In fact, we knew the first Coronel was Sheila at the time. She was very active. There were only two departments that were supporting the TWSC at the time – the Political Science Department, mainly, and the Department of History and partly, because I came from Sociology, the Department of Sociology. So there were just three departments that were helping the Third World.

Third World Studies is older than the CSSP incidentally because it belonged to the College of Arts and Sciences. Unfortunately, the College was divided into three divisions and then, the three divisions became separate colleges mainly because Roger Posadas wanted to secede to remove the sciences from what he thought were not sciences – the social sciences and arts and letters. He did not want to share funds, but I think it was a good decision because it also made us flourish at the same time.

There are other faculty members here. I see Nats Morales from Political Science Department to whom we are also very grateful because Political Science Department, without blinking an eye, lent many of its faculty members to us.

Yes, the late Elsa Jurado was our first deputy for administration. Because the TWSC fellows were an unruly batch, we were ungovernable, and we needed somebody to put a little order to our anarchy and she did. She governed us with a whip.

Then, we have Dr. Maide Valencia who is now the chair of the Department of Sociology. They were always very forgiving when I did not do my work in the Department. Okay na rin iyon because they did not disown me, because I was spending more time in the Third World Studies, I mean, it was really very gratifying for me personally.

Dr. Maria Serena I. Diokno: We have some friends from Japan who are joining us now. I saw them trickle in. And then from CAL, English Department. Yes, we have Prof. Patricia Arinto with us.

Prof. Ferrer: Maris, do you want to say a few words about Dr. Boone Schirmer?

Dr. Diokno: Boone Schirmer wrote this book on *Philippines Reader* with Stephen Shalom. How old is he now, maybe over 70 or even 80. I saw and stayed with him last year in Boston, and I was eyeing his library because he still has an excellent collection remaining. He donated his entire Filipiniana collection to the TWSC which is still used up to now. He has an excellent collection of radical literature, He himself has a very interesting story. He was an ally in our anti-bases struggle. He visited the country and the Center very often. I think, until last year, he visited Japan to support the movement calling for a plebiscite on the bases in Okinawa. He flew over there to speak, and my big mistake was not to have written Boone much earlier to get a piece from him but I think we can solicit something for our publication.

Prof. Ferrer: I think at this point we can open the floor for discussions. Who would like to start?

Dr. Emmanuel C. Lallana: The TWSC has always been in the cutting edge of Philippine Social Sciences and Arts, and it is precisely for this reason that it is high time that we change its name.

The concept of the ‘third world’ harks back to the days when scholars, activists and even bureaucrats divide the world into at least three spheres: one version is that the “first world” comprises the advanced capitalist countries; the “second world” means socialist or centrally-planned economies, and the “third world” consists of underdeveloped countries.

Another version, not necessarily using the words “first,” “second” or “third,” uses the language “core” or “center,” “semi-periphery” and “periphery.” The most uninteresting version is that which divides the world according to GNP or some such objective measure which adds a fourth and a fifth worlds to the previous three.

We don’t divide the world this way, at least, for some of us, anymore. Part of the reason is that there is no longer a socialist or second world. And “third world” societies, particularly in Asia and Latin America, are now newly industrializing economies. Even the sick man of Asia is now reportedly the region’s newest tiger. Arguably, there is still a third world in the sense of underdeveloped economies but most of them are in Africa, not exactly an area most of us are most excited about.

So what happened to the Third World? In the same way that the global expansion of capitalism created a third world in the 1960s and 1970s, the globalization of capital has ended the Third World in the late 1980s through the 1990s. And It is for this reason that globalization is what we must now study.

Globalization comprehends the radical transformation of the world economy that we have been witnessing. It is the process that generates a “multiplicity of linkages and interconnections” that link the state and society that make up the modern world system. It is also an “intensification of the levels of interaction and interconnectedness or interdependence” between the states and societies that constitute the modern world community. Ian Nethervin Peters, who argues that we have to conceive globalization in the plural, suggests that in the social sciences, there are as many conceptualization of globalizations as there are disciplines. In economics, globalization refers to economic internalization and the spread of capitalist market relations; in international relations, the focus is on increasing density of interstate relations and the development of global politics; in sociology, the concerns with the increasing worldwide social density and the emergence of world society; in cultural studies, the focus

is on global communications and the worldwide standardization as in Coca-colonization and McDonaldization and in post-colonial culture, In history, the concern is with conceptualizing global history.

If Nethervin Peters is correct and I tend to believe he is, then there are so many things that we can study for our post-Third World Studies Center as a consequence of globalization.

Let me suggest at least one area of research within the broad framework of globalization that we should look at – the future of the nation-state. Globalization, for all intents and purposes, has led into the dissolution of national boundaries. For instance, the integration of world financial markets has raised apprehensions among nations regarding their vulnerability to outside forces.

Furthermore, national policies are no longer efficacious in reducing state vulnerabilities. Consider, for instance, the efficacy of a purely national policy on the marine environment protection. As a result of the changes I have described, economic policy coordination among groups of states has become a more attractive response to improve the welfare of all the nations. But macro-economic policy coordination essentially deprives the state of its ability to unilaterally formulate policies on vital issues such as monetary policy. This shows that state autonomy has been greatly reduced by the global existence of a global hierarchy of power, the operation of a world economy, the emergence of international regimes and organizations and the foreign relations of international laws and treaties. Indeed, some extremists (like Kenichi Ohmae) have already rung the death knell of the nation-state.

Globalization has not only made the nation-state loss effective in carrying out its political, economic and security responsibilities, it is also undermining national identities by engendering global images. As Benedict Anderson has informed us, the nation is an imagined community and print capitalism, particularly the newspaper, plays an important role in making individuals living in particular administrative units to imagine themselves as part of a community that is larger than his or her village – the nation-state.

Today, one can ask if Channel V and/or MTV Asia are creating a sense of solidarity among the youths that transcends, and are more powerful than national loyalties. One can ask what kind of identities will remain and/or

emerge in the period of MTV. According to a Korean professor and a market research expert, teenagers in Asia now are more familiar with the image of Michael Jordan and Demi Moore than their own presidents.

If the nation-state will soon be extinct what will replace it? Already, there are proposals for a regional state, something that does not comprehend nationalities, and the idea of a state with non-territorial sovereignty, considering that nation-states sovereignty are within the limits of a particular territory. And if nation-states are extinct, what happens to international society or international order that is founded upon nation-states? I don't think we have the answer at this point; I think the debate is still on how long the nation-state would last, and what would replace it, but certainly, globalization has posed the question, and it is something that we can all try to understand because sooner or later, it's going to take hold of us.

So these are my thoughts on rethinking the Third World, and I hope they could help in clarifying the issues we are discussing today.

Prof. Ferrer: Thank you, Boying. You're not suggesting that we become a Global Studies Center, are you? Let us welcome those who just arrived: Dr. Olivia Caoili, Vice President for Academic Affairs, a former TWSC fellow; and Dr. Rose Torres-Yu, also a former fellow, from the Filipino Department.

Dr. Teresita Maceda: Alam kong napakapopular na ng konsepto ng globalisasyon pero batay sa aking mga pag-aaral at sariling obserbasyon, ang laging parang malapit sa konsepto at nais sigurong sumasang-ayon na talagang nandiyan na nga yang gobalisasyon na iyan ay iyong mga iskolar at mga bahagi nang ating lipunan na may access talaga sa Internet and all of these things and they can really see it's happening. *(I know how popular a concept globalization is nowadays but based on my studies and personal observation, it has still a long way to go in terms of its reach and breadth. At present, those who claim that globalization is now upon us are the ones who have direct access to the Internet and the like which serve as global links, in other words, those who see and feel it really happening.)*

However, I think, even in popular novels, like in Michael Crichton novels, that idea is them, that the end of man, the species of man, is forthcoming because everywhere. there is only one culture. And yet, as we look into our own culture, we find that globalization does not occur that

easily. I think we are experiencing now an assertion of various groups, sectors and issues. People are asserting their identities: people don't want to be called "the other." They are asserting their own selves.

As we are witnessing globalization, we are also witnessing at the same time attempts of people to say that: "Hey, we don't want to get swallowed in this thing." Some even advert to globalization as merely "Americanization." Because even now, the center is still America. This is why we often look at Philippine culture as a mere caricature of American culture. But what we don't realize is that even as we copy supposedly American soap operas, we also narrate, in more than a caricatured form, stories of poverty, injustice and the marginalized among us as well as the decadent lives of the elite. It seems that people are telling us something but we are not listening.

So I would like to go back to Dodong, and I think that as we are now voicing out our apprehension, for example, about the loss of activism in our youth, about their energies being wasted, I think that we have to revive something in that old Third World. Of course, I also don't like "third world" since I don't want to be treated as a Third World. Rather, I'd like to think that we have our own world. I am against globalization precisely because I want to assert my/our Filipino identity. So we have to go back to the basic critical tradition of the Center. What I want to see in the future is a Center that continues to address the problems of people who want to emancipate or are asserting themselves. To do this, the Center must draw knowledge not only from the social sciences but more importantly from the culture and the arts.

Prof. Ferrer: Shall we hear Dr. Lallana's rebuttal?

Dr. Lallana: I don't think that those who claim that globalization is upon us is suggesting that we are all going to be the same. Nobody here is arguing that globalization means homogenization. I think one of the more interesting popular articles on this issue is Randy's *Public Lives* column on globalization. In this article, Randy argues that globalization means hybridity. Others use globalization – the combination of global and local – to describe globalization.

One of the things about globalization is that even if it is totalizing in impulse, it also incorporates the local. Take the case of McDonald's. It is only in the Philippines where McDonald's sells McSpaghetti and McChicken. This is in deference to Filipino eating preferences. Indeed, them 'seven a

Burger McDo especially formulated for the Filipino taste bud. McDonald's must adjust and adapt to local preferences and tastes in order to remain a global corporation.

But what happens to national identities in a world dominated by McDonald's, Coca-Cola and Hollywood? I suggest that "global" icons are incorporated into the "national" identities. Purists will call this cultural imperialism (which it may very well be). But is there a national identity that is not a hybrid of local and international identities? I am ambivalent about this issue because I belong to that tradition that understands nationalities, or at least, contemporary national identities as modern inventions. It's an artificial creation, and sometimes, a lot of people are arguing for identities that are ethnic and not necessarily national.

Prof. Priscelina Legasto: Since we're talking about culture, I would like to share with you some of the things that people doing cultural studies or some of the people in the humanities are doing vis-a-vis problematizing the term "third world."

Three years back, as coordinator of the Comparative Literature Program, we rethought our programs because the word "third world" appears in programs as well as in courses, and of course, this has had a long tradition as early as the birth of the Third World Studies program. In fact, one of the first anthologies collected by the Third World Studies Program was the anthology edited by Lucila Husillos, and she was very instrumental in the emergence of these new courses and programs at the Department of English. Anyway, three years back, we did come out with a book which already problematized the Third World. This is the Post-Colonial Studies, and I would like to read from there a portion that in a way tells the group here why the term "third world" became problematic.

To me, the qualifier "third world" has lost its explanatory value. A theory and its categories are useful if these are able to address questions of power, power relations and how they impact on theoretical, critical and literary practices and texts. For me, the third world label has lost its radical or revolutionary edge as a rubric for the transgressive as well as alternative, critical and literary writings of individuals, groups, sectors or classes which have been interpellated to assume or accept minority positions. I would also include in this label those nationals originally from the former colonies and neo-colonies in Asia, Africa and Central and South America, but who

now work out an oppositional or alternative consciousness from within the interstices of the metropolitan cultures. Among these are Homi Bhabha in Britain, Irish David Lloyd, Indians Lata Mani, Gayatri Spivak, Filipinos Carlos Bulosan, E. San Juan, etc. So, to my mind, the further development of Third World discourse, even if it attempts to articulate the polyphonic realities of those countries mentioned above, is hampered by the ambivalence which the term now has.

In terms of the historical origin of the term, “third world” has become synonymous to underdeveloped, developing, poor and, also, nonaligned, as used in the 1955 conference. I’m not denying the realities that have been the objects of inquiry of third world studies, this Center in particular. What I’m questioning is the usefulness of the term third world as an analytical category.

In mainstream Philippine social sciences and humanities disciplines, Third World, as in feminism and Third World realities, political change in the Third World, sociology of developing or Third World societies, Third World literatures, etc., as a subject and area, is already inscribed in the university curricula. In fact, “third world’ has become a huge bag into which almost everything that is not mainstream, not white and western, is thrown in.

According to Sanggari, “third world’ ironically has become a term both that signifies and blurs the functioning of an economic, political and imaginary geography, able to unite vast and vastly differentiated areas of the world into a single underdeveloped terrain. So for the Western media, for instance, Ferdinand Marcos is a Third World figure, like Idi Amin, Ayatollah Khomeini, Saddam Hussein, but then, there are Fidel Castro, Mao Tse tung, Che Guevarra, Jose Marti and Sandino. In literature, we have tried to zealously guard the Third World literature by saying that Jose Garcia Villa is from the Third World but is not a Third World writer like Pablo Neruda or Aimee Cesaire. However, the aforementioned examples should demonstrate why the term “third world” is problematic. It is struck within very specific historical and geographic coordinates.

Some of us have chosen the term “post-colonial.’ I know this has become very controversial but let me just continue. Post colonial,” at least, the way I am using it, is not a label denoting geographical locations only. One can be a post-colonial writer even within the bulwarks of the metropolis. What is post-colonial discourse or post-colonial writing? Post-

colonial discourses include imaginative or creative, meaning short stories or theoretical or critical to use traditional dichotomies, writings that seek to establish alternative objects of knowledge in cultural studies or that experiment with non-mainstream literary modes and rhetorical strategies, for instance, the tapes of domestics in Hong Kong. These are treated as cultural texts that we can study. Various terms have been employed for such writings. Third World, minority, subaltern, etc.

Another feature of post-colonial discourse is that it is a critic of Western hegemony. This was very much felt in disciplines like those we have in the English Department and so, that was what we needed to address. A critic of Western hegemony. More specifically, it is an interrogation of the philosophical and historical assumptions and even structural elements of colonizers and imperialists, modern and even some post-modern metropolitan discourses which were used to legitimize colonization and which continue to marginalize the cultural production and knowledge of colonies and former colonies. This project will necessitate historical analysis of our own institutions, traditions and formations. Being a critic of domination, post-colonial discourse is similar to third world discourse.

Third World literature is understood as resistance literature or revolutionary or fighting literature. However, some revolutionary writers like Franz Fanon proceed from Western liberal humanist assumptions. One determinant in the articulation of post-colonial discourse, which makes it capable of rejecting hegemonic narratives of history and identity formation and their strong bourgeois humanist foundations, is the impact of post-modern and post-structuralist interrogations of logocentrism. In other words, some of what used to be called Third World writings are actually still underpinned by these master narratives of liberal humanism which make it pretty difficult for us in the humanities to bring in literatures of resistance, literatures of people whose writings are not considered by the canon as literature precisely because liberal humanist discourse is very concrete in terms of its definition of what constitutes literature and history.

Dr. Diokno: Could you not put these writings under a Third World course?

Dr. Legasto: The Third World, whether you are reading Fanon or Carlos Bulosan, is very liberal humanist in orientation; some are Marxist humanist in orientation. Now what is the problem with humanism? One of the theories of Humanism, as it is known in the West, or practised In the West,

is the theory of unity, that's the theory of subject which sees the person as a unitary object. Now how can you talk of a unitary subject, a unitary, rationale subject who's in full control of his resources when you have a Filipino who's been taught that his literature is not literature, his history is not history, he's not even a man if you put together all this racist, biologically-determined theories about man. What I am saying is that unless you change the paradigm, it's very difficult for you to resuscitate, to revive all these articulations of our cultural minorities or our classes.

Dr. Diokno: You use the term post-colonial for this type of discourse, right?

Dr. Legasto: Those that have been written, those writings that have been done under the category post-colonial. But I'm not saying that it is something that I'm offering as label for the Third World. I don't see the Third World Studies Program becoming Post-Colonial Studies Program. So that's the reason why we need to critique both the Western paradigms of liberal humanism as well as the more traditional humanist Marxism and in order to retrieve all of these materials not only those who are minoritized because of their class, but also because of their gender, age, religion, etc.

Dr. Raul Pertierra: Once I agreed perhaps the title Third World has to be changed because the world has changed. I think Randy and others have made it quite clear that the original intention was to look at problems of oppression and inequality in the world. And unfortunately, these have not been eliminated except that the inequality and oppression now express themselves under a different guess. So we may not use the old categories; for example, Preachy mentioned women. That new category of oppression was not so clear in our consciousness in the 60s, 70s, or 80s. Gay identity, that's clearly a form of oppression but again, the "third world" as a concept, would not have satisfied, say, feminist claims and gay liberation claims. I'm sure this side of the circle will agree that we're also shifting from a notion of structure to one of culture. When we think of the old notion of third world," we're in fact thinking of the first, second world imperialism, capitalism and these all have to do with what we would call social structures. Once I think, Tet and Preachy are operating from a cultural model so they talk about representations. So in that sense, yes. Bulosan, it doesn't make sense to talk about him as Third World, right. But that's a shifting perspective and I'm quite happy to consider that. Now, let me just say a few things about where I think we should be going. Obviously, what's happening is that the notion of the world is changing. Our old concepts of

what constitute a common world, a global world, have changed considerably. Boying pointed out that with the collapse of socialism, the Second World no longer exists. So what else is left, the First and Third Worlds. Even with Cuba and North Korea, it doesn't make sense to talk in those categories. Even in the last ten years, the Internet and CNN have made the notion of a global village a reality. You can switch on the TV and you can watch all sorts of nonsense things happening in the US. But it has also trivialized the notion of global village. That's a reality. So we have to explore the potential changes in the Internet. In the Philippines, we still have a long way to go before the Internet becomes a reality for the majority of the Filipinos. Nevertheless, it's there. In fact, I was reading an article the other day where it shows the Philippines has a very large base of Internet subscribers. In the last five years, it has grown at an average of about 350 percent a year. So, there's no doubt that in 10 years time, it could spread like fire.

I'm trying to grasp the broadest theoretical leads. I think what happened is that our notion of space and time has shifted drastically. We can no longer think of space and time in the old-fashioned way. I think this is what Boying meant when he talked about the end of the nation state, the collapse of national boundaries. That just briefly gives you two examples from my own work where I'm working with the Ilocanos of Toronto. I started working with the Ilocanos in Ilocos as one would naturally expect, but you can now think of working with Ilocanos outside Ilocos and I don't mean Pangasinan, but I mean Hawaii, and Toronto and Barcelona. So clearly, the spatial notion of Ilocano is very different from what we think of Ilocanos when you bring in Barcelona, HongKong, obviously, and Toronto. So as conceptions of space are shifting, the distinction between center and periphery no longer applies. I mean New York, Bali, Brazil in some ways are interchangeable. The other thing is that the notions of time is think fundamentally shifting. I think the cultural theorists perhaps have more interesting things to say. I'm thinking now of that movie, something with the title where the future determines the past. We no longer can think of the past creating the present and the present engendering the future. In some ways, the future now determines the present so that concepts of space and time are changing dramatically.

Finally, just also to bring back Boying's point, we have to talk about the globalization of the local and the localization of the global and both things are happening at once. The telenovelas, for example, are clearly the localization of the global. You're watching Marimar or Maria Mercedes and

it's totally in Filipino. It's dubbed but it makes sense. People in my household, people living with me are from the Ilocos and everything in the house stops from 5:30 p.m. until 7:20 p.m. Although Maria Mercedes is actually in Filipino, you can shift from Maria Mercedes to Marimar. When you talk about the localization of the global, it's not just a simple translation. I mean, Marimar is more than an affirmation of localization. Kasi mestizo ako ano, Kastila ang salita namin sa bahay. I tease my non-Kastila speaking friends that: "Aba, sayang, kung marunong pa kayong mag-Kastila; you can watch these telenovelas in Spanish as they do in Zamboanga." Now, I think part of the reason why they can translate it and it makes sense is that because we Filipinos are discovering our old identities, we are discovering our Hispanic backgrounds and maybe, I don't think we should be ashamed of that.

And let me just end to make a final comment on Dodong's point and I react to it in good humor as he may have intended it to be. I mean, if we have a syphilitic father, well we have to live with it. Tatanggapin natin iyon kahit na namatay siya sa syphilis. It's no use denying it. We have to accept the good with the bad. It's no use denying where we came from. Kahit na nga syphilitic ang tatay natin: well, he's not us.

Dr. David Wurfel: I'm sorry I have to be brief because I need to leave but I will try to come back later this afternoon. It's a special privilege for me to hop on in the TWSC on such an occasion. I've just been in the Philippines for a few days and I didn't realize this was going on and it brings on a lot of my own past experiences and thinking.

It seems to me that I share the views of many that the term "third world" has become more and more inappropriate even though many of the problems and the processes that were encompassed in the concept of "third world" are still very much with us. I think it is incumbent upon anybody proposing a new term to make it more encompassing and more appropriate to what is actually being done and this is hard. The term "third world" really had spatial connotations originally even though it had a lot of other things rolled into it. With the term globalization, we have emphasis on a process. With the term "post-colonial," we have emphasis on a time period. Which one are we talking about? Can we put all three concepts to one term? I doubt it. There's one solution to that. A very, very long term for the center. I do think that the term globalization is indeed one that's very much in people's minds today. It's a process that very much affects our lives. But

I think the problem with the term is that it is, in too many circles, accepted unquestionably as an inevitable and perhaps beneficial process. If we are to use the term globalization, I think we have to also put side-by-side terms that refer to other processes that are recurring simultaneously and for people in many parts of the world more important, namely exploitation and liberation. Therefore, if you really want a precise name, I think you're going to have to string together a number of words.

Prof. Ferrer: Before proceeding, let us welcome those who have just arrived Dr. Boy Abaya from the Anthropology Department, who is also the head of the CSSP's graduate program: and Prof. Joji Tigno, former deputy director of the Center.

Dr. Diokno: Who has another piece?

Prof. Armando Malay Jr.: I just want to add that, at least, Dodong and Marcos agreed on one point: both wanted to change the name of our country. If Marcos had his way, we would be called "Maharlikanos" instead of Filipinos. Anyway, allow me to read my piece.

Was there really ever a Third World (in the sense of a bloc forming a real alternative to the respective discourses of the two previously constituted worlds, or in the sense of a mixed bag of nations having mutual feelings of identity, commonality and solidarity)? It was a great fiction in that if the term had not existed, it would have been necessary to invent it at that point in time, that is, in post-war conditions of decolonization and the intensifying Cold War. In any event, for countless Asians, Africans, Latin Americans, Middle Easterners and even for citizens of the highly-industrialized states, there was an undeniable appeal in the concept of a late-corner but ascendant "Third Estate," as it were, posing a challenge to each of the two ideological camps which received knowledge represented as having attained superpower and hegemonic status. But was it true, as the Second World insinuated, that the Third World's intermediate position was only temporary because the laws of history said so? It was nice to think so, even if one did not appreciate the Third World in all its conceptual complexity at the time. In fact, there are several Third Worlds, not just one. There was of course the poor, backward and agrarian Third World but there was also the petroleum-rich Third World, a militant and revolutionary Third World, a non-aligned Third World, the pro-Chinese, pro-Soviet Third Worlds and even the pro-Western Third World. No wonder the myth could not survive the so-called end of ideology.

In the recently-concluded combat, it seems clear that the Third World had no value even as a swing vote for the vanquished socialist camp. Precarious and heterogeneous, the Third World was bound to fail in its project of ideological autonomy that was naively ascribed to it. And yet, I miss the time when “third world” was synonymous with heroic resistance to colonialism, neocolonialism, imperialism and the promise of better tomorrows, the truly just and democratic society, a universal society rid of hunger, illiteracy, racism, exploitation, etc., that would emerge as the natural outcome of its struggle. The present manifestations of inter-Third World solidarity, or First-World-to-Third-World solidarity are mere shadows of what these slogans used to mean. (Today, we get a pro forma international conferences, exposure trips, so-called sharings of experiences, First-World sympathizers’ purchases of Third World bananas, rice and sugar and soon). In the meantime, the trendy civil society theory has already produced one perhaps unexpected result: cooptation by the state of NGOs and POs. In short, reinventing the term Third World will probably take a lot of effort, and not just in the theoretical field.

So what does the 21st century portend? If my reading is accurate, I think that more and more transitional societies in Asia like China, Vietnam, Burma, Bangladesh, Pakistan and so on will jell” into either one or the other of a pair of more definitive formations (definitive in the sense of achieved or fine tuned). For simplicity’s sake, more than anything else, I refer to the Philippine model and the Singapore model. The Philippine model valorizes liberal democracy, Western socio-political values and consensus (which is essentially shaped by a blend of the former and an Asian understanding of hierarchy), and has both a non-protectionist economy that is allergic to nationalization but is dependent on the export of skilled and unskilled labor, and a weak state (“weak” more out of inertia than conscious preference), but a state that is nonetheless protected or stabilized in the final analysis by a well-developed civil society. The Singaporean model is characterized by a blend of paternalist but occasionally ruthless authoritarianism and an aptitude for hi-tech cultural trends and largely apolitical consensus that is elicited by clean and efficient government (I mean a social democratic program, i.e., social democratic inform but not in spirit): rising levels of prosperity, an intelligent approach to the nation state’s perceptions of its limitations and comparative advantages; and not least, a working semblance of civil society. The interesting thing is that the Singaporean formation seems willing and able to eventually accommodate more liberalized modes of governance, due to its irreversible thrust into the

cyber world of the future: whereas the Philippine model seems to have "peaked" a longtime ago probably because its political culture reached the limits of its permissiveness in the post-Marcos period.

Prof. Ferrer: But it does not seem clear whether Buddy is in favor of the term "third worlds or not.

Prof. Malay: Actually, I do not understand it in that sense because I have not read the invitation. But does every question require an answer?

Prof. Ferrer: Not really. Some may be left unanswered. Prof. Malay: I think we am all tentative here.

Dr. Temario Rivera: I don't have a prepared piece but let me just share my thoughts. I think the original concept of the "third world" can also be understood as the product of one stage of globalization in the same manner that we are now all concerned with this all-embracing process of globalization. While I also agree that even originally, the concept was already quite ambiguous and contested and Buddy has clearly stated why it is so, we could not obviously speak of a homogenous Third World neither in its economic, political or even cultural sense – that is a historical fact. But I think what underpins the concept of the "third world" really is a search for an alternative, an alternative from what was then seen as the dominant hegemonic force represented by capitalism or imperialism as you will. I think what is important to preserve in the idea of the "third world," even while I am open to re-examining the use of the "third world" in the current context of globalization is the way it captures a certain spirit, in the way that Raul has also stated earlier, that at one stage of globalization, it did represent a spirit of subversiveness, a quest for a more egalitarian, emancipatory, liberating alternative in the social and economic spheres.

Now, we know of course that we are faced with a new stage of globalization and I think it is incumbent upon us to understand what is different in this current stage of globalization, what are the new challenges, unlike the mainstream view, which welcomes globalization as a win-win situation for everybody. Again, I think it is quite obvious that in any process where you have competition, there is bound to be winners and victims. And fortunately, if only to show you the seriousness of this situation, happily, I chanced upon a recent report by no less than the head of the UNDP just to give us an understanding of some of the more important economic

disparities that have taken place in the context precisely of globalization, in order to temper the positive outlook that has been unreasonably associated with globalization. What has globalization meant so far for most of the people of the world? This is by James Speeth, the chief administrator of the UNDP (United Nations Development Program). According to him, income disparity between the richest 20 percent and the poorest 20 percent of the world's people have more than doubled in the last 30 years, the ratio going from 30:1 to 61:1. While 15 countries have seen a surge in economic growth over the past three decades, over 1.6 billion people live in more than 100 countries that are worst off today than they were 15 years ago. Between 1990 and 1993, the per capita income gap between industrial and developing countries almost tripled, from \$5,700 to \$15,400.

What is the point of all of these? I think the point is how are we able to preserve the original, political and even emotional flavor of the concept of the "third world" which is really a symbolism, I think, of a quest for an alternative, a society that is egalitarian, empowering and liberative and yet, at the same time, being sensitive to new changes that are taking place. It is a very difficult question. I have to admit that there are no easy answers to this except that I think we have to be very clear that in responding to the current globalization process, my own political experience and training has always compelled me to ask one very fundamental question, who is benefiting from all of this? My political experience and background has also compelled me, of course, to ask a difficult question: Whose side are you on? Ultimately, I think that is the kind of question and perspective that we have to take and obviously. The signal of this in the context, more specifically, of the Third World studies, I think, is first to understand very carefully what are the changes taking place in the globalization process. What is new and different in this globalization aspect from that of let's say 20 to 30 years ago and how can we respond to these challenges. Again, we'll probably need a series of discussions and consultations to address this. I just wanted to be very clear about that, that I think it would be dangerous to be complacent about this globalization process. Obviously, it's not a win-win situation. There will be victors and victims. The important thing is not to lose sight of the need to look precisely for the appropriate responses to these new problems. Should we change the name of Third World Studies? We don't have to answer that. Probably after several rounds of beer later in the afternoon, we could come up with an answer.

Prof. Diokno: Who's next?

Prof. Ferrer: Bong Mendoza. But first, let us acknowledge Tita Sicat from the English Department and Joy Natividad from Sociology.

Prof. Amado Mendoza, Jr.: The concept of the worlds essentially has a Cold War origin. Prof. Buddy Malay here tells us that the Third World" concept is a contested one. I will argue that even the concepts "First World" and "Second World" are similarly situated. In the so-called socialist "Second World," we see a pro-Soviet bloc and a pro-Chinese camp. In the Three Worlds of the Chinese, the Soviet Union was neither in the Third or the Second World but was with the United States in the First World.

Although the concepts were contested ones, they nonetheless offered a label of convenience, a label to identify with. Now, the question at hand is whether these labels are adequate or convenient enough to still identify with especially since all of us here acknowledge that Third World concerns about emancipation, liberation, etc., are still very much around. And then, we have this all-encompassing process of globalization.

I believe that the concepts of "three worlds" were all variations, responses to the problem of modernization. They were delineated for a single purpose: to outline a process that will accelerate the modernization of former Western colonies without emulating the capitalist and/or the *realsozialist* experience. These countries and peoples were seeking a third way of development which was neither capitalist nor socialist.

Now that the Cold War is over, now that the categories left" and right" are confused, now that notions of space and time are all mixed up, and now that global is local and local is global, then, indeed the Three Worlds scheme invites revision. But we are equally concerned with continuities, without enduring objectives. We are still looking forward. We are still wishing for a liberating future. If we change the concept, could we continue to give meaning to our goals? Will the change of schema, of concepts and labels, continue to reflect these concerns?

I take note of the constant reminder that globalization is a process that can and will create winners and losers. In this process, we are saying we can win or we can lose. What I want to avoid is the misconception that winners always win and losers always lose. Losers can win too. All life processes offer only possibilities, not certainties. There are indeed

possibilities of winning and possibilities of losing. Even if one is a loser today, the possibility of winning tomorrow is not absent. And if we are going to discard the label “Third World,” hope the new name must likewise capture these possibilities.

Prof. Patricia Arinto: An attempt to rename individuals or institutions must begin with a consideration of whether that for which the individual or institution stands has changed. In the case of the Third World Studies Center, the question of whether the Center is changing its thrusts and objectives should be confronted prior to the question of whether it should be renamed.

Any modification of the Center’s thrusts and objectives is, of course, premised on the assumption that social, political and economic conditions in the world have changed. Thus far, it has been argued that the collapse of the Soviet Union, the erstwhile Second World, has profoundly altered the political configuration of the world. In the cultural sphere, rapid advances in information and communications technology are telescoping time and space in ways heretofore unimagined. And with the rise of regional economic blocs and the World Trade Organization, the world economy has become more integrated than ever before. All these changes are, of course, interdependent and may be summed up by the term “globalization.”

What is the place of the so-called Third World in the age of globalization? Avid proponents of globalization argue not only that the Third World is nonexistent in the globalized world but also that the nation-state (whether of the First, Second or Third World) is passe. But this is more wishful thinking than objective fact. The figures quoted by Dr. Rivera, as well as the myriad and more concrete manifestations of poverty all around us, belie the first argument. Despite claims of economic growth, poverty is on the rise. A globalized economy is not an unalloyed blessing. For instance, it has grave implications for labor, particularly in the informal sector. In the formal sector, the downsizing of firms (to make them more competitive) bodes ill for workers (e.g., the casualization of labor).

As for the second argument, though global firms have gained ascendancy, they are not doing so at the expense of the nation-state. The rise of regional blocs like the ASEAN, APEC, BIMP-EAGA, etc., might be interpreted to be an assertion by nation-states with common cultural and economic (though more the latter than the former) interests of their identity

and influence in world affairs. At the same time, many cultural and ethnic minorities are emerging from the shadow of dominant states and demanding recognition as independent and/or sovereign territories or communities. They are calling attention to conditions of marginalization and subalternity even now that decentralization is supposedly the norm.

In fine, although the term “Third World” is no longer literally precise, its figurative/connotative meaning remains valid. And the dynamics of development, notably its unevenness, remain a valid area of study.

Parenthetically, I want to note that most acts of renaming, at least in the dominant culture, are regressive rather than progressive. Renaming in the conventional sense may be read as a turning away from, even a denial of, an earlier identity/reality. Two examples are a woman’s assumption of her husband’s name when she gets married, and the renaming of peoples/countries by colonial powers. When the subaltern/colonized subject renames herself in the act of self-assertion, this is cause for celebration. But care must be taken that the reconstruction of identity does not become an exercise in dismemberment and denial.

Dr. S.V. Epistola: Noong unang nakilala ko si Boying, nagtatagalog siya sa Iloilo. Siyempre iyong mga estudyante’y nagsasabing maganda raw, naiintindihan nila. Ngayon, Ingles siya nang Ingles, hindi ko naman siya naiintindihan. Kaya kung ako ang tatanungin ninyo, iyong “third world” pangalan na lang iyan. Iyong mga taong kasapi ng Third World Studies Center ay walang kinalaman sa pangalan. Ang relasyon ng pangalan doon sa pinangangalangan ay hindi logical necessity. *(When I first met Boying, he taught in Filipino in Iloilo. The students liked it; they said they understood better because of the language he used. But now he speaks in English, and I do not understand what he is saying. So I think “third world” is just a name. Those who comprise the Third World Studies Center have nothing to do with its name. The relationship between a name and that to which it is given is not one of logical necessity.)*

Ginawa noong 1979 dito sa Maynila ang isang pulong ng mga bansang napapaloob sa tinatawag na Third World. Naging bahagi ako ng Philippine delegation at dito ko nakilala at naging kaibigan ang ilan sa mga representante ng Third World – mga Nigerians, Tunisians at iba pa. Itong grupong ito ang tinagurian ngayon bilang group of 77. Pero noon, more than 77 pa sila. Naisipan ko, bakit hindi ko sila kumbidahan sa UP at kung

papayagsilang pumunta, sasabihin ko kay Randy na meron nga nitong mga Aprikano na katulad natin sa pag-iisip, di pakinggan natin. Pero nang sabihin ko sa mga Aprikano, “Pumapayag ka bang tawaging Third World?” Talo ako sa debate kasi, sa kanilang pananaw, ang Third World na iyan ay isang katagang inimbento nang *Time* magazine upang ikabit sa isang grupo ng tao. Sapagkat sa kanilang imahinasyon, ang daigdig ay isang mahabang super highway, nandiyan lahat ng mga lipunan. Doon sa unang-unang super highway na iyan ay patungo doon sa sinasabi nilang progress, development. Iyong mga nauunang malapit nang dumating sa development, sa progress, ay yong tinatawag nilang First World. Nandiyan ang America at mga katulad na bansa. Ngayon, doon sa buntot, nandoon tayo, kamukha ng Bangladesh. *(In 1979, a meeting among Third World countries was held in Manila. I was part of the Philippine delegation, and I met and befriended several representatives of the so-called Third world – Nigerians, Tunisians and the like. I thought of inviting them to UP, and if they obliged, I thought I'd tell Randy that we have like-minded African friends whom we can invite to speak. I asked them, “Would you like to be considered port of the Third World?” I lost in the debate because for them, third world was an arbitrary term invented by Time magazine to describe a particular group of people. Why? Because under the Western view, the world is like a super highway with all the nations on it. Ahead of the pack and close to the “finish line” of progress and development are what we call the First World – the United States and the like. At the tail-end are Third World countries like the Philippines and Bangladesh.)*

Ayon sa UN at UNESCO, na nagbibigay ng eksamen sa lahat ng mga eight graders, ang Pilipinas ay isang antas lang ang taas sa Bangladesh at ang Bangladesh ay ang pinakakulelat sa lahat. Papaano ngayon iyan? Tinatanggap mo be na i-classify ka diyan kasi iyan ang pangalan? Hindi ah. Kasi ang pananaw ko sa kasaysayan ng ating bayan, hindi lang nag-umpisa iyan noong 1521. Ang pinakamatandang kapisang papel na nagsasabi tungkol sa mga tagarito sa atin ay nasa kasaysayan ng dinastiyang Ming ng mga Tsino. *(According to the United Nations and UNESCO which gives examinations to all eight graders, the Philippines is just a level above Bangladesh, and Bangladesh is the last. How should we look at this now? Would you want to be classified as Third World just because that's the name available? Certainly not. Because, to my mind, the history of our country dates back beyond 1521. The oldest piece of paper evidencing the first inhabitants in the country is recorded in the history of the Ming dynasty in China.)*

Noong ika-walong daangtaon, may mga taong dumating sa Canton na sabi nila ay taga-Jolo sila at dumating sila lulan ng isang barkong Arabo. May dala-dala silang paninda. Alam ninyo ba kabilang sa mga panindang iyan, iyong Sulu mats. Hanggang ngayon, pag pumupunta ako sa Jolo, nagbibilin iyong mga kamag-anak ko, mga kaibigan ko: “Pasalubungan mo naman ako ng banig.” Biro mo hanggang ngayon, banig pa rin iyan pero iyan ang most saleable item mula noong panahong iyon. Ngayon, iyong sultanate ng Sulu yumaman iyan gawa ng global trade. Wala tayong ideya ng nation-state noon. Ang sultan of Sulu ay hindi sang imperyo na ang sakop ay lupa. Kung hindi, ang impluwensiya, kapangyarihan ng Sulu ay sa dagat. Pinangangalagaan nila ang katahimikan ng dagat para makapagyaot-yaot nang maginhawa ang mga nagtitinda. Ang mga Arabo na dumadating mula sa Kanlurang Asya at ang mga Tsino na dumadating mula sa Canton. *(About the year 800 A.D., there were people who arrived in an Arabian ship in Canton saying they were from Jolo. They brought various merchandise for sale. Among these were the famous Sulu mats. Even now, when I visit Job, my relatives and friends ask me to bring home some of these mats. These were the most saleable items then and now. The Sultanate of Sulu became rich because of this global trade. We had no idea back then of the nation-state. You see, the Sultanate’s source of power and influence was not based on the ownership of land but of guardianship of the sea. They took care of the sea lanes and maintained peace and order so that merchandise can freely flow. The Arabs came from West Asia while the Chinese from Canton.)*

Alam ninyo na kung bakit naging pangunahing produkto ng Batangas ang paminta? Lahat yata ng tao sa Batangas nagtatanim ng paminta. Maski kumain ng isang salop ng paminta ang mga taga-Batangas, mas malaki pa rin iyong kanilang ani. Makikita ninyo sa Calatagan, ang nahuhukay diyari ay ang pinakamagandang pinggan. Pumunta kayo sa National Museum, makikita ninyo iyong imperial ware. Pinakamagandang mga ginawa ng mga Tsino. Iyan tayo. Bakit ang tingin natin sa ating sarili ay kung sinong kawawang hindi kayang makipagsabayan kung kani-kanino. Magiging kawawa tayo kung sasali tayo sa kanila, kung makikisukob tayo doon sa kanilang payong. Pumayag naman si Ramos na pumasok sa APEC iyong kanilang mga computers. Sino ang tumutol? Si Mahathir. Hindi ko naman sinasabing kontra ako kay Ramos. Sinasabi ko lang kung sino ang pumayag at sino ang hindi. Masama bang pumayag ka sa mga Amerikano? Masama iyon kung ang ideya mo ay huwag tayong makikisukob sa payong ng iba. Doon tayo sa sarili nating payong. Ngayon, ang pag-aralan natin,

ay kung papaano natin magagawa iyan. Nandiyan tayo. Nandiyan ang TWSC. *(Do you know why the primary product of Batangas is black pepper? Almost all of the people plant black pepper. And even if all these people were to consume a bagful of those, their total harvest would still be large enough for trade. In Calatagan, you can find the most precious plates and China ware. Visit the National Museum and you can see the imperial ware. The most beautiful ones made by the Chinese. This is who we are. Now, who can say we cannot compete? Now, what we should discuss is how we can compete effectively. This is where we come in, where the Center could play a role.)*

Dr. Malay: Regarding the genealogy of the term third world," it is not true that *Time* magazine was the one which invented the same. It was a French demographer by the name Alfred Sauvy who first used it. According to other sources I have read, it was French political scientist Georges Balandier who first did. But a greater number of scholars claim that it was Alfred Sauvy who used it first. *Time* just picked it up afterwards.

Prof. Alexander R. Magno: Actually, either nabob ako o masyado akong napalayo sa Diliman. Hindi ko naintindihan iyong sinabi ni Preachy; hindi ko naintindihan iyon. Ang ginagawa ba natin, dito ay rine-resolve natin iyong paradigm of the Third World o ang rine-resolve natin ay kung papano natin titingnan iyong globalization na wala namang definition. Palagay ko mas-fruitful ang usapan kung ang pagtutuunan natin ng pansin ay iyong local at ano ba iyong niche ng TWSC. Dito sa kaayusan natin sa loob nang pamantasan, ano ba ang papel niyan? Ano ba ang kinabukasan niyan? Ano ba ang kahihinatnan? Dahil kung pipilitin nating magkasundo sa mga malalaking konsepto ng globalization, baka walang abutin iyong usapan natin. Doon sa "niche-ing, bake may matalakay tayong konkreto. Ano ba talaga ang papel ng Third World? Imbes na magsalita na lang ako dito, magtatanong na lang ako. Ano ba ang dapat gawin ng Third World Studies Center? *(I think I have been away too much from the University. I cannot understand what Preachy said. Are we resolving here the paradigm of the Third world or are we trying to look at globalization which has actually no definition. I think it will be more fruitful if we should talk about the local and look at how the Center can find its rightful niche. What is its role in the University? What is its future? This is better because if we will force ourselves to agree on the big concepts of globalization, then we won't achieve anything. If we focus on the niche of TWSC then perhaps we can*

agree on something concrete. Instead of talking, I think it is better for me to ask questions. What should the Third World Studies Center work or focus on?)

Prof. Ferrer: Does anybody in the audience want to react or give his or her own perspective?

Prof. David: Am I in favor of changing the name of the Third World Studies Center to something else or not? I really don't know. I don't care actually. I really don't care because when we adopted the name Third World Studies Center, we were considering other names like Center for Nationalist Studies or Center for Alternative Philippine Studies. In fact, we were even thinking of a Center for General Studies because there is such a Department of General Studies at the University of New South Wales. I mean a nondescript label like general studies or Center for Interdisciplinary Studies but we wanted a label, a name that would free us from the constricted areas of concern of the traditional disciplines. In a sense, it was very liberating to adopt an ambiguous name like Third World Studies which was a contested term even during that time.

I remember Zeus Salazar objected to the Third World Studies because he said: "Third World, ni hindi ka second class, third class ka." (*Third World, you're not even second class, but third class.*) And Jun de Leon was also objecting to it because Third World connoted inferiority. Well, so did for a long time the term "Moro" but now it's a badge of honor. I mean it's the way you use a particular name.

At that time, it was very liberating and emancipating because I could do work personally on certain topics that I cannot do as a sociologist because the agenda of sociological scholarship was pretty well defined, so did the agenda of conventional political science and conventional history. But in Third World Studies, we could do work on the notion of cultural bastardization by McDonald's and Coca-cola, and indeed, we did work on McDonald's and on Coca-cola. We wanted to do work on plantation economy, and the School of Economics wasn't doing work on that nor the Department of Political Science or Anthropology. These were areas of concern that somehow couldn't easily be fitted in the agenda of the traditional disciplines found in the University. But not one of us suggested renaming the Department of Sociology or the Department of Political Science, or the Department of Anthropology. We just thought that it was

necessary to find a place in which we could do work on topics outside the boundaries of the traditional disciplines. And “third world” was a very convenient term at the time. In fact, we weren’t even doing real Third World studies in the real sense of the word. Otherwise, it should have taken us to Latin America or Africa or many parts of Asia. I would even say that we were just looking at a small group of Southeast Asian countries. But the rest of the Third World, we were content with simply collecting publications from them. And it served our purpose. I’m not very sentimental about names, and I’m not deeply attached to names, it depends on how you use names in actual practice. Our usage of particular names carries particular meanings for each one of us.

I think everyone knows, as S.V. pointed out earlier, that there is no logical relationship between a piece of reality and the name you use for it. I mean it’s conventional. It’s something that you adopt, I mean, this is the problem of representation that you have in culture: is a particular vocabulary a very accurate way of depicting something? No. Language is not suppose to be like that. Nobody believes in that anymore, except perhaps the metaphysicians.

Third World is all right for me. When we first used it, we defined it in our journal. It referred to two things. First, it referred to a group of countries most of which had come out of a colonial experience whose cultures have been bastardized. They were struggling and resisting to preserve a little of the identity they know against the assault of Westernization. These were countries whose economies were somehow distorted by the entry of global capitalism and who manifested the simultaneous existence of different modes of production. These were countries whose political systems were formally, perhaps Jeffersonian in character, like our country, but substantively manifested certain paternalistic characteristics that were being submerged by the more formal institutions. Throughout, the aspect of reality we were dealing with was the element of distortion. But to speak of distortion also meant that you had a concept of something pure and something whole before distortion set in. Most of us are questioning that now. That there is any such thing. But what is essential that time was that it allowed us to focus our attention on emancipatory movements, on traditions of resistance on the need to call upon the resources of history in order to define your identity in a period of terrible flux. Arguably, there were certain values, political values that informed our work at that time most of which probably might stand considerable rethinking.

As was correctly said a while ago, we have to decide whether what we are rethinking is the label or what we are rethinking are concerns, the areas of research and scholarship, or the political and sociocultural values that previously informed our work. All such questions I think deserve to be addressed, and then, let us decide whether the new values that we hold and the new areas of scholarship that we have decided for ourselves at this point in time and the new roles that we think are relevant to the types of institutional settings in which we find ourselves in the university and in our society, whether these concerns and values are best described by the “third world” or by something else. To me, therefore, the label should come after. Let us first decide who we are, what we want to be, because we are what we want to be. But then, if we have to adopt a new name for every reconceptualization of our identity, there would be no end, I mean, you have to change the name of the United Nations because as Boying had said, nationhood has become irrelevant, passé. Although I don’t think so.

I just came back from Job, and I was shocked to know that people identify themselves not even as Tausug, least of all, Filipinos. That term is hardly used. They think of themselves as: “Taga-Maimbung ako,” Taga-Patikul ako,” “Taga-Indangan ako.” It’s in terms of their old communities. It’s not even in terms of their own tribal identities. I asked Misuari when I was there: “Who is a Tausug here?” They are all Tausug but they don’t refer to themselves as Tausug or anything else. I am a combination of the Tausug warrior, and the Samal seafarer. It doesn’t mean anything when he is addressing his fellow Tausug. What means a lot to them is: “He’s from Maimbung, she’s from Indanan.” And then they would have a particular concept of the mentality of those from Maimbung or Indanan. It’s fascinating because these are local identities that have not been destroyed whatsoever. They continue to be relevant to the way of life that they live.

But Filipino, nobody has heard of that. I mean, I have come to the conclusion that in Sulu, the Philippine government absolutely does not exist and yet, they have icons there of the government like the PNP. For example, there’s a PMAer there who’s the head of the provincial police. The poor guy can’t even move one step towards investigating the assassination of the bishop because nobody wants to testify. But the people there can because they know, the entire province is run by entire families. At the most, three families: the Tulawis, the Loongs and the Tans. And the entire social order hangs on the balance of temporary alliances of these three families, and they have nothing to do with the police, the Church, not even the State,

nothing, it's just amazing. These are local identities. And yet Coca-cola is sold there. Well, I did not see McDonald's yet in Jolo. Jollibee, I didn't see it there. I don't think there's any market for these things there. Even the tricycles are not yet there because it's still *trisikad* and it's probably the last remaining outpost of our country, if we can still regard it as part of our county that is, untouched by globalization as we know it in Manila.

Prof. Magno: Naintindihan, ko iyong sinabi ni Randy. Iyong pinakamahalaga sigurong nagawa ng TWSC noong nakaraang dalawampung taon had nothing to do with the concept of Third World. (*I agree with Randy. The most important studies and researches of the TWSC had nothing to do with the Third World.*)

Personally, one of the main reasons why I stayed in the University for so long was that the TWSC provided some sort of a zone of sanity where you can't be standardized; otherwise, the University would have been unbearable. During those days, the Center was not simply a center of dissent in an oppositional way but truly a center for critical thinking where nothing was sacred.

I remember *Kasarinlan's* best-selling issue then, which went through four printings, was the issue where we exposed the quarrel within the Communist Party of the Philippines. There was a conspiracy of silence on the part of the Left. They refused to talk about it, so the Center brought the dispute to the fore. I was accused of being a CIA agent because of that but then the copies were sold out and the issue went through four reprints.

The symposia organized by the Third World raised new concepts on a variety of things. Before EDSA, the Third World was a center of resistance. I remember the charts of the political forces then. Included in these charts of various political forces, whether drawn by the military or the Socialist Democratic groups, was the TWSC. We always had difficulty explaining whether Third World Studies Center was an academic institution or an NGO. It was technically an academic institution, it behaved as an NGO, and I think it was the ambiguity that allowed the Center to do what it did. Of course, many of us have travelled intellectually and ideologically a long way from being a Director of the Third World Studies Center.

I am now the president of the Foundation for Economic Freedom. Bong Mendoza has our brochure. Its not a firm, it's an NGO. Its an advocacy NGO.

I think if you will bother to read our brochure, I think we're performing a liberating role. I think we don't have to problematize the name, but what is truly problematic about the Third World Studies Center is not the name, but the future of the Center.

Dr. Pertierra: Like Randy, on one level, I don't think it's important whether we should change the name or not. On another, I think the Third World Studies Center sounds a bit outdated, much as I still have sympathy for it. And I think we all agreed that what's important is the passion, the issues, the concerns with oppression that Temy pointed out.

If we're seriously thinking of changing the name, at least we should have some idea. Unfortunately, I'm not very good at thinking of titles. Obviously, what it is a Center for the Study of Global and Local Inequalities – that's one thing but it sounds too long. Another one would be Liberational Study Center, Emancipatory Study Center, or what Alex used, Center for Critical Studies. The problem is to do two things at the same time: one, indicates the values, in other words, concern with liberation, with inequality, with oppression. It's one thing to signal that, but the other is to indicate the framework of this global-local thing. And I think that's the problem. On the one hand, it seems unimportant, as long as the people know what they are doing; on the other, the problem is, if probably not in the next five years, in the next 20 years, Third World Studies, it may be a bit outdated.

Prof. David: Just a quick reaction before Boying speaks. I know that Maris graduated from the School of Oriental and African studies of the University of London. That is a colonial label if there is such a thing and I would have thought that the University of London would have moved to change it after Edward Said lambasted Orientalism but it remains, doesn't it? I mean, how would you like your alma mater to be renamed something else. Oriental and African Studies, my God, all the marks of colonial supremacy. Everything is there. But it doesn't seem to bother them, does it?

Dr. Lallana: Well, I still believe that you should change the name. Even if I agree that there is no inherent relationship between names and what they signify. But names matter. For example, are we not better off now that we are not known as the Far East but known as Southeast Asia? That we are Southeast Asia and not Far East matters. Names are important because in some sense, it reflects who we are. Names say something about who we are.

Now, while I am calling for a change of name, I never proposed a name. Precisely because I believe that before you come up with a name, you have to have an agenda – to indicate who we are or who we want to be. That is why my proposal was to pick what I thought was the most interesting and most important development upon us today which is globalization in all its ramifications in all disciplines. If everybody agrees that this should be our focus, then find a name that is specific enough to give a sense of what the center is all about but ambiguous enough that it does not prevent us from bringing in all sorts of interesting people. I am not sure that at the end of a serious rethinking about who we are, where we are and where we want to be, the “Third World Studies Center” is really an adequate name to represent who we are.

Dr. Legasto: What is in a name, Randy? Everything. It’s not true that it doesn’t mean anything. Because language is important and when somebody says that oppression has not changed, our problems are still the same. That is not true. Because when you’re talking of globalization as in what happened in 1500, globalization as in what happened in 19th century and globalization now, you’re talking about different technologies, you’re talking, for instance now, at least what we’re doing in cultural studies is to address globalization in terms of how representations are being manipulated. The technologies have changed. The importance of addressing globalization that is brought to us through the information superhighway, through modes of technology like the radio, the TV., the film industry, music, I mean those are things that were not as important before because people talked in terms of structures, in terms of economics but then, you can have a progressive movement that talks only about, let’s say, how cultural forms reflect economic realities that call them real relations implying that all other kinds of relations are not real or epiphenomenal only. What I am saying is that, I’m not trying to say that the Third World Studies should go into cultural studies. What I’m saying is that there are modes of exploitation that were not addressed before, ways through which ideology, imperial ideology, capitalist ideology are functioning that were not there before, that were not addressed before. And so, that’s the reason why in the humanities for instance, in the English Department in particular, we are concerned about labels, because let’s say you can have a progressive, a nationalist thinker, say of writings of the underground, but these are just sketches, these are not flesh and blood characters. Now that shows that the aesthetic ideology operational is realism.

Classic realism is part of liberal humanist ideology and what I'm saying is that if you use standards that are Western, you dissociate yourself from the literature that is being produced in Muslim Mindanao. You will not recognize the works that are associated with the groups of Karl Gaspar, you will not bring them in. In fact I had to fight my department so that they will allow me to study theater in Mindanao, of Cebu, of the Cordilleras.

What is sociology of power, Randy? You yourself told me that it's still conventional. It's still bourgeois. So what is it going into? I mean the conventional sociology and that's why you have to change it. The same thing is happening to us now. Everything is in a name actually because representations have been thought of as only reflecting social reality, where in fact it constructs social reality.

Prof. David: Well, you have not changed your name: you have changed your ideology and persuasion.

Dr. Legasto: My name? We are still Department of English and Comparative Literature.

Prof. David: But you are still Preachy Legasto.

Dr. Legasto: Yes. I am Priscelina Legasto, by the way. I used it in all my writings, not Preachy.

Prof. David: But people are still named Baby and they perform responsible functions. They don't distract their parents. Joker Arroyo is now a congressman but he is still a Joker, Cardinal Sin...

Dr. Legasto: Precisely that has an effect, Cardinal has an effect: Cardinal Sin has an effect. Sin is still the operational word.

Prof. Ferrer: Let us welcome a former Deputy Director, Dr. Cynthia Bautista from Sociology and UP CIDS, and Dr. Chim Zayas of Anthropology Department. Any more comments?

Dr. Ma. Cynthia B. Bautista: I missed much of the discussion. I agree that maybe we can postpone the discussion of whether we should change the name or not. But the point of the agenda is where we are going now. Ang nakikita ko from the outside dahil matagal na akong wala sa Third World.

Basically, we're now developing the thrust on Southeast Asian studies at may thrust din on democratization. Early on, what makes it Third World? In CIDS, we're trying to come up with a program that's dealing with globalization. In Third World, critical perspectives and critical paradigms are the key words. And maybe that is what will be the continuity.

During Randy's time, there have been efforts to develop international desks. You understand what's going on in Thailand; you understand what's going on in Southeast Asia, but always from the perspective of the Philippines and always also with a critical paradigm. Other paradigms are critical but some paradigms are less critical than others. I think what makes it Third World is that it is not necessarily bound to the critical within certain frameworks pero it can take on all kinds of critical perspectives of those frameworks. So, I think the direction is right and I think it developed from the past.

Prof. Teresita Sicat: What I found exhilarating about the Third World Studies Center when joined it in the late seventies was the significance it endowed upon critical studies in the English Department. After writing a formalist critique as a master's thesis for a whole year, I arrived at the question, 'So what?' It was a question that remained unanswered until I stepped into the Third World Studies Center, where the thrust of all critical studies was towards emancipation, liberation from oppression – particularly relevant in the face of the dark period of the dictatorship: committed colleagues becoming *desaparecidos*, the fresh swarms of beggars in the streets, the fear of the military, the excesses of the Marcoses.

So I am bit puzzled by our quandary this afternoon. With reservations about globalization, I came to listen to how globalization changed or did not change our conditions as a Third World country. Temy's statistics on 18-20 percent of the world's population – 1.6 billion human beings – eloquently emphasize that not only has nothing changed but things have worsened.

The Third World Studies Center should simply continue to be emancipatory. What we should focus on now is to study and analyze the changing nature of the marginalization of 20 percent of the world's population – and then address those issues and present fresh alternatives.

Dr. Rosario Torres-Yu: Marami na kasing nasabing mga punto at saka pumunta lang naman kasi ako dito para makinig at ma-update at saka siyempre isang reunion ito ayon sa sulat ni Maris. So sabik na sabik na rin akong makipag-interact sa mga kaguro mula sa iba't-ibang disiplina. Ito lang ang gusto kong sabihin. Sa palagay ko kung papalitan man ang pangalan ng TWSC, nasa sa inyong desisyon, pero sa palagay ko dapat itong magpatuloy dahil sa binubuhay kasi nito iyong diwa ng interaksyon ng mga guro sa iba't-ibang disiplina. We talk of interdisciplinary studies, we talk of such things pero hindi buhay iyon. Dito sa Third World, buhay iyon. Lalo na sa palagay ko ngayon. Sa konteksto ng nangyayari ngayon na humaharap tayo sa maraming pagbabago bunga ng globalisasyon, kinukuwestyon ang mga lumang paradigms, naghahanap ng mga bago. Sa unibersidad, kailangan natin ng venue para dito. At sa palagay ko, dapat talaga itong magpatuloy at natutuwa ako na pinag-iisipan natin ito. Sana pasiglahin pa natin. *(A lot of points have already been said. I just went here to listen and to be updated and, of course, to get to see and interact with my colleagues from the different disciplines. This is just what I want to say: it is the decision of the Center whether it will change the name or not but I think it should continue because it vivifies the spirit of interdisciplinary discourse. At the Third World Studies Center, interdisciplinary studies is well and alive. We need such venues in the University. To my mind, therefore, this should continue especially in the context of the changes brought about by globalization.)*

At katulad namin na nasa humanidades at nasa Department of Filipino, wala kaming bang venue para makipag-interact sa ibang disiplina pero kailangan namin ito sa aming disiplina at hindi lang sa disiplina kundi pati sa paninindigan. Kasi katulad ng nasabi ng marami sa inyo, isa sa nagbubuklod sa atin sa unibersidad, ay iyong paninindigan laban sa opresyon, laban sa kahirapan at iyong paninindigan para umunlad iyong Pilipino. Palagay ko iyon ang kailangang panatilihin at palakasin pa natin. *(We, in the humanities and Filipino Department, in particular, need a venue to interact with the other disciplines. The Center should also continue with and strengthen its standpoint against oppression, poverty and the drive towards uplifting the welfare of the Filipino. This is one thing that unites us in the university. This is what we should keep and strengthen.)*

Dr. Diokno: I think hindi naman natin inaasahang masasagot ang mga tanong na gusto nating talakaying ngayong hapon. At kung pakikinggan natin lahat ng mga posibleng pangalan na lumabas, Third World na rin

siguro. Center for Alternative/Critical Studies, Center for Post-Colonial Studies, Center for Global Studies, Center for Studies of all the Worlds, Center for Localization Studies, Sentro Para sa 'Di Laging Natatalo, depende sa perspektibo, puwedeng Sentro Para sa Laging Natatalo, Sentro for Passionate Studies, Post-Third World, Center for Peripheral Studies, actually iyong mga peripheral na iyan, gusto kong i-assure si Randy and in a sense si Alex na hanggang ngayon, haven pa rin sa misfits ang Sentro. Iyong mga nagtrabaho ay medyo misfit pa rin. *(I think we should not expect that all questions raised in this afternoon's discussion will be answered. And even if we would listen to all suggested names, most likely, we would still continue using "third world." Center for Alternative/ Critical Studies, Center for Post-Colonial Studies, Center for Localization Studies, Center for the Underdeveloped, depending on the perspective, perhaps Center for the Developing Nations, Center for Passionate Studies, Post-Third World, Center for Peripheral Studies, actually concerning those peripheral... I want to assure Randy and in a sense, Alex, that until now, the Center remains a haven for misfits. Those working there are still somewhat misfit.)*

I think whatever we agree or don't agree on, there are three things na nagkakasundo tayo: una, iyong panatilihin natin ang interes at pananaliksik sa mga isyung may kinalaman sa Third World, exploitation, uneven development, deliberate neglect ng mga sector at uring panlipunan; pangalawa, I don't know what Alex has to say about this pero panatilihin natin ang ating aktibistang tradisyon, bagamat meron nang iba't-ibang paraan ng articulation, handa pa rin tayong mag-question; and of course, third, to keep the Center an arena of discussion and debate, and of course, yong sinasabi ni Rose na interdisciplinary dialogue. *(I think whatever we agree or don't agree upon, there are three things where we have consensus: first, to maintain our interest and research on issues involving the Third World, exploitation, uneven development, deliberate neglect of different sectors and social classes; secondly, I don't know what Alex has to say about this, we must remain in the activist tradition, although there are different ways of articulation, we are still ready to criticize; and of course, thirdly, to keep the Center as an arena of discussion and debate, and interdisciplinary dialogue.)* ❀